

IWOOD
HOW LONG HAS IT EXISTED AS A DISCRETE SETTLED UNIT
AND
HOW DID THIS AFFECT ITS ECONOMY?

By

Gillian M Bedingfield

MA Dissertation

Bristol University 1996

YCCART would like to thank Mike Bedingfield for allowing YCCART to publish this excellent and valuable document

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

- 1 Introduction.
- 2 Congresbury to 1066.
- 3 Pre-conquest settlement.
- 4 Early Iwood.
- 5 Late Anglo-Saxon and medieval settlement.
- 6 Late Anglo-Saxon and medieval Congresbury.
- 7 Iwood's ownership and settlement from the 13th to the 19th century.
- 8 Iwood as a member of an estate.
- 9 Iwood's economy to 1352.
- 10 Iwood: 1364 to the 19th century.
- 11 Comparisons with other small settlements.
- 12 Conclusion.

MAPS

- 1 Congresbury parish 1996.
- 2 Congresbury parish: to show the distribution of the major Romano-British, pre-conquest and medieval finds recorded in the Avon Sites and Monuments Record 1994.
- 3 Iwood Area: to show possible Romano-British & medieval occupation sites.
- 4 To show Broadfield Down in relation to Iwood.
- 5 Congresbury parish: to show the lands of the Manor of the Dean & Chapter of Wells in 1812 & those of the "Rodney" estate in 1840.
- 6 To show the medieval lands of Iwood.
- 7 To show the Somerset & Gloucestershire manors and lands which were held with Iwood as different estates over the period from the 14th century to c1650. (County boundaries shown pre 1974.)

APPENDICES

- 1 De La More and Bluet/Blewet family trees.
- 2 Iwood's lords and tenants 1228 - 1840.
- 3 Extracts from documents to show the size and value of Iwood at different dates.
- 4 Iwood's mills.
- 5 Piecework and daily rates of pay 1341-7.
- 6 Areas and percentages of areas of crops sown on various manors 1340-9.
- 7 Uses of crops.
- 8 Iwood's grain sales including grain from the mills.
- 9 Analysis of cash receipts - Iwood, Wrington & 3 Essex manors.
- 10 Grain yields for Iwood and other manors.
- 11 Cash income and costs for Iwood and its mills, plus cash receipts from Yatton and other external sources.
- 12 Comparisons of lands held in Iwood, Yatton and Oldland 1328-1352.
- 13 Estates holding Iwood with other lands and manors from the late 13th to the 17th century.
- 14 1647 Rental including Iwood/Yatton & Miscellaneous, rents, values and profits of Iwood & Yatton.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Avon County archaeologist for the use of the Avon Sites and Monuments Record for Congresbury, 1994.

Martin Bodman for his information about mills on the Congresbury Yeo and his valuable references to advertisements for Congresbury properties in 19th century newspapers.

C. James Bond for very kindly providing several references to assarts and assarting.

Richard Broomhead for allowing me access to his forthcoming book -
"Congresbury - The History of a Landscape"
also for the map used as the basis of maps 3 & 6 and for his interest and comments.

David Phelps for his considerable help in the presentation of the maps.

IWOOD - FOR HOW LONG HAS IT EXISTED AS A DISCRETE SETTLED UNIT AND HOW DID THIS AFFECT ITS ECONOMY?

1 INTRODUCTION.

Iwood, now in North Somerset, is an insignificant part of Congresbury parish. Congresbury straddles the A370 from Bristol to Weston-s-mare and Iwood lies north of the parish's river Yeo, bordering on Congresbury's eastern boundary with Wrington. See Map 1. Congresbury, lying to the north of the Mendips, has much of its area in the flat claylands, criss-crossed with drainage ditches, which are part of the North Somerset Levels known locally as "the moors", and still liable to flood. The land in the north-eastern part of the parish rises steeply to the north from the Wrington Road to a maximum 172 metres and is largely wooded. North of the village is the iron-age Cadbury Hill fort. The parish's present area is about 4000 acres but in 1840, before the formation of Hewish parish adjoining the present parish of Congresbury on the west, it was 4450 acres. The great majority of the agricultural land is grade 3 in the Ministry of Agriculture's system, with small areas of grade 4 and a band of grade 2 covering the rising land on either side of Wrington Road below the woods. Iwood's land now is thus grade 3 in the southern half and grade 4 in the northern.

No medieval surveys, extents or custumals of Iwood manor survive, if indeed any were ever made. Information about medieval Iwood appears in charter rolls, final concords, inquisitions post mortem and the accounts of 1341-52. Iwood is also mentioned in Congresbury's records, including manorial surveys and court rolls. No complete cartographic record of Iwood was made until 1840, although two small parts were surveyed in 1736-9 and a very small amount of additional information appears on Congresbury's enclosure map of 1816. A newspaper advertisement of 1805 provides the earliest list of fields. Deeds of Iwood Farm, once part of the manor, survive only from the late 19th century (R.Broomhead pers.comm.) and the present owner of Iwood Manor House declined to help with my research.

In 1987-8 Avon County Council authorised a survey of Congresbury parish largely under the supervision of Richard Broomhead. Considerable fieldwalking was done, but in this mainly pastoral parish there were few opportunities to

search ploughed fields. The distribution of known finds therefore may not be as significant as presently appears. The survey report has yet to be published but evidence found has been added to the Avon Sites and Monuments Record for Congresbury. Map 2 shows the more significant finds for the Romano-British period and later and indicates that there were probably two occupation sites in Iwood during the Romano-British period.

I thus intend to show that Iwood has been settled, possibly continuously, from that period and that it was certainly a discrete settled land unit within the present Congresbury parish from, at least, the 9th century. I shall also demonstrate how this area later became a small medieval manor in the 13th century, independent of Congresbury manor, and continued, intact into the 19th century as a freehold property and as a member of a small but increasing estate until the 18th century. I shall discuss Iwood's economy up to 1840, but particularly during the 14th century, when accounts survive for the period 1341-52, showing how its development was affected by its independence.

2 CONGRESBURY TO 1066.

The earliest evidence of human activity in Congresbury found during the parish survey dates from the 4th millenium BC; the limited finds of flint artefacts are however insufficient to show settlement. For the Bronze Age "flint distributions are more likely to reflect the pattern of archaeological fieldwork rather than the true dispersal of settlement" (Broomhead : forthcoming). Finds of Iron Age pottery may just possibly indicate settlement within the present village and at Iwood. Certainly similar finds on Cadbury Hill show settlement there by the middle of the 1st millenium BC, with the earthworks there assumed to be of Iron Age origin (Rahtz 1992 pp226-7). I. Burrow has suggested that this hillfort's territory covered much of Wrington and most of Congresbury, Puxton and Yatton parishes, including Wemberham, now in Yatton, the site of a substantial Romano-British villa (Burrow in Rahtz 1992 p224).

More relevant to this study perhaps, the parish survey produced considerable evidence of Romano-British activity, see Map 2. Only two sites however produced 1st century pottery, one in the Honey Hall area and the other south

of Iwood close to the disused railway. Later Romano-British pottery, much of it locally produced, coins, a Roman plough, a two-roomed building and part of a mosaic (both now lost) provide evidence for at least eight and possibly seventeen occupation sites, including Iwood, and indicate dispersed settlement. Local pottery was manufactured in an area south of the present village, the extent of which is still to be determined, for over 100 years, ceasing by about the mid-4th century. Thus Congresbury can be seen as a part of the developing Roman settlement of Somerset, both agricultural and industrial, within the bounds of a possible estate of which Wemberham villa was the centre. Somerset, although not then defined as such, was until the mid-4th century at least, an apparently peaceful, well-organised part of the Roman empire (Costen 1992 p49).

In the early 5th century the economy broke down completely and the relatively large number of Roman coin hoards found in Somerset, (more than 20% of all such found in Britain) perhaps indicates a period of severe disorder, with individuals attempting to preserve their wealth (Costen 1992 p50). A hoard of 133 coins of the mid-4th century found near Honey Hall in 1830, the cessation of pottery manufacture and the destruction at the end of the 4th century of a Roman temple at Henley Wood in neighbouring Yatton indicates that the Congresbury area may not have been exempt from disruption.

With the disappearance of government officials and the Roman army no taxes were demanded. The need to sell surplus food to pay the taxes vanished and so did the markets, making a return to subsistence farming likely. Less food produced meant less employment. Those with neither work nor land starved and reproduction rates dropped. (Costen 1992 pp54-6). Landowners, however, would have held on to their property as best they could and although some farmsteads and rural settlements contracted or were deserted, others, particularly farmsteads, must have continued.

During the 5th century raiders in the Bristol Channel and the menace of the Saxon migration westward were a constant threat but the Saxons were temporarily deterred when defeated in battle c500 AD at Mount Badon. During this period Cadbury hillfort was re-occupied and Professor Rahtz suggests occupation from the late 5th to the end of the 6th century, although a much longer period, perhaps another century on either side, is possible.

Archaeological evidence shows security and defence as reasons for re-occupation and that the inhabitants were of high status, demonstrated by the earthworks, substantial buildings, gold jewellery and imports from the Byzantine world, tableware, glass and wine or oil in amphorae. This suggests a hierarchical society needing food and services and imposing control over its surrounding territory which must have included hamlets and farmsteads, some of which would have been in Congresbury. (Rahtz et al 1992 pp242, 246 & 249).

Unfortunately, in Somerset, little or no pottery was either produced or used from the fifth century to the tenth (Aston 1994 p222). Certainly no pottery of that period has been found in Congresbury although small quantities of pre-conquest pottery sherds were found at two sites in the Honey Hall area and another close to the church, see Map 2.

Traditionally, according to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, the Saxons took control of Somerset after the battle of Pensewood in 658AD. Surviving charters of the late 7th century certainly show West Saxon kings and bishops transferring estates (Costen 1992 p82). It was around this time that St Congar was allegedly performing miracles in the Congresbury area and that King Ine was supposed to have bestowed on him territory around Congresbury (Cran 1983 p2). The discovery, recently, of a celtic cross in Brinsea adds credence to the presence of an early church. P.Hase suggests that Congresbury was a Christian site before 620 AD (Hase 1994 p50). Certainly a charter of King Ine, 688-726, shows that the king granted twenty hides at Congresbury to the church of Sherborne (Finberg 1964 p113) and evidence for a minster in Congresbury, c888 AD, is given by Asser in his "Life of King Alfred" (Cran 1983 p13).

Congresbury must later have been taken back from the church by the Crown because Dudoc, Bishop of Wells prior to Giso, is said to have acquired Congresbury from the king sometime before 1033. When Dudoc died in 1060 he left all his possessions to the church, but Earl Harold "frustrated the bequest". (Finberg 1964 p149).

Certainly Domesday Book shows that Earl Harold held Congresbury, taxed on 20 hides, in 1066 (Thorn & Thorn 1990 1.21), thus the estate appears to have survived intact to 1066. Within this manor three thanes then held between them three hides. Post-medieval documentation shows that the manor included

Wick St Lawrence as well as Congresbury parish. R.Broomhead suggests that Puxton, a detached part of Kewstoke and part of the present Hewish parish were also included in the manor of 1066 (Broomhead: forthcoming). Domesday Book deals in manors, not settlements but it is likely that the three thane holdings represent three separate settlements, perhaps hamlets. One was in Wick St Lawrence, possibly at Bourton (Broomhead pers.comm), one at Hewish (a name suggesting a discrete unit of perhaps one hide (Costen 1992 p94)) and the third perhaps in the Honey Hall area. A fourth settlement probably existed close to the church, also mentioned in Domesday Book, but no other settlements are indicated.

3 PRE-CONQUEST SETTLEMENT

The Congresbury area may well have included several hamlets and farmsteads from the Roman to the Norman conquest, but that is not to say that each site was continuously occupied during the whole period or that all the settlements have survived. What, therefore, can be said about rural settlement generally in the period from the Roman to the Norman conquest and is it possible to prove continuous occupation of a particular site throughout the post Roman, Saxon and pre Conquest periods?

Christopher Taylor suggests that the present dispersed pattern of settlement found in many parts of the country, including parts of Cornwall and Devon is possibly the remains of the Roman pattern or earlier (Taylor 1983 p175) and Carenza Lewis suggests the same for Wiltshire (Lewis 1994 p186). Della Hooke says that the dominant pattern of rural settlement in Romano-British England was that of dispersed settlement (Hooke 1995 p103) but she also says, even though this pattern may not have changed, that there was little true continuity from the Romano-British into the early medieval period, even in Cornwall (Hooke 1994 p89).

The long period between the Roman empire's collapse and the Saxons' takeover saw many hillforts in Somerset re-occupied, of which Cadbury in Congresbury is an important example. However no farm, hamlet or village in Somerset has been demonstrated to have clearly existed in the period from the 5th to the 12th century (Aston 1988 p69), because as already mentioned, much of this

period in Somerset was aceramic. There must have been such settlements but as Della Hooke says "what we are facing is surely a population that archaeologists find difficult to locate rather than a population that was not there" (Hooke 1995 p19). It is however generally accepted that the population of England dropped considerably in the post-Roman period and did not revive until the tenth century resulting in less cultivation and some resultant woodland regeneration.

Research into Somerset's settlement pattern during this period has used field and place-names plus charters. Large numbers of place-names indicating small settlements and farmsteads, such as "cott", "wyrth" and "hiwisc" and higher status names, many for example including "tun", show considerable settlement of variable size and status in Anglo-Saxon Somerset (Costen 1992 pp87-95). Additional evidence for the identification of possible Anglo-Saxon settlements is found in aerial photographs and by field work. Three such possible post-Roman farmsteads or hamlets have been found, one at Sweetworthy in Luccombe, another an enclosure in Lovington and the third, rectangular buildings in Kingsdon. Excavations at Pickwick in Dundry have shown that the site was occupied during the later prehistoric, Roman and medieval periods and it is suggested that the site was also continuously occupied through the aceramic period as well, although no pottery exists to prove it. (Aston 1994 pp221-2)

Dr Leech has shown that the dispersed settlements of Roman-Britain in south Somerset are reflected in the medieval settlement plan there (in Ellison 1983 p7). James Bond, however, looking at settlement from late prehistoric to post-medieval times, on the Failand Ridge, which lies between Clevedon and Clifton, Bristol, concluded that there was considerable continuity of land use but not tenurial or boundary continuity. Settlements were apparently the "least stable elements of this landscape at all periods". (Bond 1995 pp146-7)

Further afield Wharram Percy in Yorkshire provides a marvellous example of a multi-period site, from prehistoric, through Roman-British, Anglo-Saxon and medieval periods to its desertion c1500. Anglo-Saxon occupation has been proved there by the discovery of large quantities of Anglo-Saxon pottery but even so there is the suggestion of a hiatus in that period (Hurst 1985 p204).

It seems clear therefore that during the Romano-British period a pattern of dispersed settlement was common in rural areas. In Somerset the post-conquest period saw re-occupation of hillforts. Not until the 10th century however is it possible to identify and date any of the other predominantly scattered settlements by archaeological means and documentary evidence before the 11th century is largely limited to charters and place-name interpretation. Continuous occupation of a Somerset site from the Roman to the Norman conquest is therefore at present unlikely to be provable.

4 EARLY IWOOD.

As already mentioned, only slight evidence for Iron Age settlement has been found at Iwood, but substantial evidence exists for occupation there in the Romano-British period. Although no first or second century pottery was found, over 500 third and fourth century sherds, the majority from locally produced pottery, were recovered during field-walking in the field directly north of site 2 on Map 3. Also recovered were fragments of pennant roof tiles which together with the character of the pottery sherds suggest an occupation site not a Romano-British pottery kiln. At site 1 a number of similar pottery sherds were found, but the identification of that site as an occupation site is more doubtful. (Broomhead pers. comm.)

Aerial photographs (1948 RAF and 1975 County of Avon series) reveal slight earthworks and crop marks in the above mentioned field, which may indicate an earlier settlement system but which are largely uninterpretable and undatable (R. Broomhead pers. comm.). The earthworks in the adjoining field are probably medieval and will be discussed later.

There was, therefore an occupied site in Iwood during the 3rd and 4th centuries and continued occupation in the post-Roman period is entirely possible but also unprovable.

The grant of the mill at "Ywod", in 1228, also included four villeins and their land holdings; one of the villeins was named Maud de Ywod (Cal Charter Rolls Vol 1 p77). Surnames at that time were in their infancy and such a topographical name indicates that Maud almost certainly lived at Iwood (Hanks

& Hodges 1990 ppix-xx). Clearly Iwood was a known named occupation site in 1228 and had probably been so named for some considerable time, perhaps even pre conquest. Unfortunately no field names within Iwood suggest Anglo-Saxon occupation but the rounded shape of the road bounding Iwood on the north-west is informative. Michael Aston suggests that such a boundary shape, taken in conjunction with the presence of Romano-British pottery in a hamlet known to exist in the 12th and 13th century, is indicative of an Anglo-Saxon farmstead (Aston 1994 p228). Maud's name indicates an occupation site in Iwood in the 13th century as does archaeological evidence which identifies one site occupied from the 11th to the 14th century and another during the 13th century; see Map 3. Thus the evidence suggests a settlement within the Iwood area in the Anglo-Saxon period.

Further information indicating possible early existence of settlement in Iwood appears in a newspaper advertisement of 1805 for the letting of Iwood Farm [Manor]. This states "the farm gives an unlimited right of common over...the extensive and valuable hill of Broadwells or Broadfield Downs". (Bristol Journal 1805) This area is in Wrington, much of it now under Bristol Airport; see Map 4. Iwood's rights over Broadfield Down are confirmed, but not in detail, in a 1706 deed (SRO DD/SF 1036). Wrington's enclosure award of 1813 states that "all right of intercommonage on the land intended to be enclosed [including Broadfield Downs] should cease and be forever extinguished...the whole of the said commons to be allotted and awarded unto and held exclusively by the several proprietors of the said Old Auster or Ancient Tenements within Wrington" (SRO Q/RDe 124). Iwood then, as now, in Congresbury, is not mentioned. Neither is Iwood's right of common mentioned in its 1829 sale advertisement (Felix Farleys Journal 1829), so Iwood had lost its rights on Broadfield Down.

The intercommonage of 1813 was between Wrington, Yatton and Kenn, not Congresbury, the inference being that the Iwood area was once considered part of what is now Wrington. No lord is likely to have granted rights of common to an area outside his jurisdiction then or later and no other part of Congresbury is known to have had any such rights in Wrington. The rights to pasturage, being attached to the land, not its holder, cannot be transferred to any other landholding (Harris & Ryan 1967 pp37-8) and human nature being what it is, those valuable rights would have been jealously guarded.

The boundary between Iwood and Wrington existed by 904AD, according to a Saxon Charter of that date (Finberg 1964 p128). (An impressive bank running south along the boundary from the Wrington Road can still be seen on the Iwood side of the Congresbury-Wrington boundary.) The charter, however, was drawn up to replace older documents burnt in a fire (Finberg 1964 p128) thus the boundary was in existence some time before and could well have been of some age even before the earlier charter was drawn up. The conclusion must be that to have qualified for those rights of common a distinct area of settlement or "Old Auster" existed in the 9th century in today's Iwood.

Iwood was not the only part of Wrington to have changed parishes before 904 AD. The area just north of Iwood has a large number of fields called "Udley". See Map 5. This area was presumably cut off from the hamlet called Udley, just east of the Congresbury-Wrington boundary, when that boundary was imposed. Udley probably derives from a personal name and "leah". "Leah" meaning forest, wood, glade or clearing is used much more commonly after 730AD than before (Gelling 1993 p198) which suggests that the boundary was more likely to have been determined after 730 than before. However although Congresbury estate, created during Kine Ine's reign, 688-726, has no surviving boundary charter, its limits may well have been determined when, or soon after, it was granted to Sherborne church. Perhaps this gives an 8th century date before which Iwood's occupation site must have been established.

The right of common must also have been regularly and frequently exercised, otherwise it would have lapsed and been forgotten. The fact that such a right was still in existence and considered valuable in 1805 implies that the right had indeed been consistently exercised. This in turn implies the existence of continuous occupation of Iwood from before the settling of the Wrington boundary until the early 19th century. The importance of this is that it demonstrates the existence of at least a farmstead at Iwood during part of Somerset's aceramic period. Thus, with the additional evidence of the topographical name, Maud de Ywod, and more particularly that of the curved boundary, the period of unprovable occupation can be reduced to c500 years and possibly as little as c300 years. Obviously there remains a very long period when the presence of an occupation site at Iwood is unprovable but it is a very much shorter period than at, for example, Pickwick in Dundry, where

continuous occupation from the Roman to the Norman conquest is considered possible.

5 LATE ANGLO-SAXON AND MEDIEVAL SETTLEMENT.

By the late Anglo-Saxon period, hamlets and farmsteads were densely scattered over most low-lying areas and in some regions settlement nucleation had begun (Hooke 1994 p90). Domesday Book is unreliable with regard to settlement, as already mentioned, so that many then existing occupation sites were not included.

Nucleation could take place, Christopher Taylor has suggested, in several ways. The simplest is steady growth, not necessarily formless, around a single farmstead perhaps spreading along an existing road or around a junction and a development of that idea is agglomeration around several farmsteads with the settlement growing together producing a "poly-focal" village (Taylor 1983 p131). Both of these can be seen as the logical result of the pressure of an expanding population, but proving such origins and dating the development is extremely difficult. Another suggestion, probably happening only on a small scale, is that people living in an area of dispersed settlement chose to occupy a single site and the fourth suggestion is that of deliberate planning, but here too determining the plan's date is difficult (Taylor 1983 p133-4). In some cases a planned nuclear village was part of the total reorganisation of the parish which included the formation of an open-field agricultural system. Shapwick, Somerset, is an example, with the changes there taking place sometime before 1086 and possibly as early as the 10th century (Corcos 1983 pp51-2). In all cases later development can obviously obscure or even obliterate the early morphology of the settlement.

Villages have never been immutable and just as they can appear, grow and survive to the present day, for whatever reasons, so some have also contracted into hamlets and single farmsteads or even dispersed settlement and many have totally disappeared. Deserted medieval villages provide opportunities for studies of settlement patterns that might still underlie existing villages and so help explain their development.

It is also possible that settlements moved and certainly in the 18th century there are well documented cases of the shifting of whole villages. One example of settlement "drift" is a farmstead in Whiteparish, Wiltshire, called Blaxwell Farm, first recorded in 1242. The present 18th century farmhouse would appear to be around 150 metres south of the 13th century occupation site which is in turn 200 metres north-east of the 16th century site (Taylor 1983 p200).

In Somerset, parishes such as Shapwick are comparatively rare although Ann Ellison has shown, in southern Somerset, that a number of villages have planned elements (Ellison 1983 pp5-7). Parishes with several settlements, a village, hamlets, farmsteads, and irregular field systems are much more common and in the west a pattern of dispersed settlement is still largely in existence (Aston 1994 p226).

Not all settlement however is of ancient origin. Much medieval colonisation of woodland, moor and wetlands produced new settlements. The Forest of Arden, Warwickshire is one such area. Its colonisation of woodland and waste resulted in small enclosed fields, with villages, hamlets and the distinctive moated farmsteads of the late 13th century, many of them still standing. In the case of Tanworth a study of surviving land charters has shown how both individual small assarts, 2-15 acres and larger blocks, up to 60 acres, sometimes rewards for officials, were positively encouraged by the lord, the Earl of Warwick, from c1180. Initially assarts were close to the strip-fields, known to exist c1200, but as fields in severalty were created so later grants were for areas further from the nucleus. Later assarts were sometimes added to existing farm units and dispersed settlement of cottages, farms and an occasional hamlet grew throughout the parish. An active land market resulted in the engrossing of smaller holdings into the hands of enterprising freeholders and produced a number of sub-manors. (Roberts 1968 pp103-112)

In Yorkshire the results of assarting could be very different. There, land clearance in the 13th century was sometimes a communal activity resulting in the enlargement of the common fields or in assarts shared by a number of tenants, although assarts also produced some severally cultivated land (Bishop 1935-6 pp18 & 20). In the huge manor of Wakefield, a complex estate, 14th century assarting was usually on a small scale, anything over 5 acres being

considered large. Indeed at Holme, with upland clearly available, although perhaps of doubtful worth, assarts were seldom larger than 2 acres. But some tenants did manage to build up their holdings over a number of years. (Stinson 1983 pp57 & 62)

In the Somerset Levels much enclosure and reclamation was carried out by the monastic and ecclesiastical authorities in the 12th and 13th centuries, particularly by Glastonbury Abbey. Permission was given to the church of Wells to assart, enclose and make parks in North Curry as well as Congresbury in 1227 (Cal Ch Rolls 1903 p4) and near Taunton in Curry Moor the church enclosed twenty-two named meadows in 1263. Lay men were also involved in improvements. A wood in West Harptree was enclosed in 1248-9 by Anselm de Gurney and permission to enclose pasture in Badgeworth was given by John of Hampton in 1253-4. (Hallam 1988 pp219-33)

Thus settlements and their associated agricultural systems can be seen to have had very different origins, resulting in very different settlement patterns with field systems developing in different ways in different periods.

6 LATE ANGLO-SAXON AND MEDIEVAL CONGRESBURY.

Congresbury is one of those Somerset parishes with a nucleated village, hamlets and farmsteads which probably never had a true open-field agricultural system.

In 1086 the king held Congresbury, from which two of the twenty hides of the 1066 estate had been given away. The three thanes, mentioned previously, held 0.75, 1.0 and 1.25 hides respectively with their tenants. Bishop Maurice held the church with half a hide, the demesne was 5 hides and the remaining 9.5 hides were divided between the manor's tenants. A total of 43.5 virgates were held by villein tenants including those of the thanes. (Thorn & Thorn 1980 1.21) Post-medieval documentation shows that the manor included Wick St Lawrence as well as Congresbury parish, which until this century included part of the present Hewish parish south of the river Yeo.

There is no indication of Iwood in 1086 and its small size, given in the Hundred Rolls of 1275 as 2 virgates, makes it too small to have been one of the three thane's holding. It may however have been known as Iwood by 1086, an identifiable unit but an integral part of Congresbury manor.

In 1086 the manor had land for 50 ploughs. Stephen Rippon suggests that where ploughlands were greater than hideage, as here, there had been an increase in cultivated land and agricultural productivity (Rippon 1994 p242). This is supported in Congresbury by Sally Harvey's proposition that large numbers of bordars are a sign of population and agricultural expansion. In Congresbury there were a total of 51 bordars and only 40 villeins. Villeins, she suggests were the holders of customary lands. Bordars, listed under the manor's tenants, were smallholders either actively increasing cultivated land by assarting on its peripheries, or the villeins' workforce or undertenants. (Harvey S 1976 pp197-9) Thus by 1086 Congresbury manor was an already expanding community with increasing quantities of arable land.

In addition to the arable there was 270 acres of meadow and estimated areas of pasture, 1440 acres, and woodland, 1830 acres. In Congresbury the meadow lay on either side of the river Yeo with some pasture probably in the moors. Woodland almost certainly covered the higher land in the north, as it did in the post-medieval period when it was called Kingswood and field names such as Gildenhurst, Smallhurst and Stibhurst in the moors show woodland was once widespread there. The demesne raised pigs, goats, cattle and in 1086 had 200 sheep.

The parish survey found sufficient evidence of Roman, pre-conquest and medieval settlement along Honey Hall lane, (Map 2) to suggest that this area was a distinct area of occupation in the Roman and pre-conquest periods and through the medieval period. A large part of the area was sold in the early 17th century; little documentation exists, although surveys of 1567 (BRO 04235) and 1570/1 (SRO DD/CC(Chap)110002) show five tenants. Congresbury's 1739 manorial map (BRO 33041 BMS/4/PL 1/4) shows only "The lands of Mr Coysgarne" written in a large blank, unsurveyed area. Thus this area had become a freehold estate, with, until the early 19th century, absentee landlords.

During King John's reign Congresbury manor was granted to Jocelyn, Bishop of Bath 1206 to 1242. Henry III confirmed this grant in 1227 and at the same time the manor was disafforested, permission was given to assart and enclose woodland and Congresbury was granted a two-day fair and a market (Calendar Charter Rolls 1903 pp4 & 16).

The change of lordship may well have been a catalyst for changes in the manor, particularly with land clearance permitted. It may also have been at this time that the village was replanned to provide a market place, today's Broad Street, where an annual fair was held until the 1930s. This street would appear to have been the only planned element in the village, the rest of the settlement resulting from agglomeration around several farmsteads, whose lands now underlie the present village.

Certainly the bishop created two small separate estates within Congresbury after receiving the manor. One was Iwood, in 1228, of which more later, the other was for the Dean and Chapter of Wells, in 1237, by the grant of Congresbury church "to the increase of their common fund" (Cal. of Mss, Dean & Chapter of Wells Vol 1 p49). An 1812 survey (SRO DD/CC 10862 & 111134) shows that this manor then consisted of many small parcels of land scattered around the parish, almost 124 acres in Congresbury and 83 acres in Wick St Lawrence. See Map 5. Most of these holdings can be traced, via the 1650 Parliamentary Survey (SRO DD/CC (Chap) 110001/1), to the earliest extant survey of 1570/1 (SRO DD/CC(Chap)110002) when there were 15 "old auster" tenements. This manor had no demesne and tenants did no customary works, but it had a court, with extant records from the 15th to the 19th century. Its income came from rents, heriots, fines and court perquisites and it ceased to exist in the late 19th century, when the land was sold.

The small amount of documentation extant for medieval Congresbury makes it difficult to assess the development of its agricultural system. However by 1302 demesne pasture was being let and 113s 9d was produced by the commutation of plough and harvest works at 1d each, suggesting demesne farming was already contracting. (PRO SC6 1131/3 in Broomhead : forthcoming)

In the 14th century Congresbury-Rodney "manor" was created by purchase. In 1313 Richard de Rodeneye bought a messuage and 3 carucates of land in

Congresbury (SRS Vol 12 p39). Its area was probably less than 130 medieval acres and in 1328 produced £16 in rent (SRO DD/TB Box 20 F.T.I.) a huge sum compared with rent in 1647 of £16 12s 1d from Iwood and Yatton together, (SRO DD/X/FRC10) probably twice the size of the Rodney lands in 1328, and including two mills. By 1567 Rodney lands were "One capital messuage and certain lands called Parcke Feeld" plus 20 acres by Old Moor, (BRO 04235), considerably less than 130 medieval acres. Ownership has been traced from 1313 to 1840. A valuation in 1829 (SRO DD/DN 158) and the 1840 tithe map both give the area as 53 acres; see Map 5. Despite the Rodney family calling it their Congresbury manor the property was probably only ever just a freehold farmstead, surviving now as Park Farm, see Map 1. The parish survey also identified several other medieval farmsteads within Congresbury.

The northern levels were not satisfactorily drained until the 19th century. However, the roughly parallel "droves" across the moor, see Map 1, suggest that Congresbury's moors were at least partially drained in the medieval period (Rippon 1994 p244). This is supported by the existence of the meer wall, the parish's western boundary in the moors, by 1351 (SRO DD/SAS BA1). Settlement, however, was confined to higher land east and south of the moors, above the 5 metre contour.

In 1475 Congresbury manor had 164 tenements, about 48 yardlands (virgates), and rents paid for the demesne and "overland" were nearly three times, in total, that paid for the customary holdings (H&W RO Worcs.Dio. 009:1 BA2636/162). The increase in arable since 1086, the rents for "overland" and the fact that in 1567 only 255 acres of manorial woodland and waste remained, suggests considerable clearance of woodland and reclamation of moorland since 1086.

The 1567 survey of Congresbury manor (BRO 04235) shows only 143 tenements, 43.5 yardlands. With the manor acquired by the Crown in 1548 and later sold, parcels of manorial land had probably been sold without rent payable, so disappearing from manorial records. This certainly happened after 1567 as the 1656 survey (BRO 04237) omits several areas covered in 1567.

The 1567 survey divides the manor into several separate agricultural areas. In each area commonable land was held only by the tenants of that area and in

most cases a large majority of each tenant's holding was held in severalty. There was therefore, probably, never a classic open-field system. The division of Congresbury into separate areas could possibly be seen as the result of a system of assarting and land clearance, perhaps even before 1066, similar to that in Yorkshire in the 13th century which resulted in fields being held jointly.

7 IWOOD'S OWNERSHIP AND SETTLEMENT FROM THE 13TH TO THE 19TH CENTURY.

Before 1228 Iwood, the name meaning the wood on the Yeo, was just a part of Congresbury manor, but with at least two occupation sites and possibly four (Map 3). In 1228 Jocelyn, Bishop of Bath granted Iwood to Stephen, his chamberlain, and totally changed Iwood's nature and status. It is unlikely however that Stephen, with official duties to perform, was ever resident. The grant was "a mill in Cungresbury called the mill of Ywod with the site and suit thereof" together with four named villeins and their land holdings and "a wood in Ywod closed with dyke and paling to assart...as he [Stephen] may wish". Stephen was to pay an annual 4 marks [£2 13s 4d] and suit of court (Cal Charter Rolls Vol 1 p77).

Jocelyn also gave Stephen the mill of Congresbury, West Mill, with its soke, a fardel of land and a villein, plus an aldergrove called Kingsalre, all outside the Iwood area, but which became part of Iwood manor. As Stephen held both Congresbury's mills, the Bishop specified that demesne corn be ground free of charge at West Mill, with timber from Congresbury's woodland allowed for repairs. The annual payment was another 4 marks. (BRO O4235 f54(i))

In 1254 Nichola, once wife of Stephen the chamberlain, sold a tenement in Congresbury to Robertus le Maresc' (Cal. Close Rolls 1929 p161), presumably the property granted to her husband.

Somerset's Hundred Rolls of 1275, confirm the original grants saying that Stephen had paid 8 marks annually for two virgates of land in "Ywode" and two water mills. These two virgates presumably included the land outside Iwood granted with Congresbury mill. Also noted is a Bartholomew de la More holding one virgate of land in Congresbury in a clearance or purpresture, plus the bank of the river Wring, or Yeo, previously common land. (Rotuli Hundredorum

1818 pp 129-30) Bartholomew was possibly the son of Robert le Marese' and was either father or grandfather of Stephen de la More who definitely held Iwood in 1317. See the De la More family tree, Appendix 1.

As discussed, Iwood already included a farmstead when it was granted in 1228. This and the fact that the grant's area was described in 1275 as two virgates suggests that it was part of Congresbury manor's customary arable land. None of the 4 villeins granted with Iwood, however, had typical customary holdings; each held a different area with land described variously as "land", "land within the moor", "land without the moor" and meadow, a total of 28.5 acres. No complete cartographic record exists for Iwood until 1840 but two small areas were surveyed for the 1736-9 maps of Congresbury manor (BRO 33041 BMC/4/PL1/1-2). One is an area adjoining Iwood including fields called "Moor Furlong", (see Map 6), surveyed because the trustees of Congresbury manor retained part of it. This area also contained land belonging to Iwood and probably the tenants' land called "within the moor", making it clearer still that Iwood, pre 1228, was customary land. The tenants' "land" and "land without the moor" cannot be identified but probably lay within Iwood as shown on Map 6.

At least one occupation site existed in Iwood from the 11th century, with quantities of 11th to 14th century pottery sherds suggesting a site north-east of Iwood bridge (Avon SMR 7252), site 6, Map 3. Thirteenth century pottery shows another site close to the present Iwood Farm (Avon SMR 7255), site 3, and earthworks north-west of Iwood Bridge, sites 4 and 5 are described as "potential medieval house platforms" (Avon SMR 7254). Thus four possible medieval occupation sites, nicely and perhaps coincidentally, equal to the number of villeins, can be identified in Iwood, although more may exist. Settlement had certainly shifted, if only a short distance, from the Romano-British positions. Site 7, where the remains of a 19th century mill-wheel still stand, is probably that of the medieval mill mentioned in the 1228 grant and Iwood was thus a small hamlet by then. These sites and the evidence of human activity, visible on aerial photographs, all lie west of the lane (Iwood Lane) running due north from the river, suggesting established cultivation there. Thus "the wood in Ywod" was probably east of the lane, where the only two Iwood fields with names definitely suggesting woodland, "Iwood Oak" and "Woods", lie. See Map 6.

Site 8, Map 3, where Iwood Manor House now stands, east of the lane, appears the most likely site for the medieval manorial messuage. Iwood's 14th century accounts show that there was a manor house of sorts, a barn, a substantial cattleshed, a wagon house and a dovecote, but no evidence of any of these were found in Iwood during the parish survey. This lack of archaeological evidence indicates that the site was indeed that of the present Iwood Manor House where large scale landscaping of the gardens around the house was carried out in the 19th century, destroying any evidence (Broomhead: pers. comm.). Bartholomew's clearing of 1275 would seem a likely place for him to have built a new messuage, having appropriated the river bank which the Hundred Rolls say he had done. This probably forced the alteration of the present right of way, running east along the Yeo's northern bank from the village until it reaches Iwood Bridge, where it crosses to the south bank, only returning to the river's north bank when past Iwood's land. The deviation in Iwood Lane past this site would also seem a logical result of the new messuage.

In 1317 Stephen de la More owned 2 messuages, 2 mills, quantities of arable land and meadow with 20 acres of wood plus 26s in rent in Yatton, Congresbury (Iwood) and Banwell (SRS Vol 12 1898 p67/8). It is not possible to assign the land between the three named places. This and the different units used in measuring the land make it impossible to accurately describe 13th century Iwood, but there was certainly no more than 20 acres of wood by 1317 remaining from the original grant. Iwood cannot be described as a totally assarted medieval estate, as many Arden Forest sub-manors were, but by 1275 it included some assarted woodland, the "wood in Ywod" of the original grant.

Stephen's Inquisition Post Mortem (IPM) shows that in 1328 he and his wife held two messuages and land, with no mention of mills, in Yatton & Ywode, valued together at £10 per annum, and in Oldland Gloucestershire, a messuage and land, for which an extent was given. (Cal IPM 1909 p118 & PRO C135/11) Thus Iwood had become part of a small estate. The fact that Stephen paid 3s in Congresbury's 1327 subsidy (SRS 1889 p264) suggests that he spent at least part of his time resident in Iwood.

Iwood remained with the De la More family and descendants on the female side into the fifteenth century. See the De la More family tree in Appendix 1. Inquisitions post mortem and other documents, appendix 3, unfortunately say

little about Iwood in that period or later. Only from 1341 to 1352, when Iwood's accounts survive, can Iwood be studied in any great detail.

Some time after 1417 Iwood passed to the Bluett family of Greenham in Stawley, Somerset, later of Holcombe Rogus in Devon. It is possible, that the Bluetts received Iwood by marriage to a female descendent of the De la More family. The Bluetts held Iwood until John Bluett died in 1634 leaving only female descendants; they held Iwood jointly and passed their respective shares to their children who in turn passed them to theirs, the manor being held jointly until 1715. See the Bluett family tree in Appendix 1 and a more detailed account of ownership and tenantry in Appendix 2.

Iwood then became the property of the Richardson family and some time before 1725 West Mill and the fardel of land granted with it in the 13th century were sold, but the aldergrove "Kingsalre" remained appertinent to Iwood until at least 1840. By 1739 some of the tenants' land was sold and by 1766, and probably much earlier, perhaps before 1725, Yatton too had been sold.

Congresbury manor's map of 1739 shows a building where Iwood Farm now stands and another in land once held by a medieval tenant, west of the field called West Lease (Map 6). As the majority of Iwood was not surveyed in 1739 nothing can be said about other possible settlement changes by then. Congresbury's 1816 enclosure map shows in addition a building south of Iwood Farm, just east of site 3 on Map 3, a cottage just north of Iwood Bridge, Iwood Mill and Iwood Manor House, clearly incorrectly placed. The four occupation sites of the 14th century, sites 3-6 Map 3, had been deserted and settlement had again shifted within Iwood. The name Iwood has however never moved. Iwood's right of common confirms this; as already mentioned, such rights cannot be separated from the land as the landholder cannot transfer them to another landholding.

The Richardsons owned Iwood for two generations, the first resident landlords since Stephen de la More in the early 14th century. Through the marriage of a Richardson daughter it went to a John Tripp who sold Iwood c1816. Iwood was thus owned by only three families from 1254 to 1816, with non-resident landlords from 1328 to c1715. Considerable attention was paid to Iwood in the 13th and 14th centuries and perhaps during the 15th century, since a very brief court roll of 1461 exists. Thereafter Iwood was only one of several

manors in the Bluet estate. The Blewetts certainly neglected Iwood in the 17th century when the 1656 survey shows that they had not informed Congresbury's manorial lords of the names of the new owners. The survey notes only that "The heirs of Mr Blewett" (John Blewett died in 1634) paid Iwood's chief rent of £5 6s 8d. Indeed this survey condemns the many absentee landlords of Congresbury who let out their lands to tenants "...whoe think they have little cause to bestowe much paines... for improvement on other mens lands ..." (BRO 04327).

It was probably the continuity of ownership and perhaps neglect that kept Iwood intact from the 13th to the 19th century. This preserved the right of common, which supports the other information demonstrating the presence of an occupation site within Iwood from the Anglo-Saxon to the medieval period. Indeed Brian Roberts picks out "propriety and jurisdictional rights over land" as the major factor in the preservation of "landscapes and institutions" (Roberts 1976 p300).

8 IWOOD AS A MEMBER OF AN ESTATE. See also Map 7 and Appendix 13.

Iwood became part of an estate when Stephen de la More, having Iwood, inherited Oldland manor in 1292 (Ellacombe 1867 p205). By 1317 Stephen had land and rents in Yatton and Banwell (SRS Vol 12 pp67-8), the sole reference to Banwell. Limited evidence for Yatton lands exists in a single joint account of 1350-1 (BL Add Roll 7668), but the date of Yatton's acquisition is unknown. From the mid 15th century Iwood and Yatton, some distance from most other manors in the Bluet estate, are sometimes mentioned as a single entity, called Iwood/Yatton, or just Iwood or even Congresbury, although Yatton land was often clearly included. Although it is now generally impossible to disentangle information and divide tenants, rents etc. between them, no confusion is likely to have existed when the documents were created. Available information shows that in the 14th and 15th centuries the two manors were run as entirely separate units. Once the manors were no longer farmed directly there was probably little contact, but in the 14th century there was a small amount of trade between them.

Iwood's accounts, 1341-7, include 50s rent collected annually from Loxton's farm. In Stephen's 1328 inquisition (PRO C139/11) Congresbury and Yatton

together were worth £10, and Oldland, with an extent, £10 3s 7.5d, so with rent from Loxton, Stephen had at least £22 13s p.a. a respectable income for a minor knight.

The 1340 IPM for William, Stephen's son, shows Oldland, with another extent, worth £12 8s 0d (Ellacombe 1893 p289), but no inquisition for Somerset lands exists. William had probably lived at Oldland, the extent showing no value "above the value of the residence" for its manorial messuage. Comparing Oldland with Iwood (See Appendix 12), Oldland was considerably larger, its demesne arable alone being 197 acres, probably 3 times that at Iwood. At Oldland a third of the arable was used as common fallow, suggesting a classic three-field open-field system, in contrast to an irregular system at Iwood, to be shown later. Oldland's rents provided a reliable income, and a 1344/5 rental (GRO Transcript PRO ADD 26434) shows 47 tenants, against Iwood's 5, paying a total of £9 13s 1d. This rental increase from 1340's £5 12s might reflect increasing pressure on the land, but more probably shows the true position, the rental made for the lord not officialdom. Oldland was more valuable, with many more tenants than Iwood, providing a regular income, a hedge against variable agricultural profits. As with Yatton, there was apparently only limited direct contact between Iwood and Oldland.

Yatton's lands are briefly described in the 1350-1 account. See Appendix 12. Both pasture and meadow was all apparently in strips in twelve named, but unidentified, fields and the area sown, 40.5 acres, was possibly, like Iwood that year, less than usual. Yatton produced roughly the same average profits as Iwood; see Appendix 11. But as Iwood had two mills and Yatton none, Yatton's area was possibly greater and more fertile than Iwood's, although the limited information makes comparisons difficult. From Yatton's 1350-1 account and the small amount of trade shown in Iwood's accounts, Yatton's range of produce was similar to Iwood's, wheat, barley, oats, beans, apples, cider, cattle, pigs and poultry but, unlike Iwood, no sheep.

By 1366 Cecily, William de la More's daughter who then held his lands, had granted her mother, Maud Basset, Iwood, Yatton and Loxton for her life, and later, some time after 1417, Iwood and Yatton went to the Bluet family, as already mentioned. Oldland was held by Cecily from 1350 when its association with Iwood ended (Cal IPM Vol VII p133).

Cecily's inquisition, 1393, gives Iwood's value as only 20s whereas Yatton's value was 8 marks [£5 6s 8d] (PRO C136/80). This startling difference contrasts markedly with the 1340s, when profits were about equal. The total value of Iwood and Yatton, £6 6s 8d, also compares badly with their value of £10 in 1327, but reflects the general drop in landed revenues towards the end of the 14th century (Dyer 1993 p42).

Agnes Bevyll's 1441 inquisition (PRO C139/105) shows her Somerset estate consisted of Iwood manor, North Petherton Hundred and manor and Faryngdon manor, but not Loxton. Agnes also held property in other counties. She was once John Bluet's wife, and their son, another John inherited her Somerset estate. (See Appendix 1) Iwood manor, presumably including Yatton, value 10 marks (£6 13s 4d), 5% more than in 1393, represented a considerable 27% of Agnes' Somerset estate and was a useful addition to the Bluet estate.

Agnes received North Petherton, but not Faryngdon, from her parents (Cal IPMs Vol XVIII p337) and possibly Iwood and Yatton from her mother. Faryngdon, in Stogursey, value £5 in 1441, was probably only a farmstead, perhaps now Farrington Hill Farm, elevated to a manor, like Iwood and Yatton. Certainly a 1461 court roll (BL Add Roll 7671) shows separate courts held at Iwood Blwet, Yatton Blwet, Faryngdon Blwet and Almondsworth Blwet (Almsworthy).

Appendix 13 shows how the Bluet estate increased over the next two hundred years. Greenham came to the Bluet family by marriage in the 14th century. Property in Kydesford was purchased in 1402 (SRS Vol 22 p6), Kittisford "manor" appearing in John Bluet's 1463 IPM, and Almsworthy was also probably purchased. Like many others, the Bluets' small estate was built by inheritance, purchase and marriage with Iwood/Yatton clearly rather isolated from most of the estate's lands. See Map 7.

Walter Bluet's 1481/2 inquisition omitted Iwood/Yatton (Cal IPM Vol 4 1828 p407) but Walter's son, or probably his agent, paid Iwood's rent in 1497/8 and 1503/4 (SRO DD/CC (Chap) 131919 6/8 & DD/SAS BA3). Iwood was therefore just forgotten. Indeed no owner apparently paid any attention to Iwood from then until the 18th century, apart from paying the annual rent, except when Congresbury manor demanded evidence of the Bluet's ownership of West Mill in 1567 (BRO 04235).

Walter's descendant, John Bluet, died in 1634 without male heirs, leaving only daughters. A 1647 rental relating to their joint inheritance (SRO DD/X/FRC 10) included Iwood/Yatton, called Congresbury Manor, which provided nett rents of £16 12s 1d, approximately 8.2% of the total, so was not then, or earlier, an inconsiderable asset. Iwood's real value, in common with others, however had actually decreased since 1393. Its value then, £6 13s 4d needed to increase (very roughly) to £44 10s by 1647 to provide equivalent purchasing power (Munby 1989 pp26-77).

Iwood remained associated with several of the properties in the 1647 rental until 1715 (SRO DD/SL 5). Thomas Richardson owned and occupied Iwood from c1719, Iwood's first resident landowner since 1328, with the present Iwood Manor House probably dating from his ownership. Thus an obscure part of Congresbury parish became first a tiny manor then the country estate of an unimportant gentleman.

9 IWOOD'S ECONOMY TO 1352.

How was Iwood's cultivation organised?

The earliest cultivation system was probably the infield/outfield, where one area, the infield, was continuously cropped and parts of the area around, the outfield, were cultivated occasionally as necessary and then returned to pasture for several years (Taylor 1975 p68). This system required considerable pasture, waste or common (Aston 1988 p91).

At some point, probably due to population pressure and the necessity of more cultivation, which in turn reduced the grazing area, co-operation between cultivators became essential for survival. From this necessity, in some areas, the common field system was constructed. This required the arable land to be divided into strips with each individual's strips distributed around the fields. Strict rules enforced which crops were grown and both arable and meadowland were pastured by those same individuals' stock after harvest and in fallow years. The grazing of waste and pasture was also strictly regulated and regulation was commonly carried out by a manorial court. This did not need a two or three field system; the furlong, a group of strips, not the field was the area of crop rotation, making the rotation of two, three or more