

NOTES & QUERIES

FOR

SOMERSET AND DORSET

EDITED BY

D. M. M. SHORROCKS, M.A., F.S.A.,

222 Staplegrove Road, Taunton, Somerset, TA2 6AL,

AND

G. J. DAVIES, B.A., Ph.D., F.S.A.,

16 Melcombe Avenue, Weymouth, Dorset.

*"Attempt the end, and never stand to doubt;
Nothing's so hard, but search will find it out".*

HERRICK.

CONTENTS

No.		Page
	Subscriptions	337
	Back Issues	337
207	Hardy's "Romantic Adventures". J. B. Smith.....	337
208	History of Hutton. H. Coward	341
209	Dorset prepares for invasion, 1797. M. Turner	347
210	Iron Lady of Somerset. J. P. Ferris	351
211	Iron smelting at Witham, Trudoxhill, Nunney. M. McGarvie .	353
212	Enclosure disputes, Stour Provost & Stalbridge. J. H. Bettey .	355
213	Strachey MSS in British Library. M. McGarvie	359
214	Sherborne Parish Registers. A. A. Moon	362
215	King Arthur's Leaden Cross. S. C. Morland	366
216	Note: Drovers, N. W. Hants	367
217	Query: Margaret Harkness	367
218-226	Book Reviews	367-372

Annual Subscription £2 (U.S.A. 6 dollars),
payable in advance. Two parts annually, post free.

BRIDPORT

C. J. CREED, Printer, Broadoak, Bridport

Entered at the New York Post Office as Second Class Matter

COMMITTEE

MRS. COSMO RAWLINS, B.A., F.S.A. (Chairman).

J. H. BETTEY, M.A., PH.D., F.S.A.

J. H. HARVEY, HON. DR. YORK, F.S.A.

M. B. McDERMOTT, M.A.

M. McGARVIE, B.A., F.S.A.

D. M. M. SHORROCKS, M.A., F.S.A.

W. STUART BES1, M.A.

MISS M. HOLMES, M.A.

J. R. RUSTON

GLANVILLE J. DAVIES, B.A., PH.D., F.S.A.

J. H. P. PAFFORD D LIT., F.S.A.

ROGER N. R. PEERS, M.A., F.S.A., F.M.A.

L. C. HAYWARD, B.A., F.S.A.

226 Goldcroft, Yeovil, Somerset, BA21 4DA. (Hon. Secretary and Treasurer).

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Subscribers are reminded that from 1st January, 1981, the annual subscription is £2 (\$6 for subscribers in the U.S.A.).

Subscriptions should be paid in advance in January to L. C. Hayward, 226 Goldcroft, Yeovil, Somerset BA21 4DA.

NOTES AND QUERIES FOR SOMERSET AND DORSET (SDNQ) has been published in unbroken sequence since 1888. At present two parts are issued annually.

CONTRIBUTIONS are invited on the history, architecture, archaeology, genealogy and folklore of Somerset and Dorset, including industrial history and archaeology. The Editors welcome copies of or extracts from MSS. or other records, as well as queries on matters of like interest. All communications, preferably typewritten, should be sent to one or other of the Editors. Contributors wishing to have spare copies of the parts containing their communications must inform the Editors when sending them in. The charge will be 60p each.

BOOKS FOR REVIEW will be received and noticed as opportunity offers.

ADVERTISEMENTS will be inserted at the following rates: whole page £10, half page £6, quarter page £4, inch space £2.50, half-inch space £1.50, whole width of page per issue, payable in advance.

BACK NUMBERS are available at £1 each plus postage, on application to the Hon. Secretary.

SUBSCRIPTIONS. Because of the increasing postal charges, subscribers who have not yet paid for this year (£2) are earnestly requested to do so NOW to avoid the need for a reminder from the treasurer.

BACK ISSUES WANTED. Subscribers willing to dispose of Part 123, volume XVI, and Parts 205, 206, 210, 213, volume XXIII, and Part 287, March 1968, are invited to communicate with L. C. Hayward, 226 Goldcroft, Yeovil, Somerset. BA21 4DA

207. THE CHANGING TOPOGRAPHY OF HARDY'S "ROMANTIC ADVENTURES". Although Hardy originally planned to have Margery, the heroine of "The Romantic Adventures of a Milkmaid", disappear with the mysterious Baron von Xanten in his yacht, never to be heard of in England again, in the 1883 magazine version of the story, the author bowed to Victorian convention by making the milkmaid a reluctant fugitive, who tearfully prevailed upon her would-be abductor to let her return to her husband, Jim: "'Oh sir!' she gasped, 'I once saved your life; save me now, for pity's sake.'" (p. 88)¹ In the story as it appeared in 1913, Margery still responds to the call of duty, but less willingly. And on hearing of the death of the Baron she confesses to Jim: "'If he had pressed me . . . I would have gone. And I was disappointed that he did not press me.'" (p. 487)² As for the Baron, his sentiments are no longer "doubtful" (p. 89), but "impassioned" (p. 486), and the Mephistophelian side of his nature is brought out a little more.

Along with changes in characterization and motivation demanded by these shifts of emphasis, the definitive version of 1913 is also marked by a change in location. Hardy transferred the scene from Dorset to the valley of the Exe in Devon, "probably to ensure that the world of the romantic milkmaid was not associated with that of the tragic dairymaid in *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*, an important part of which is set in the 'Froom' valley. This is identical with the 'Swenn' valley in which 'The Romantic Adventures of a Milkmaid' was set originally".³ In revising the original, Hardy removes some dialectal features which might be too reminiscent of Dorset, and adds others which are meant to reflect the speech of Devonshire, though this type of adjustment is not on a large scale.⁴ The general tendency in the revised version is in fact for dialectal features to be toned down somewhat, possibly as a concession to readers unfamiliar with the vernacular. Paradoxically, however, the result is not a 'flattening' of the dialogue, since a more subtle deployment of linguistic features now throws differences of background and attitude more effectively into relief. This is evident in the exchanges between Margery and the Baron. Although in the revised version she is quite capable, when affected by emotion, of lapsing into

dialect, she quite plausibly tends to shed provincialisms when addressing von Xanten. Even so, the social distance between milkmaid and nobleman is maintained through his avoidance of reduced forms such as *I'll* and *there's* in favour of the less colloquial *I will* and *there is*. At the same time the Baron's exotic background is hinted at through the addition of "My Gott" (p. 413), while "My dear girl, God bless you!" becomes "My good maiden, Gott bless you!" Such modifications, though they are not numerous, help to colour our attitudes, as does, say, the change from "the poet Chaucer" to "your poet Chaucer" (p. 15, cf. p. 419), or the alteration of Xanten's name to von Xanten throughout the 1913 edition.⁵

Just as, in shifting the scene to Devonshire, Hardy restricts himself to a minimum of changes reflecting regional dialect, so, in adapting the complex topography of the Swenn valley to that of the Exe, he makes only those alterations that logic and consistency demand, or that the reader familiar with the more conspicuous features of the region might expect. At the same time, just as the dialogue is made to reflect attitude, character and social background more clearly than before, topography can also on occasion be pressed into the service of characterization. However, before discussing the new, Devonshire, topography, we have to be clear about the network of places and natural features, real and imaginary, referred to in the original version of the story. Here I shall try to avoid the temptation of identifying places and features which are generally held to be unidentifiable.⁶ Even so, I shall feel justified in following clues where Hardy gives them, and in comparing the landscape of the story with the 'real' landscape as we know it today.

In the original version Margery Tucker lives at Stickleford (Tincleton), and frequently visits her grandmother at Rook's Gate four miles to the east, on the way to what must be Anglebury (Wareham). This would place Rook's Gate somewhere in the vicinity of Clouds Hill (SY 824 909). The nearby Mount Lodge, inhabited at the time by Baron Xanten, is "a building of the medium size, and unpretending, the facade being of stone; and of the Italian elevation made familiar by Inigo Jones and his school". (Ch. 1) Both architectural style and location are reminiscent of Woolbridge Manor, just to the north of Wool. This is the 'Caroline' manor-house referred to in *Tess* as Wellbridge Manor.⁷ Mount Lodge is between Stickleford and Lord Blakemore's "in the next county", which must be Hampshire or Wiltshire. In order to shorten the journey to the latter destination, where he and Margery are to attend the ball, Xanten chooses a rendezvous "two miles or more" from Stickleford Dairy. It is Three Walks End in Chillington Wood, which must thus be located near Pallington

Heath, to the east of Tincleton. (Ch. 3) The location of Jim Hayward's lime-kiln and house is more difficult, if not impossible, to establish. From the house a lane winds between the steep escarpments of a ravine till it reaches the kiln, immediately behind which lies a British castle, "with triple rings of defence, rising roll behind roll, their outlines cutting sharply against the sky". (Ch. 7) We shall seek in vain for a fort corresponding to this description in the vicinity of Tincleton, alias Stickleford. Nevertheless, Margery's father refers to Jim as one of the Stickleford folk, and their properties must at some point be contiguous if ashes can blow from Jim's couch-heap on to the dairyman's hay. (Ch. 13) But Tincleton again becomes less likely as the location for Jim's home if we bear in mind that he has a lonely walk of miles after his meeting with Margery midway between Stickleford and Rook's Gate. (Ch. 7) The kiln is also several miles away from Mount Lodge. The nearest way from the kiln to that house, and to Budmouth (Weymouth) and Casterbridge (Dorchester), is via Rook's Gate, which abuts on the highroad to those towns. (Ch. 10, Ch. 15) All this suggests that "Jim's village" (Ch. 15) is north of Rook's Gate, possibly in the vicinity of Briantspuddle (SY 816 933), though this again lacks anything like the trivallate fort of Hardy's description.

The Yeomenry Review in which Jim takes part is held "on some high ground a little way out of the town" of Casterbridge. (Ch. 16) This ground could well be near Frome Whitfield just north of Dorchester, and Dairyman Tucker's route thence to the Melchester (Salisbury) and London road "a mile or so ahead" (Ch. 17) could be along what is now a narrow road linking Charminster and Stinsford. On arriving at "the white track to London" Tucker sees no trace of Xanten and Margery ahead, but on looking along the other arm of the fork, leading to Stickleford, Anglebury (Wareham) and the coast, he sees the Baron's carriage ascending a distant hill and vanishing under the trees. Misdirected by the dairyman, Jim takes the London road, but after some miles he has to stop at a wayside hamlet and inn. At this point in the original story we find the following description:

"This hamlet had once been a populous village. It bore the name of Letscombe Cross. In the middle, where most of the houses had formerly stood, a road from the hills traversed the highway at right angles down to the water meads, and at the intersection rose the remains of the old mediaeval cross which shared its name with the hamlet. The interesting relic of anti-Renaissance [sic] times was sadly nibbled by years and weather, but it still retained some of its old ornament, and was often copied into the pocket-book of the vagrant artist." (p. 84)

A little later, the cross is described as having four octagonal steps. (p. 86)

There are wayside crosses within a few miles of Dorchester to

the north-east, but none in any way corresponding to the above account, or located on the road to Salisbury and London at any point that Jim could have reached in the circumstances described by Hardy.⁸ However, in some other respects the vicinity of Northbrook, just to the north-east of Puddletown, on the side nearest the medieval village of Bardolfeston, is reminiscent of the hamlet that had once been the "populous village" of Letscombe Cross. In the 1913 edition the above passage is omitted, and instead of swearing on the cross (p. 86) the Baron swears on the hilt of Jim's sword that he will no more disturb the couple in their conjugal bliss. (p. 483) No other omissions of this magnitude were made in the revision, and it may be that Hardy took the opportunity to delete such a specific reference to a cross that will be sought with as little success on the road out of Exeter as it will on that leading from Dorchester.⁹

In the revised edition most of the attributes of Casterbridge are transferred to Exonbury (Exeter), except that the latter loses Winford Hill, gaining in return a cathedral clock and generally being referred to as 'city' rather than 'town'. Budmouth becomes Tivworthy (Tiverton) as a destination for the unnamed musician (p. 454), but Plymouth when it is a matter of finding a sanctuary for the unfairly used Harriet Peach (p. 486), Lord Blakemore's becomes Lord Toneborough's (Toneborough is Taunton), and Stickleford becomes Silverthorn, which has been identified as Silverton, six or seven miles to the north of Exeter.¹⁰ Rook's Gate, Mount Lodge and Chillington Wood retain their names, and the descriptions of them, as of Jim's kiln, remain unaltered,¹¹ though we shall look in vain for specific counterparts on the map of Devon, even where we think we may have found them on that of Dorset.

Nevertheless, Hardy has to be mindful of the general situation of Jim's home, now to the north of Exonbury rather than to the east of Casterbridge. In the revised version, von Xanten still travels south-east from the scene of the Review, Idmouth (Sidmouth) superseding an unnamed cove (probably Lulworth) as his destination. But when instead of setting sail there he takes Margery to her husband's home, then returns to seek Jim on the London road, he will have to approach from the west rather than from the east. This is an alteration which well serves the changes of emphasis in the portrayal of character referred to at the beginning of this article. In the original version we read:

"Jim Hayward was standing in sight of this object [the cross] when he beheld, advancing toward it from the opposite direction, the black horses and carriage he sought, now gilded and glorious with the dying fires of the western sun." (p. 84)

This becomes:

"Standing in sight of the white way by which he had come he beheld advancing towards him the horses and carriage he sought, now black and daemonic against the slanting fires of the western sun." (p. 482)

At one point in the new edition Margery agrees that the devil has perhaps shown her all the kingdoms of the world. (p. 436) Now, at the end of the story, von Xanten has truly become one of Hardy's "Mephistophelian visitants".¹²

1. Thomas Hardy, *Her Shattered Idol or The Romantic Adventures of a Milkmaid* (Chicago: Stein, 1910) is taken here to represent the magazine version of 1883.
2. "The Romantic Adventures of a Milkmaid", New Wessex Edition, *The Stories of Thomas Hardy*, ed. F. B. Pinion (Macmillan, 1977), vol. ii, *Life's Little Ironies and A Changed Man*.
3. Editor's note, *ibid.*, pp. 497 f. It has also been suggested that Hardy might have wanted to make the place-names of the story "more suggestive". See Michael Benazon, "The Romantic Adventures of a Milkmaid: Hardy's Modern Romance", in *English Studies in Canada*, v, i, Spring 1979, pp. 56-65, where some of Hardy's other textual alterations and their implications are also discussed.
4. J. B. Smith, "Dialect in Thomas Hardy's Short Stories", *The Thomas Hardy Annual*, ed. Norman Page (Macmillan, forthcoming.)
5. Another change of personal name is that of Louisa Peach to Harriet Peach. The name Louisa no doubt had special significance for Hardy: see F. B. Pinion, *A Hardy Companion* (1968; rpt. Macmillan, 1974), p. 395. The only other change of personal name in the story is that of Lord and Lady Blakemore to Lord and Lady Toneborough.
6. Chillington Wood and Mount Lodge, for example. See J. Stevens-Cox, *Hardy's Wessex*, fourth edition (Toucan Press, 1979).
7. Pinion, *A Hardy Companion*, p. 505.
8. See Alfred Pope, *The Old Stone Crosses of Dorset* (Chiswick Press, 1906), especially pp. 115-117.
9. Other possible reasons for the omission might be that it could have been seen as inappropriate for a satanic figure such as von Xanten to swear on a cross, or that the scene is vaguely reminiscent of that at Cross-in-Hand in *Tess* (Ch. 45).
10. At one point in the original story, Hardy obviously makes a slip in saying that Rook's Gate is "four miles to the west" of Stickleford (p. 30). When he 'corrects' this to "four miles to the east" of Silverthorn (p. 433), he is clearly making an adjustment required by the original topography, rather than thinking of the new, Devonshire map, on which Rook's Gate could just as well be to the west as to the east of Margery's village.
12. See Pinion, *A Hardy Companion*, pp. 156-158.

Bath

J. B. SMITH

208. AN 18TH CENTURY MS HISTORY OF HUTTON. In 1982 a curious manuscript, bearing the title *History of Hutton*, (hereafter *History*), was acquired by Somerset Record Office.¹ Although the scope of this *History* is limited, what it reveals of its author's strength and weakness and of the sources to which he apparently had access may be worth considering by readers of any other of his works. For, whilst this manuscript bears neither the author's name nor the date of its composition, these can confidently be established from internal evidence. It must have been written during 1788 or early in 1789, for it mentions a challenged presentation to the living "confirmed in 1788", but does not include the presentation made in April 1789. That its author was Richard Locke, the Burnham landowner who also

wrote *A Survey of Somerset* (hereafter *Survey*), was first suspected by Mr. D. Shorrocks, the County Archivist, mainly from its handwriting which a detailed comparison reveals to be identical with that of the manuscript of Locke's *Survey* in Somerset Record Office.² Positive proof that Locke was the author of this *History of Hutton* is provided by its reference to "a very curious Will published in the *Entertainer* of the 14th of January last" and later to John Payne "whose Will I have already given to the publick." Clearly this matches his reference in his *Survey* to the same John Payne who "made a curious will dated 1476 (*sic*, but *recte* 1496) and printed in the *Sherborn Entertainer* of the 14th January 1788." Although Locke's *History* is addressed "To the Printer", it was probably, like much of his work, never published and it is therefore not altogether surprising that no mention of it was made by Madeline Ward in her review of Locke's life and literary work in the preface to Locke's *Supplement* to Collinson's *History of Somerset*, (1939).

Nearly seven times longer than the section on Hutton in Locke's *Survey*, his *History* naturally reveals more fully some of its author's characteristics. The prosperous Burnham landowner who took a keen interest in agriculture, and whose influence upon neighbouring farmers Madeline Ward compared to that of the more famous Coke at Holkham in Norfolk, is clearly evident in the long passage describing the nature and use of land in the parish. Concerning the "flat and marshy" land, then valued at 30s. or 40s. an acre, he observes that "if it was summer fed instead of being Mowed — drained the best possible — the Ant hills destroyed — the banks brought to a good tilth and spread over the land, it would be then worth Grazing" 50s. an acre. As for the "dry hilly Ground", which, he says, "is in great repute for producing good crops either of Corn or Grass" but worth only 20s. an acre, he remarks that "Providence hath made up the deficiency by the many rich veins of Lead and Brass Ore and a yellow Mineral called Oaker with which the hill abounds" and, he adds, "there is a strong presumption supported with much reason that there are veins of Coal in this parish." Elsewhere in the *History* he reveals that, at some time before 1739, the heiresses of Richard Hebden, claimants to part of the manor of Elborough within the parish, began to dig mines upon the hill there. He also shows himself to have been aware of, and to have approved of, a project for the inclosure of the common land, although this was not in fact achieved until 1849 (the moor) and 1856 (the hill).

It is, however, the image of Locke as a local historian of no mean competence that is mainly projected in both the county *Survey* and the parish *History*. The latter provides a far more

detailed account of Hutton's past than that given by Collinson in 1791 but, rather oddly, omits the Domesday Book record of the manors of Hutton and Elborough (quoted fully by Collinson) and the early stages of the Payne family's pedigree, both of which he includes in his *Survey*. His documentation and general level of accuracy were not greatly surpassed in Emmanuel Green's article on the Manor of Hutton, published in 1885³, and then only in Green's medieval section including the early 15th cent. partition of the manor, of which both Locke and Collinson were apparently unaware. As far as Locke is concerned this unawareness is surprising for it is evident from his *History* that he had access to a considerable collection of deeds and other documents relating to Hutton from the 13th cent. onwards and these probably included records of the partition. Certainly such records (or some, at least) are to be found in the extensive Ashton Court MSS in the Bristol Record Office,⁴ and, even if Locke had not seen these documents, he had probably read an inventory of those among them relating particularly to Hutton, which had been made in 1749 by John Matthews when he purchased part of the manor.⁵ Only from one or other of these sources could Locke have learned, for example, that John, son of John le Walshe, secured the manor "by way of Jointure to Elizabeth his wife, daughter of Richard Flory" in 1359.

Locke's account of Hutton's subsequent history during the 16th and 17th cents. is even more detailed and probably far more accurate, revealing his close acquaintance with records of litigation, particularly of proceedings in the Court of Chancery, by various claimants to portions of the manor. At least one passage in the *History* would seem to indicate that Locke had also visited the parish and used the oral testimony of some of its inhabitants to supplement and interpret the documentary evidence. From the daughter of Anne Selman (nee Ferris), a descendant of the Paynes, he heard "the merry story" of the parson's demanding tithe of her mother, who earlier, when he was "her intended husband", had presented him to the living of Hutton but had subsequently been jilted by him. "Her threatening to kill him," Locke continues, "so alarmed his fears that he never more ventured to ask her for Tithe as long as he lived."

Such illuminating flashes, however, are rare in Locke's work and most of the twelve closely-written pages of his *History* are packed with facts less attractive for the student of local or family history, so long as he is aware of Locke's limitations and weaknesses. One may search it in vain for evidence concerning the life and work of Hutton's inhabitants, the changing names and patterns of its fields and lanes, or the various phases in the construction of its principal buildings, the Church and the

Court. Apart from his contemporary, mainly agricultural, survey of the parish, his list of presentations to the living, his isolated mention of digging mines and the rare anecdote quoted above, Locke's *History* is almost entirely a genealogical study, tracing the descent of the manor or portions of it through various families from "soon after the Conquest" to his own day.

Curiously enough, this vaguely phrased starting-point for his *History* is quite different from the one he chose for the beginning of his account of Hutton in his *Survey* and consequently the first stages of his two versions of the history of the parish are also quite different. Although in the first paragraph of his *History* he reveals that he undertook to write it in response to a request by readers of his earlier article in the *Entertainer* that he should "trace the pedigree of the Payne family" and "give a larger account of Hutton, the place of their residence," it is not in his *History* but in the *Survey* that he clearly complies with this request by starting with the Domesday Book record that the two manors of Hutton and Elborough were held by Azelin de Perceval and proceeding to trace from him, with doubtful accuracy, the pedigree of the Paynes as lords of the manor of Hutton. In his *History*, however, after a page about the living and advowson of the church and two pages of his survey of the parish in his own day, he begins his historical account by stating that the manor was held "soon after the Conquest" by John de Saint Laude (i.e. St. Lo), that "as early as Henry the third Elborow was divided from Hutton" as "a distinct Manor" with "a moiety of the Advowson", and that "in the Reign of Edward the third it was the property of the Payne family." From this point he devotes a page to a history of the separate manor of Hutton down to 1687 before reverting to the manor of Elborough and resuming his pedigree of the Payne family from 1360 to 1639, the death of Nicholas Payne.

There is also a slight discrepancy between *History* and *Survey* in the dating of John Payne's will. Whereas the former gives it correctly as 1496, the latter has 1476 as a correction written over an earlier entry. A copy of the will had existed at the time of the above mentioned inventory of 1749, but does not appear to have survived to reach the Ashton Court MSS. today. Altogether it would seem that the Hutton section of the *Survey* was not so much a summary of his *History* as partly a revised version of it and partly a supplement to it.

No amount of revision by Locke himself, however, could have eliminated all the errors in his *History*. Most of those in its earlier part sprang from his fundamental misconception of the medieval manor and its place in the feudal structure. Although he states that John de St. Lo held Hutton "under the Honour of Gloucester," he was apparently unaware of any intermediate

stage of overlordship and, even in his *Survey*, his linking of the Payne family with Azelin shows the same unawareness. For him a manor had always been a "property", a territorially integral piece of real estate to be bought and sold freely, without mention of obligations to a feudal overlord, as indeed it was in Locke's day and had been for over a century past. Hence the two inaccurate statements (quoted above) which misdirected the subsequent course of the medieval part of his *History*. The first of these concerned the separation of the manor of Elborough from that of Hutton. Actually, although Hutton and Elborough were separate manors before and shortly after the Conquest (as the Domesday Book record, correctly quoted by Locke in his *Survey*, shows), and although in 1303 they were still held as two fees by John le Waleys,⁶ an extent of the manor made in 1309⁷ covers both as if they were one. It lists pieces of demesne land according to their use, and rarely distinguishes between those in Elborough and those in Hutton. For more than a century onwards the two 'fees', both held by a single member of the Waleys or Walsh family, constituted the manor of Hutton. Quite inaccurate, therefore, on at least two counts is Locke's statement that "the manor thus divided from Elborow became the property of Richard de Hampton, who in 1343 sold it to John le Walshe." Evidently Locke had misinterpreted a 1346 deed of feoffment to trustees among whom Richard de Hampton was the first to be named.⁸ A later member of this family, as lord of Harptree, would have been overlord of Hutton, but Locke apparently did not know or comprehend this.

There was no subsequent division of this manor of Hutton (including Elborough) until after the death of the last male in this branch of the Waleys family, Roger Walsh (son of Roger), c. 1425. When the consequent partition of the manor and a few other Walsh lands into one moiety and two quarters was completed in 1430,⁹ no distinction was made between Hutton and Elborough, the tenements in both parts of the parish being allotted strictly in turn and the demesne fields etc. (even the Court house and farm) being divided and, where necessary, sub-divided, east and west or north and south. In 1604 Nicholas Payne, who shared the whole manor with the Ludlows, sold Hutton Court and its surrounding land to Bishop Still¹⁰ and in 1612 sold all his tenements in the village of Hutton to Nathaniel Still,¹¹ so that the Payne estate in the parish then consisted mainly of lands and tenements in Elborough. But he did not alienate the advowson and manorial rights and continued to hold courts for the manor of Hutton to 1622 and then for the manors of Hutton, Ludwell and Elborough until his death (c. 1638), as did his heirs.¹² The Codringtons, who inherited the Hutton Court estate from the Stills, apparently held no

manorial courts, but when they sold it in 1730 to Humphrey Brent it was described as 'that manor or reputed manor of Hutton'.¹³ By the middle of the 18th cent. the term 'manor' had become virtually synonymous with 'estate' and the parish comprised three such manors, Hutton (Brent), Elborough and Ludwell¹⁴ (Matthews) and Oldmixon¹⁵ (Symonds), all intermingled. This accounts for Locke's mistaken belief in the long-standing separation of the manors of Hutton and Elborough.

Locke's second basic inaccuracy was to assume that "by Edward III Elborow was the property of the Payne family." The Paynes, who held many lands elsewhere in North Somerset, actually appeared in the middle of the 13th cent. as free tenants of the manor of Hutton, their chief tenement being at Ludwell. They had a quasi-manorial status but were not lords of even part of the manor of Hutton (including Elborough) until the partition of 1430 assigned a quarter to Richard Payne's wife, Agnes (nee Oldmixon), daughter of Joan (nee Walsh) who was one of the sisters and co-heiresses of Roger Walsh. It was this Agnes's sister, Joan, (not, as Locke states, Roger Walsh's sister) who married the younger William Dodesham and they had no issue. It was, therefore, not from them (as Locke declares) that one moiety of the manor came to be held by the Cokers, but from Joan Walsh's sister, Agnes, whose first husband was Walter Coker. Yet Locke quite correctly says that John Coker sold "the Manor House of Hutton" to John Payne by a deed dated 20 July 1482.¹⁶ In 1579, when Henry Coker exercised his right of presentation to the living of Hutton, he did so according to his turn as holder of a moiety of the advowson, not, as Locke maintains, because he "purchased a turn of Thomas Payne." Incidentally, Locke's list of presentations to this living after the reign of Elizabeth is correct apart from his unaccountable omission of the very first, that by Nicholas Payne in 1607. Equally unaccountable but more extraordinary is Locke's statement that Bishop Still, who purchased Hutton Court from Nicholas Payne in 1604, "had married Ann, his eldest daughter."

Despite such inaccuracies as these much of Locke's *History* is substantially correct, especially its record of the intricate subdivisions of the whole manor during the late 17th and the 18th cents. It, therefore, remains a rich source of information concerning the history of that parish and of several Somerset families.

1. S.R.O., DD/S/BK.
2. Do., DD/SAS/PR 86.
3. *Proc. Som. Arch. Soc.*, 31, pp. 57-63.
4. Bristol R.O., AC/D 11; AC/M 8.
5. S.R.O., DD/X/ELL. (It seems more likely that Locke had seen the originals, as he mistranscribes at least one surname which the inventory records correctly — *Som. Ed.*).

6. *Feudal Aids*, vol. 4, p. 312 (HMSO, 1906).
7. B.R.O., AC/M8/10.
8. Do., AC/D11/5.
9. Do., AC/M8/11, 12.
10. Do., AC Box 10.
11. *Ibid.*
12. B.R.O., AC/M8/3.
13. S.R.O., DD/MPG (C/1421).
14. B.R.O., AC/PL/85, map of 1759.
15. Hine's map, 1756 (Weston public library).
16. B.R.O., AC/D11/31, but Locke wrongly gives the date as 1481.

Hutton

HAROLD COWARD

209. DORSET PREPARES FOR INVASION: THE STATE OF CIVIL POWER IN 1797. During the French Revolutionary wars of the 1790s and then again from 1803-5 during the Napoleonic wars there was a genuine fear in Britain that a French invasion was both possible and indeed imminent.¹ Such fears were well founded in fact, on the one hand with French landings in Bantry and Killala Bays in Ireland and in west Wales, between 1796-8, and on the other with the observed build up of an invasion flotilla at the French held Channel ports. The purpose of this note is to add to the information we already have of the preparations for invasion that were made in Dorset. The document of 1797 which is printed below supplements Professor W. E. Minchinton's assessment of Dorset agriculture during the Napoleonic wars and in particular Brigadier R. Chevenix-Trench's discussion of the second invasion scare of 1803 brought to life under the title 'Dorset Under Arms'.²

In the event there was not an invasion, but while the threat remained the State undertook some precautionary measures. These usually involved the mobilisation of the local militia, the supplementation of that militia, and the call to arms and service of voluntary support. These measures were usually conducted at the local level under the direction of the county Lords Lieutenant and their deputies. It seems that Dorset was something of a pioneer county in this respect undertaking local enquiries and surveys on the state and readiness of civil defence ahead of the specific requests which came from Whitehall. Indeed, it may be that the actions which Central Government took were inspired by the initiative of the Dorset Lieutenancy. Professor Minchinton has made the same point and published the Dorset live and deadstock survey of October 1796.³ The removal of deadstock is mentioned in the document printed below and indeed the Dorset live and deadstock survey was a precursor of other enquiries in other counties.⁴ They were ordered under the direction of the 1798 Defence of the Realm Act (38 Geo. III, c. 27, 5 April 1798). Again in 1803 the Lord Lieutenant of Dorset and his divisional commanders acted very

swiftly to the call to mobilise under the authority of the reconstituted Defence of the Realm Act (43 Geo. III, c. 55, 11 June 1803).⁵

The document printed below, dated loosely as 1797 from the watermark on the paper, can be found in the Humberside (formerly East Riding) Record Office in Beverley, along with a duplicate of the same with the name of the county and the names of the regional divisions and actual entries missing.⁶ Evidently this Dorset enquiry was intended to act as a blueprint for others to follow, though the extent to which other county lieutenancy did so is not known. There are in print a number of enquiries of a similar nature for other counties demonstrating both the results of such a *posse comitatus* as this and the contemporary live and deadstock returns.⁷ That Dorset was the pioneer among counties is without doubt.

It was upon the proceedings taken in 1797, in the County of Dorset, that an Act was passed, on the 5th April, 1798 (38 Geo. III, c.27), entitled *An Act to enable His Majesty more effectually to provide for the Defence and Security of the Realm during the present War, and for indemnifying persons who may suffer in their property, by such measures as may be necessary for that purpose.*

This act was founded "upon the proceedings taken under the Common Law in the County of Dorset".⁸ We can add weight to this assertion from the Home Office Domestic Entry Letter Book, that is from copies of the letters sent out from the Home Office. On February 15th 1798 the Secretary of State for Home Affairs wrote to the Earl of Darlington, the Lord Lieutenant of Durham,

My Lord,

I beg leave to submit to your Lordship's consideration the inclosed state of the Civil power of the County of Dorset arranged under several heads, comprising the number, disposition and arrangement of the *Posse Comitatus*, and of the Waggon, Carts, and Cart Horses in each division, which may, if necessary be used for the purposes therein mentioned.

I am persuaded that the Utility of that arrangement, is so evident, as to render any argument in support of it unnecessary and to induce your Lordship blank Copies of the scheme, and shall be very glad to think that I have by these means facilitated and promoted its adoption. ⁹

I venture to suggest that the document printed below is the equivalent of a request made to the Lord Lieutenant of the East Riding of Yorkshire, though there is no correspondence or other evidence to support this. Though no reference is made to Dorset in the minute books of the deputy Lieutenants in East Yorkshire, nevertheless they resolved in November 1796 to take a census of the live and dead stock within 10-12 miles of the coast. The Dorset live and dead stock survey was made in October 1796, without solicitation, and was made available to the Secretary of State for Home Affairs.¹⁰ It looks increasingly as though Dorset was the pioneer county of its day in the invasion preparations, and certainly not all of the local

evidence points so obviously to the so called 'Pitt reign of terror' and the problems of insurrection which also occupied the Home Affairs Department.¹¹ The lieutenancy and the local militia cast their gaze as much out to sea as they did to the political problems along their own shores.¹²

1. R. Glover, *Britain at Bay: Defence against Bonaparte, 1803-14* (London, 1973); and the series of articles published in the 1970s by P. M. Kerrigan in *An Cosantoir* under the general title 'The Defences of Ireland 1793-1815'.
2. W. E. Minchinton, 'Agriculture in Dorset during the Napoleonic Wars', *Proc. Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society*, vol. 77 (1955), pp. 162-73; R. Chevenix-Trench, 'Dorset Under Arms in 1803', *Proc. Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society*, vol. 90 (1968), pp. 303-12.
3. "In the collection of livestock returns the county of Dorset was a pioneer". Minchinton *ibid*, p. 162.
4. As in footnote 7 below.
5. As described in Chevenix-Trench, *loc.cit*.
6. Humberside C.R.O. LT 9/52 'A State of the Civil Power of the County of Dorset'.
7. For example J. Cranmer-Byng, 'Essex Prepares for Invasion 1796-1805', *Essex Review*, vol. 60 (1951), pp. 127-34 and 185-93, and vol. 61 (1952), pp. 43-7 and 57-74; G. H. Kenyon, 'The Civil Defence and Livestock Returns for Sussex in 1801', *Sussex Archaeological Collection*, vol. 89 (1950), pp. 57-84. Obviously the south coast counties were the most vulnerable to invasion, and in Kent the Royal Military Canal was constructed after 1803, but civil defence spread to other, less obviously vulnerable places. For example see R. W. S. Norfolk, *Militia, Yeomanry and Volunteer Forces of the East Riding 1689-1908* (East Yorkshire Local Hist. Soc. Pamphlet Series, no. 19, 1965), especially pp. 12-33.
8. Toulmin Smith, *National Defence in Practice with the Opinions of William Pitt, Charles James Fox, etc. etc., on the Arming of the People* (London, 1859), p.9.
9. P.R.O. HO/43/10, letter of 15th February 1798, before the Defence of the Realm Act, April, 1798.
10. P.R.O. HO/42/39, Colonel, Volunteer Dorset Rangers, West Lodge, Milton, Dorset, October 1796. In the case of the East Riding the local farmers were less than forthcoming in answering the requests of the local lieutenancy, as over a year after a request for information many of them had not sent in a return, Humberside C.R.O. LT 6/1, 17 February 1798.
11. This other aspect of the troubled times of the 1790s is perfectly illustrated in R. A. E. Wells, *Insurrection the British Experience 1795-1803* (Gloucester, 1983).
12. The 'Divisions' set out in the document printed here do not conform with the 'Divisions' as set out in the 1801 and later censuses. But at the crude county level the number of men included in this *posse* was 20,857 from a county male population in 1801 of 53,667. Thus nearly 39 per cent of the male population of Dorset in the late 1790s were between the ages of 15 and 65 and were not already engaged in the Military, but 'ready' to obey the commands of the county Sheriff.

University of Hull

M. TURNER

A
S T A T E
OF THE
C I V I L P O W E R
OF THE
C O U N T Y O F D O R S E T,

Containing the Number of Persons between the Ages of 15 and 60 Years (not engaged in a *Military* Capacity) returned to the SHERIFF within the respective Divisions of the said County; who are to be *ready* and obedient to his Commands, in Case the *Peffe Comitatus* should be raised to suppress any Riot or Insurrection, or to repel Invaders. Also the Number of Waggons, Carts, and Cart Horses, in such Divisions, returned to the Lieutenancy, which may be used for the Removal of *dead* Stock, and conveying Soldiers, or their Baggage, &c.

Divisions.	No. of Men returned to the Sheriff.	Disposition and Arrangement of the <i>Peffe Comitatus</i> .			No. of Waggons, Carts, and Cart Horses, returned to the Lieutenancy.			Disposition and Arrangement of the Waggons and Horses.			
		COMMANDERS.			Waggons	Carts.	Cart Horses.	Directors of Stock.	Drivers of Waggons.	Number of Waggons.	No. of Cart Horses.
		Chief.	Petty.	Privates.							
Wareham,	2085	17	85	1700	268	142	1209	26	260	260	1040
Wimborne,	2870	23	115	2300	465	285	1970	47	470	470	1880
Blandford,	1385	10	50	1000	157	59	629	16	160	160	640
Shaftesbury,	1785	14	70	1400	196	172	870	19	190	190	760
Sturminster,	1745	15	75	1500	213	152	810	21	210	210	840
Sherborne,	1707	13	65	1300	220	114	767	22	220	220	880
Cerne,	1356	11	55	1100	203	69	779	21	210	210	840
Dorchester,	3708	31	155	3100	425	302	1893	42	420	420	1680
Beaminster,	4216	35	175	3500	446	236	1842	45	450	450	1800
TOTAL	20857	169	845	16900	2593	1545	10769	259	2590	2590	10360

RECAPITULATION.

No. of Chief Commanders, 100 Men each,	169	No. of Drivers of Waggons	-	2590
— Petty ditto, 20 ditto each,	845	No. remaining	-	3
— Privates	16900	Total of Waggons returned to the Lieutenancy	2593	
Total of Commanders and Privates	17914	No. of Cart Horses to be used, 4 for each, Wagon,	-	10360
No. of Directors of Stock, 10 Waggons each,	259	No. remaining	-	409
— Drivers of Waggons, 1 ditto each,	2590	Total of Cart Horses returned to the Lieutenancy	-	10769
No. remaining	94			
Total returned to the Sheriff	20857			

Note. The *Carts* are not included in this Arrangement, but should any be wanted, there will be 409 Horses towards driving them, and 94 Persons to be employed as Drivers.

210. THE IRON LADY OF SOMERSET. Rachel, Lady Hopton, who died in 1629 after twenty years' widowhood, was long remembered among her numerous descendants as a benevolent but formidable matriarch.¹ Her eldest son, Robert, a very active justice of the peace and deputy lieutenant, sat for Somerset in the Parliament of 1621, two of her younger sons, Thomas and Arthur, were knighted in the service of Charles I, and 'she married all her daughters to great estates and great families', half of them to men of title. Her grandson Sir John Ernle, Chancellor of the Exchequer under Charles II and James II, wrote of her: 'Every year she had all her children and grandchildren meet together at her house, and before they went away would know if any little or great animosities were between any of them; if so, she would never let them go till they were reconciled'.²

But Ernle's account is chiefly interesting as a portrait of a Jacobean lady active in an industry which has seldom succeeded in attracting her sex or her class. 'Lady Hopton's forge' was probably operated at Witham Friary under her direction from 1597, when her spendthrift husband Sir Arthur inherited the property,³ until 1620, when her son Robert, whom she had brought into the management of the enterprise, gave up trade and dispersed the workmen. Unfortunately there is as yet no evidence to show whether she took over a going concern, revived an ancient one, or had to start from scratch.⁴ But Witham was not readily accessible from a distance at this period; strangers approaching it from Bristol were advised to procure the help of a guide (*see below*). The presumption must be that Lady Hopton or her predecessors had discovered an easily worked outcrop, and that the closure of the enterprise was necessitated by the exhaustion of local supplies.

Ernle emphasises Lady Hopton's personal responsibility for the forge in his account of her husband's death-bed. To the physical agonies of 'a gangrene in the toe' was added the uneasy consciousness that he had for years exceeded his income and was leaving his large family in debt. But his wife 'desired him to be no way concerned for his debts, for he owed not a penny to anyone. . . . She had set up an iron-works and paid all he owed, unknown to him.' In her widowhood her 'way of living was very great. She had a hundred in her family⁵ and bred them up to several trades. She rose at six of the clock herself, went to the iron-work and came in about 9; went with all her family to prayers, and after dinner she and her children and grandchildren went to their several works with her in the dining-room, where she spun the finest sheets that are.' Apart, perhaps, from the spinning, it must be stressed that Lady Hopton was not indulging in expensive hobbies considered suitable to her sex and class. To her must be ascribed the

transformation of the Hopton fortunes. Her husband and her father-in-law Sir Owen, the lieutenant of the Tower, had been reduced to selling all the ancestral estate in Suffolk. But her son and her grandson, Sir Ralph, later Lord Hopton, were free of financial worries. Indeed the latter is one of the few Cavalier commanders whose papers in the *Calendar of the Committee for Compounding* reveal no considerable burden of debt or encumbrance. This happy condition may well have been a factor in his military successes, though chroniclers of his campaigns are not apt to give much weight to such unromantic considerations as the amplitude of his resources or the soundness of his credit status in enabling him to retain control of his men.

Fortunately we are not dependent solely on the family tradition recorded by Ernle. The *Lismore Papers*⁶ contain several contemporary references to the forge in the closing months of its operation. On 20 May 1619 Richard Blacknoll, who managed the Cappoquin furnace in co. Waterford for the parvenu Lord Boyle (better known as the great Earl of Cork), wrote a letter of instruction to one Thomas Smith, who was on a business trip to England.⁷

His lordship advizeth you [to] make some private meanes to procure a guide to the Lady Hoppens Fordg, called Wittham, which is about 20 myles from Bristoll, where, by observing the course prescribed unto you, you shall easily discerne and know whether her sonne Sir [sic] Robert Hoppen had any conference with Mr Woodward in Bristoll concerning some iron he should offer him to sell in my Lord Boyles behalf, and what the said Sir Robert did offer him for a Tonn delivered in Bristoll, and see and understand the State of that worke, and where they buy their sow iron, and what lykelyhood there is of continuance of the worke, etc. And yf good occasion be offered, you maie see to deale with Sir Robert or my Lady Hoppen for a hundred or half a hundred tonn of sow iron for a tryall. The lowest price that his lordship will sell a tonn of sow iron for is five pounds sterling delivered on the key at Bristoll, or fower pounds tenn shillings sterling delivered on the key at Yoghall, free of all charge.

It is to be regretted that Grosart did not print Smith's report, if indeed it survived. Evidently a bargain was struck, for in the accounts of John Doughty, Boyle's Bristol agent who represented the city in the Parliaments of 1626 and 1628-9, there appear the following items:⁸

Receivede the 5th of december 1619 of Mr Roberte Hopton	£200-00-00
Receavede more of Mr Robert Hopton in part of the 20	
tun of sowe iron that is come and to come the som of	080-00-00
Paid for the caaridge and selleredge of the 4 tun of sowes	
for Mr Hopton	00-02-00
Paid for wayinge and caryinge of the Iron for Mr Hopton	00-01-00
Paid for hallinge Mr Hoptons 40 ton of iron to his storehouse	
att 8d.	01-06-08
Paid for wayinge his 40 ton	00-10-00

Boyle's prices to a new customer 'for a trial' were doubtless

attractive; but his doubts over the viability of the enterprise in the face of local competition from the Forest of Dean and handicapped by the cost of transporting pig-iron from Bristol to Witham proved well-founded. On 17 Feb. 1620 he received the following letter from Doughty:⁹

Mr Hopton hathe sent me in this day, being the next day after Candellmas Day, 80 *li.*, . . . and he hathe written me prayinge me to sell the 20 tons of sowe iron when hit comes, for that he hathe wrought out his, and purposeth to doe noe more therin; . . . and also that yf your Lordship wante a hammer mann you may have his, the whiche is as good as any is in England, he thinketh.

The operations here described were probably on a small scale, and possibly brief in duration. Nevertheless field archaeology on comparable sites in the Sussex Weald has usually succeeded in revealing traces of slag-heaps or hammer-ponds. It would be interesting to ascertain whether any visible memorial to Lady Hopton's successful enterprise survives at Witham.

1. She left five sons and ten daughters, who all lived to maturity.
2. *Notes & Queries* (Series I), iv, 98.
3. F. A. Brown, *Abstracts of Somersetshire Wills*, vi, 51: will of his aunt, Lady Dorothy, wid. of Sir Ralph Hopton, ref. P.C.C. 74 Cobham.
4. But see next following article, McGarvie, *Iron Smelting at Witham Friary, etc.*
5. Probably to be interpreted in a wider sense as household.
6. *Lismore Papers of Sir Richard Boyle* (1st Earl of Cork), ed. A. B. Grosart (5 vols., 1886-88).
7. *Ibid.*, II, 163-4.
8. *Ibid.*, II, 214-7.
9. *Ibid.*, II, 220.

London.

J. P. FERRIS

211. IRON SMELTING AT WITHAM FRIARY, TRUDOXHILL AND NUNNEY. The earliest reference to an iron mill at Witham Friary, as far as I am aware, is contained in the grant of a large part of the estate of the Carthusian priory there to Sir Ralph Hopton in 1544. This included both a corn mill and an iron mill,¹ the latter probably at Witham Hole, where iron slag is still to be found in abundance. The present house there is 17th cent., but may well have had a predecessor, for it occupies a suitable site close to the stream which flows from Gare Hill to the River Frome.² The retaining banks of a large pond survive in the field below Witham Hole, but this may be a relic of an earlier monastic fish pond.

There may have been more than one iron mill for the name clings to a wood, farm and bridge a short distance north of Witham Hole, but outside the monastic boundary, in Trudoxhill a hamlet of Nunney. The present Iron Mills Farmhouse seems largely 18th cent., but in 1620 there was a mill here called King's.³ In the early 17th cent. Iron Mills Bridge

was known as Yewe or Yeowe Bridge — there are numerous variations in spelling — and the River Frome as Yowater.⁴ The evidence of the name Iron Mills, significant as it is, does not stand alone. It is supported by a curious tradition picked up by Francis Thynne, *Lancaster Herald* and a member of the Longleat family. He was a frequent visitor to Longleat and married into a Nunney family, so knew the district well. His note on the iron mill comes at the end of his description of Nunney church, precisely dated 22 Aug. 1583. Thynne's handwriting is minute, crabbed and almost illegible, but appears to read as follows:

In Trottoxeshill in Nonney parish (as my brother Mawdlye, Lord of Nonney, being LX yeres of age herde olde menne before reporte) there were ther smythes that kept pretenses [apprentices] dwelling with them who wrought the yrone maille at the yrone myll standing therebye & not farr from Ewe bridge uppone the water that runeth from Frayrye [Witham Friary village as opposed to Witham Charterhouse where the priory stood] to ewe bridge & so to frome [the River Frome]. Of whiche yrone mille there is certenne notes yet remayninge of the buildinge betwene whiche smythes who had a bell at the townes end to gyve notice of ther enemyes & the smythes of Newe forest besides Bristowe [Bristol; Thynne presumably means the Forest of Dean] there was contynuale all [*sic*] stryffe & the one iniuryed the other whereuppon they of Trotokeshill compleyning to the Kinge as he passed that waye to an abbey were after by the other of new forest sleyne all in one nyghte.⁵

The tradition Thynne heard, no doubt revived by the workings of Lady Hopton's forge, lingered on to 1757 to be relayed in rather less detail to John Theobald: 'The ancient Inhabitants,' he says, 'have a tradition that at this place [Trudoxhill] there had formerly been an ironwork, but no one now living can give any account of it.'⁶ The Nunney churchwardens' books record that at Wells Assizes in 1751 John Green of Timsbury indicted the parish roads from the pound to the Iron Mills at Trudoxhill'. It is tempting to link these traditions with the place-name Smithick's, smith's farm, a little way up stream from Iron Mills Bridge and with the making of 'staves with heads of iron after the fashion of lances and other staves and axes whatsoever with heads of iron and lead newly made by men of Frome' which so worried Henry IV in 1400.⁷

The Earl of Cork and Orrery told a meeting of the Somerset Arch. Soc. at Frome in 1875 that 'a few years ago some gentlemen came upon a heap of what appeared to them to be charcoal scoriae mixed with iron ore.'⁸ This was 'near Bunn's Lane', a lane close to Witham Hole and Iron Mills.

John Theobald also recorded a 'remarkable spring', which rose in Wanstrow and flowed through Nunney where it turned a 'Shear mill for grinding the Clothiers Shears & other edged tools, call'd Hodinots Mill, as being on Lands belonging to one

of that Name'. This property was in the Manor of Haydon, belonging to the Horners of Mells. Deeds in the possession of the Earl of Oxford and Asquith take the story back to 1717 when Thomas Horner granted a messuage called Nicol's Temmes (later spelt Toms or Tommes) to Richard Hoddinott of Nunney, edgetoolmaker; the messuage was the present Combe Farm. The mill was close by, adjoining the present Nunney Court. It was taken over by the Fussells of Mells after the death of Hoddinott in 1760 and continued making edge tools until the 1880s. Extensive, although formless, ruins of the enterprise survive.

Kelly's *Directory* for 1883 notes that: 'In April, 1873, a mine of iron ore was opened here [Nunney], and was worked by the Furzeham Iron Ore Co.; this has since been closed!

A report by J. C. Longbourne, from Wadham Turner, civil and mining engineers of Whitehaven, Cumbria, dated 9 March, 1874, indicates why. He says the iron ore was first discovered in the northern part of James Theobald's estate at Nunney 'where it has been worked at the outcrop; but only a few hundred tons have been gotten. The ore is found in an irregular vein bearing North West & South East... The quality of the ore is not so good as the best Cumberland Haemalite; but, if carefully selected, it will always command a ready sale... the uniformity of the limestone at Nunney is... much against a large discovery of ore being made...' In the early days 12 or 13 men were employed. The ore was carted to Frome Station and sent to Staffordshire. Mr. Harry Haynes, a local man, since dead, showed me the site of the mine in Nunney Combe.

1. Particulars of the grant are given in full in *Monastic Remains of Witham, Bruton and Stavordale*, by Sir Richard Colt Hoare, Bt., 1824, p.127.
2. Called the 'Fishburn', see *Proc. Som. Arch. Soc.*, 64, 'The Foundation Charter of Witham Charterhouse'.
3. PRO E134/17 c. 7244. Sir John Hippisley v Robert Hopton: Bounds of the manors of Marston Bigot and Witham Friary.
4. For the evidence see *The Bounds of Selwood*, by Michael McGarvie, 1978, p.6.
5. B.L., Cotton Ms. Cleopatra C. III.
6. Parochial Histories, Soc. of Antiquaries Ms. 115. Copy at Taunton Castle.
7. *Cal. Close Rolls*, Henry IV, 1, p.46.
8. *Proc. Som. Arch. Soc.*, 21, I, p.13.
9. S.R.O. DD/BR/ls 19.

Frome

MICHAEL MCGARVIE

212. ENCLOSURE DISPUTES AT STOUR PROVOST AND STAL-BRIDGE DURING THE EARLY SEVENTEENTH CENTURY. One of the best-documented examples of enclosure in the clayland area of Dorset occurred at Stour Provost in the Blackmore Vale near Shaftesbury. This illustrates very well some of the pressures which could be put upon tenants involved in such enclosures, and some of the motives of those who most actively

sought to promote the enclosure. The large manor of Stour Provost, nearly 3,000 acres in extent, belonged to the Provost and Fellows of King's College, Cambridge. Before the enclosure in the 1620s it would have served as a model for a common-field manor. A detailed Survey of 1575 and a Terrier of the College demesne lands made in 1594 show that besides numerous closes and common meadow land around the village and along the banks of the river Stour, there were three large open arable fields, North, South and East fields, in which the tenants and the farmer of the demesne held their arable lands. There were some 1,300 acres of waste or common grazing land, and there were also eight large coppices of demesne woodland.¹ The sale of timber and underwood was in fact a most important source of revenue for the College, and the woodlands were carefully managed and extensively documented.² There were five freehold tenants in 1575, holding respectively 35, 50, 44, 76 and 20 acres. The lessee of the demesne lands, Christopher Lodge, held 70 acres on a twenty-year lease and paid an annual rent of £6 17s 2d; and there were 53 copyhold tenants with holdings ranging from an acre to 75 acres, paying a total annual rent of £12 11s 7d. Each of the copyhold tenants had grazing rights on the common lands for sheep and cattle *sine numero*.³ No doubt over-stocking of the common was a powerful incentive for the more substantial tenants to press forward with proposals for enclosure.

In 1619-20 a proposal was made to enclose part of the extensive waste and common pasture ground of the manor which was described as

'very fertile and apt for tillage and ... used to small profit ... By division and enclosure it would yield much greater profit to all tenants and also to the Provost, Fellows and Scholars at King's College'.⁴

It does not appear who made the original proposal, but it is clear that it was strongly supported by the College and by Christopher Lodge. It would not be surprising if the proposal had come from Christopher Lodge himself, for he was paying a rent which was proportionately much greater than that of the copyhold tenants, yet his arable land, like theirs, was scattered throughout the three fields, and he was obliged to inter-common his cattle with the other tenants.⁵ The proposal for enclosure was strongly resisted by six of the copyholders, apparently led by Clement Mayo. Nothing came of their objections, however, and in 1621 the commons were divided among the tenants by Chancery Decree.⁶ Here the matter might have rested and we should know nothing of the underlying pressures in the business, but the six recalcitrant tenants refused to pay their share of the expenses in obtaining the Chancery Decree, and the dispute came again before the Court of Chancery in 1624. In the evidence presented to the Court it was alleged by the representative of the College that all the tenants

had agreed to the enclosure proposal, and that they had all agreed to reimburse the Provost of King's College, Dr Samuel Collins, for the expenses involved which amounted to £26. It was also alleged that the objectors had taken possession of the lands allotted to them

'... to their great advantage and improvement of their severall tenements by the said Inclosure'.⁷

Clement Mayo and the five other objectors made depositions before a Chancery Commission, and their evidence shows the sort of pressures which could be brought to bear upon tenants in order to secure apparently unanimous agreement to changes. Clement Mayo, the leading objector, declared that he had been against the enclosure from the first,

'albeit after much sollicitacon and entreaty of some of the then parties to the suite, ... and upon payment unto this defendant and other defendants in that suite of such costs as formerlie they had been at in that suite which amounted unto fiteene pounds or thereabouts, and upon their promise that this defendant and the other defendants should not bee att anie other costs touching the said suite so as this defendant and they would not contest further in the said suite ...'

he had been persuaded to agree, although very reluctantly. Other tenants mentioned similar pressures and persuasions.⁸

Their evidence shows the inside story of one enclosure, apparently carried out by the unanimous agreement of the tenants. It goes some way towards helping to explain the apparent ease with which it was possible to obtain the agreement of large numbers of conservatively-minded tenants to radical changes which would revolutionise their whole manner of life. As a result of the enclosure at Stour Provost, the common grazing lands of the manor were all divided and during the course of the seventeenth century the common arable fields were enclosed piecemeal. By the eighteenth century most of the parish was enclosed, and the large-scale map made by the well-known cartographer, John Doharty of Worcester, for King's College in 1747 shows all the field boundaries and the farms very much as they are in the twentieth century.⁹

A well-documented dispute of a different kind occurred at Stalbridge during the early seventeenth century. Again this involved rights of common, and our knowledge of the episode comes from the fact that some tenants vigorously opposed the changes which were proposed. In 1618 the manor of Stalbridge was purchased by Mervyn, Lord Audley second Earl of Castlehaven, who decided to make his principal residence there, and commenced building a large house to the north-west of the town.¹⁰ The site he selected for his house was 'a great pasture and waste and wooddy ground', in which the 42 copyholders of Stalbridge, the 18 copy-holders of Sir George Thornhull's manor of Stalbridge Weston, and the farmer of

Antioch all shared rights of common. The Earl sought the agreement of his tenants that he should enclose this area for his house, garden and park, and in return he undertook to allow them rights of common in some other part of the manor, or to give them a money payment in lieu of the beasts they had formerly fed on the common. According to the Earl's account of what happened, the tenants all agreed to accept his proposals. Twenty-nine of them chose to have rights of common elsewhere in the manor, and thirteen tenants chose instead a money payment. He had therefore gone ahead with his scheme, and commenced building his great mansion.¹¹ But the Earl seems to have forgotten to seek the agreement of the tenants of Stalbridge Weston or of the farmer of Antioch. They, not unnaturally, objected strongly to the enclosure of the land, and the Earl claimed that they had stirred up the other tenants to break the agreement they had made with him.

In a long and complicated case before the Court of Chancery the tenants gave much information about the usefulness of the common to them. They claimed that the common provided them with fern for use in their tenements, furze for brewing and baking, and common for their sheep and cattle, and stated that without it they would be unable to support themselves or their families, nor be able

'to soyle and manure their arable lands and paie their Rents'.¹²

The topographical evidence makes the result of this dispute quite clear. The tenants obviously lost their battle, for the Earl of Castlehaven built his mansion and enclosed the whole surrounding area within a great wall, more than six feet high and more than five miles in length, which survives as one of the great Dorset monuments to aristocratic power and wealth, a reminder of R. H. Tawney's bitter remark on parks made

'for those motives of social amenity and ostentation which have done so much to make the English countryside the admiration of travellers, and so much to ruin the English peasantry'.¹³

The Earl did not long enjoy his mansion and parkland, however, for he was a man of licentious and dissolute life, and in 1631 he was tried and executed for a series of spectacularly bestial crimes including rape and sodomy. The house at Stalbridge passed to Richard Boyle, Earl of Cork, whose son Robert, the mathematician and scientist spent his boyhood there, and later inherited it.¹⁴

1. King's College, Cambridge MSS, D128 Survey of Stour Provost 1575; 2/X/30 Terrier of Stour Provost 1594.
2. King's College MSS 1/X/8; 2/X/9; 2/X/10; 2/X/11; 2/X/14.
3. King's College MSS D128; 2/X/30.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Ibid.*
6. P.R.O. C2/Jas I K8/48 Proposal for the enclosure of Waste and Commons at Stour Provost 1620.

7. P.R.O. C2/Jas I N1/68.
8. *Ibid.*
9. King's College MSS D129 Court Book of Stour Provost 1651-55; John Doharty's map of Stour Provost 1747.
10. P.R.O. C2/Jas I C2/62.
11. J. Hutchins, *History of Dorset*, 3rd Edition, 1861-70, III, p.671.
12. P.R.O. C2/Jas I C2/62; C2/Jas I C26/36.
13. R. H. Tawney, *The Agrarian Problem in the Sixteenth Century*, 1967, p.201.
14. *Calendar State Papers (Domestic)*, 1629-31, 371; 1631-3, 20. W. Cobbett, *State Trials*, N.D., III, pp. 401-26.

University of Bristol

J. H. BETTEY

213. STRACHEY MANUSCRIPTS IN THE BRITISH LIBRARY. In the 1730s John Strachey, F.R.S. of Sutton Court in Stowey, began to compile a history of his county to be entitled 'Somersetshire Illustrated'. The proposed work, the prospectus for which was published in 1736,¹ was never completed, nor was it published. However, both Strachey's rough notes and his fair copy of the history are among the Strachey papers in the Somerset Record Office.² I have discussed 'Somersetshire Illustrated' at some length in an article in *Transactions of the Ancient Monuments Society*³ (in which is published Strachey's archaeological correspondence with the Revd. John Pointer⁴) so do not want to go into it again here. Since this paper was published, however, I have come across duplicate portions of 'Somersetshire Illustrated' among the Egmont papers in the British Library.⁵ The manuscripts are similar in paper, form and layout to the fair copy in the Record Office. They include notes on the hundreds of Winterstoke, Portbury, Carhampton, Brent cum Wrington, Hartcliffe cum Bedminster and Bempstone.

How did Strachey's local historical notes come to rest in the archives of the Earls of Egmont, generally thought of as Irish nobility associated with County Cork? This is not as surprising as it might seem. The Egmonts, under their family name of Perceval, were established in Somerset (at Walton in Gordano in particular) long before Richard Perceval became registrar of the Court of Wards in Ireland in 1616. He settled in Ireland and acquired vast estates, but the family remained proud of their Somerset origins, a pride reflected in the building of Enmore Castle by John Perceval (1711-1770), second Earl of Egmont. Evidently the Earl, as Viscount Perceval, was interested in his Somerset forebears and their estates and knowing that Strachey was an authority on the antiquities of the county, wrote to him with a sheaf of historical questions. One of the questions was about Martock, so Strachey simply sent Lord Perceval his notes on Winterstoke hundred, using the blank back page to write the following letter. Lord Perceval's interest in Overwere (Overweare) is accounted for by the fact that his

ancestor, David Perceval, who died in 1534, married Alice, daughter of Thomas Bythemore, of Overwere. The letter gives an interesting glimpse of an 18th cent. antiquary in action. It is dated 8th Nov. 1738.

I am honour'd with Your Lordships commands but am got into the lower part of Devon fifteen mile from Plymouth & Detained by an Indisposition which hinders me from Travelling on horseback, & there is no Stage Coach comes nearer than Exeter 30 miles hence & I doubt I shall not be able to get thither before the Season is over for the Bath Stage which goes hence thro' Taunton where I propose to make some Search myself into the records which are kept in ye castle there & make no doubt but I shall find some person there to make farther Scrutiny in the arch Deacons office. as to Castle cary I beleive If there were any Records there they were destroyed by demolishing the Old Castle — The late Mr. Player, a Lawyer & Lord of the Mannor told me he had none but Court Rolls of any Antiquity or Moment — What relates to Martok Is Overleaf. I will send by next post to a Clergy-man Near Ilchester to give me information as to ye values &c: of ye manour & likewise to my son in Somersetshire to look out three old Deeds of Anselm de Gournay & Bythemore & Transmit them to his Brother in London that Your Lordship may peruse or Copy them if you think fit tho' I beleive they will prove nothing more than that they were Lords of Overwere being only grants of small parcells within the Mannor.

I am My Lord Your Lships most

Obedient humble servt.

Jo. Strachey

Addressed: To the Right Honble The Lord Visct Percivale In Pell Mell St. James s London.

Perceval never returned the notes. Strachey appears to have sent his gleanings of the histories of the other hundreds at a later date, for on f. 18 he mentions his own settlement of Streme in Overwere on his son Hodges in 1742. Strachey himself died at Greenwich the following year.

There are 30ff of manuscript, 24 relating to the above-mentioned hundreds and six of odd notes. Much of the space is taken up with genealogical information and manorial descents, but one or two snippets are of more general interest and worthy of record. On f. 11 there is a neat description of Brent Knoll: 'On top of the hill or knoll is an Area of 5 Or 6 Acres, Enclosed with a triple rampart of an oval figure & a fine Spring of water called Dripping Well riseth on the Side of the Hill. Within the Rampire appear some Vestiges of Stone building & Battle-borow farm in South Brent at the bottom of this Knoll seems to Carry some remembrance of a battle fought there...'

The appearance of the Abbot of Glastonbury's mansion at East Brent, demolished in 1708, is well known, but Strachey (f.12) adds a curious gloss to it: 'The late Manr: hous was formerly a Cell to the Abbey of Glaston & the Abbot Sometime kept his Christmas there. It was built with a cloyster & remained Entire till 1708 when it was taken down & the Materials sold & many monuments of the Monks or their

Priors which were in ye cloysters were sold some to Doctr Weston of Blackford who set them up as Statues In his garden. Others In the year 1717 I saw Lye Scattered in the Church yard & in the rubbish of the cloysters mangled & disfigured.'

There is a nice thumb-nail sketch of Martock on f. 22: 'Martok is a parish of a Very large Extent, is a Hundred within its self hath a Court Leet & Court Baron a good yearly fayr for cattle &c: on St. Lawrence day ... but a Sorry Decayed market. The Town is old & mean built but there is a large old Church & a good Freeschole its Seated in a Deep rich Soyl good Grazing Land and also particularly famous for Broad garden beans But it Lyes Low is no place for Sweet Air Pleasure or Sport.'

I have described the Strachey material in the British Library as duplicating that in the Somerset Record Office. This is only so in the broadest sense in that the two sets of papers deal with the same hundreds. The information that they each contain is not identical and there is often a difference of emphasis. For instance, when discussing Martock in DD/SH 108 Strachey says it was 'formerly a good market but South Petherton hath of late year greatly out done it' and tells a story against the free school in which the boys reading their lessons from the canticles turned them into the Somerset vernacular. Strachey charitably took it 'for tryall whither the boy understood his lesson to put him to turn it into his native Dialect'.

Mr. D. M. M. Shorrocks kindly pointed out to me that there was an earlier letter from Perceval to Strachey amongst the Strachey papers in the Somerset Record Office (DD/SH 104/105). This is dated from Pall Mall on 15 Dec. 1737 and gives further evidence of scholarly co-operation between the two men. Perceval is disappointed about Mrs. Rogers' resolution 'not to part with Nailsay', but he has obtained a subscription for Strachey's work from Sir Philip Parker and has spoken to 'Osborne ye Bookseller to favour your work'. He continues:

'I have been in hopes of seeing you here ever since I have been in Town, that I might Communicate to you some Papers which may be very usefull to your work.

My Pedigree is not yet given to the Graver, for I have made very great Additions, and am still at more — In about a month I shall have it perfect.'

1. *Proc. Som. Arch. Soc.*, 14, pp. 94-96.
2. DD/SH 107 and 108.
3. Volume 27, pp. 77-104.
4. B.L. Ad. MS. 6214.
5. Ad. MS. 47201.

Frome

MICHAEL McGARVIE

214. SHERBORNE PARISH REGISTER AND ITS CLERKS, 1538-1653. Although there have been articles on parish registers in this journal,¹ these have been of small parishes. With Sherborne, because of the size of the parish and quantity of related records it is possible to make a more detailed study of the circumstances that affected the making of the Register.² The first volume, covering the years 1538 to 1653, is particularly interesting because it covers years of great religious, political and social change.

The Register, originally of All Hallows Church, was begun in November 1538 in obedience to Thomas Cromwell's injunction of 5 Sept. which required every parish to have a book to record christenings, marriages and burials and a 'sure coffer' to keep it in.³ The Churchwardens' Accounts for 1537/8 record the following:

It' payd for the makynge of the chyrche cowfer to Symon Carver iiis, xd: It' payd to Thomas Mollyns for Jemes and loks for that same cowfer iis: It' payd for the register booke off the same cowfer iis.⁴

Sherborne's two chapelries, Castleton and North Wootton, although they had their own registers of baptisms and marriages, had to bury their dead at Sherborne and were registered there, as was recorded at the beginning of the North Wootton register in 1538:

A perfect not of all ye Weddings and Christenings — as for the Burialls, it is registred at Shirbourne.⁵

At first the Register appears to have been kept, in latin, by John Chetmill, the vicar, and it was he who recorded the buying of the Abbey by the town in 1540⁹. Unfortunately, despite recording matters of interest like that, he did not enter the names of children's parents, unlike the keeper of North Wootton's register, and the parish clerks who took over from him continued in this manner.

The first national change in registration was made in 1597, which among other things required the making of Bishop's Transcripts, although in the Diocese of Sarum the earliest transcripts begin from 1577 to 1579, presumably when the biennial visitation took place. The reason for this is unknown but other dioceses also have transcripts beginning before 1597.⁶ Most of Dorset's pre 1731 transcripts were lost in the Blandford fire, but fortunately Sherborne and North Wootton were part of the Dean's peculiar and theirs survive from 1585. It is not known if this date is due to the loss of earlier transcripts or the result of an entry recorded in the Churchwardens' Accounts of 1584:

In Fees at the busshop of Caunterbury his visitacon vs iiiid.⁷

The Diocese of Canterbury was particularly careful in keeping transcripts and Sherborne may have been ordered to do something previously neglected.⁸ The Dean's visitation on the

21 July the following year (146) entailed the following expences:

To the paritor for his Fee at the visitacon	xii
for a gallon of wyne geven to the Deane	xxd
for writing oute of the Register	iis
to the Register for his Fee	xvid ⁹

Until 1603 the transcripts were delivered to the Dean on his triennial summer visitation (146, 182, 206).

The 1597 Provincial Constitution of Canterbury introduced major changes in registration. It was ordered that each parish was to buy a book of parchment and transcribe the old register into it. Also there were orders regarding Bishop's Transcripts, but despite the system differing from Sherborne's it continued in the old manner until 1603. Sherborne's transcript of the parish register was made by a professional scrivener, Michael Humfry, who was probably employed in some aspect of the legal profession as shown by his writing 'This Inden' (69) when making a trial piece of script. He was not of a Sherborne family although on 24 July 1597 the baptism of John Humfrey, possibly his son, is entered and emphasized in black-letter script. Unlike many other places which took the accession of Queen Elizabeth as the starting date for the new register, he begins in 1538, but it is not known whether this was on his own initiative or an order from the vestry. He gives the impression of being diligent, using a neat legible hand with black-letter headings. When confused by the original register he made a note of it 'being so in the old regester' (36, 38), and included short notes from the original like 'de Almshouses', 'senex' and 'infans' (192n 189-191) which the clerk left out of the Bishop's Transcript. He finished the transcript on 14 Dec. 1599, and on the 13 Jan. 1600 the vestry made an order that:

md it is agreed by the parties aforesaid that the Churchwarden shall paye unto Michael Humfry for money due to him for writinge the new Regester boock and was left unpayed — iiis iiid.¹⁰

The register kept in the clerk's hand begins here. Besides the principal parish clerk the gravedigger also seems to have had some status in this respect and may have stood in for the other occasionally. In 1580 John Yeatman and John Rousell the 'Beadsman' were both described as clerks and received the same wages.¹¹ Rousell was the beadsman in 1599.¹² Mistakes in the order of entries (36, 427) indicate that the Register was copied up monthly from notes made by the clerk.

The names of a few early clerks are known but the first about whom much can be discovered is John Yeatman, clerk in 1599, and in whose handwriting the Register may have been kept until Oct. 1604. He was probably a cleric in minor orders and although nothing is known of his origins, people of that name were in Sherborne from 1570 (95). The 'yeatma' of Shurborne'

who owed 16s to a nearby farmer may be this man.¹³ He was parish clerk by 1580 with wages of 10s and was also responsible for looking after the Abbey clock which brought in an extra 13/4d.¹⁴ Along with two others he was presented at the Dean's visitation of 1593 because they:

do teach young children their primer, whether they be lycensed we knowe not.¹⁵

In late 1594 the plague hit Sherborne and on 9 February 1595 he received 20s:

for his paynes in burying the sick & in regard his wages is deminissed by theccasion of the sicknes.¹⁶

On the fifteenth of September that year he married Julian Tynny, widow of John, who possessed the rights to a house in Newland held by copy of the Almshouse.¹⁷ The Almshouse also paid him 4d yearly for assisting the minister at the quarterly communions held there.¹⁸ Puritanism had been gaining a hold in Sherborne since the late 1570s when the church ale had been replaced by rates, and the Abbey organ was removed in 1583.¹⁹ Yeatman was given 40s in 1598:

for his better maintenance and in consideration for that he should not kepe his Clarcks ale by consent of some of the parishioners at the last accompt.²⁰

He became tenant of the Church House kitchen in 1606²¹ and was buried 13 June 1609, being described as *clericus maritatus*.

A number of changes in the method of keeping the Register were made around 1604 when a new clerk took over, possibly in response to the 70th Canon of the Convocation made in 1603.²² Although it was mainly intended to regulate the keeping of transcripts for the first time fathers' names were included in entries concerning children. The first two pages written by the new clerk were signed by the vicar and churchwardens (222, 224), despite this having been ordered back in 1597. In obedience to the Canon each sheet of the transcript was also signed by the vicar and churchwardens. The transcript now ran from Lady Day and each year was sent to the registry in Salisbury as shown by an endorsement on the transcript for 1619/20 (291n, 340):

Deliver thes to mr Willim Hutchhens Regester in salsburey.

Unlike the earlier transcripts which were in the same hand as the Register they were now in a different and neater hand with corrections made after completion. The reason for this is unknown but Steel²³ suggests that as they were being sent to a higher authority, some parishes took more care over making them.

The clerks moved closer to the seat of Godliness with an order made in 1630:

we doe order by consent of William Sampson Clothier that the Clark of this parish for the tyme being shall have a seate in the Church next behinde the vicar where the sayd Wm Sampson doth now sitt, and that the sayd

Wm Sampson shall have some other convenient seate in the sayd Church in recompence of his sayd seat soe disposed off as aforesd.²⁴

From July 1634 to March 1635 the manuscript is in the distinctive hand of one of the Fisher family, at this period probably only scribes or clerks, but after the Restoration they rose to become members of the town oligarchy. He included mothers' names as well as fathers in baptism entries. The clerk who kept the Register from July 1646 to the end of the volume experienced all the changes made by Parliament in the early Interregnum. He stopped using latin in 1650 in obedience to a Parliamentary Ordinance of that year requiring all legal records to be kept in English. The volume ends in 1653 because that year an Ordinance was passed making many changes in registration²⁵ and having the side effect of causing many parishes to start a new volume. There are a few indications as to the use of the Register. In 1596 a note was made in the Almshouse minute book that:

By the viewe of the Churchbooke it appearith that John Harvy died August 1588.²⁶

Also there are calculations in the margins, presumably for working out ages (124, 305).

1. Barwick, *SDNQ*, 15 (1917), 74; Mudford, 13 (1913) p.217; North Cadbury, 21 (1935) 247; Templecombe, 5 (1897) 91, 133.
2. This article is based on the introduction of a transcript of the Register, a copy of which is deposited in the Dorset Record Office. Some material, mainly of a critical or descriptive material has been omitted from this article as has a list of surviving Bishop's Transcripts. Figures in brackets in the article refer to the transcript. P 155/RE1 in the *D.R.O.* covers 1538 to 1653.
3. D. J. Steel, *General Sources of Births, Marriages and Deaths before 1837* (1968) p.8.
4. J. Fowler, *Mediaeval Sherborne* (1951), p.279.
5. C. H. Mayo, *The Parish Register of North Wootton* (1877), p.1.
6. Steel, pp. 167-170.
7. DRO P155/CW56, Churchwardens' Account 1584/5.
8. Steel, pp. 168-9.
9. DRO P155/CW57, Churchwardens' Account 1585/6.
10. DRO P155/VE1, f 6r, Sherborne Church Book of Orders.
11. DRO P155/CW51, cf Fowler, plate opposite p.340.
12. DRO P155/VE1.
13. R. Machin (ed), *Probate Inventories of Chetnole, Leigh and Yetminster* (1976), Inventory no. 1.
14. DRO P155/CW51, Churchwardens' Account 1579/80.
15. Wiltshire RO Dean, Churchwardens' Presentments 1591-1593, File 6, no. 5.
16. DRO P155/VE1, f 3v.
17. DRO D204/D24, Admissions Register of Sherborne Almshouse, survey 1584; D204/A165, Almshouse Weekbook 1602-3.
18. DRO D204/A165.
19. Fowler, p.277n1.
20. DRO P155/CW69, Churchwardens' Account 1597/8.
21. C. H. Mayo, *Guide to the Parish Church of Sherborne* (1925), p.124.
22. Steel, p.170.
23. Steel, p.175.
24. DRO P155/VE1, f. 13v, 29 March 1630.
25. Steel, p.11.
26. DRO D204/D1, f. 4r, Almshouse Minute Book.

215. KING ARTHUR'S LEADEN CROSS. When in 1191 the monks of Glastonbury claimed that the bones they had exhumed between two pyramids on the south side of the Lady Chapel were those of King Arthur, this identification was established, or at least supported, by a leaden cross inscribed: '*Hic jacet sepultus inclitus rex Arthurius in insula Avalonia.*' A drawing of the cross was included by Leland in the 6th ed. of his *Britannia* (1607) and it has been a happy subject for congratulation, argument or dispute ever since. The cross is said to have been in Wells during the 18th cent., but its whereabouts since then is unknown, unless the man who now claims to possess it can establish its authenticity.

The form of the letters on the cross has been carefully studied. Professor Alcock in his *Arthur's Britain* (pp. 77 *et seq.*) agrees with other authorities in saying that the lettering is definitely not of the 6th cent., the time of Arthur's death, but could well be of the 10th cent., when Dunstan is known to have raised the level of the cemetery. It is suggested that possibly at this time Arthur's grave, previously marked by an inscribed stone, was opened and closed again with the lead cross placed above the bones for identification. One objection to this theory is that it implies that the monks knew in Dunstan's time that Arthur lay buried in their cemetery, but did not pass on the knowledge, although recording with pride the burial there of 3 Saxon kings, Edmund, Edgar and Edmund Ironside.

When William of Malmesbury wrote his *Gesta Regum* in 1125, Arthur was to him a fabulous hero among the Britons and deserved to be proclaimed in veracious histories not in fallacious fables. His tomb was unknown, whence the ancient fable that he was to come again. A little later William worked at the abbey to compile his *Antiquity of the Church of Glastonbury*, reading documents, studying the buildings and the inscriptions they bore and listening to what the monks could tell him, but his resulting treatise contained no reference to Arthur, a deficiency that was later remedied by editing and adding to his script.

It was probably in 1136 that Geoffrey of Monmouth produced his *Historia Regum Britanniae*, well described as romance masquerading as history. He tells of the glorious victories and conquests of Arthur in Britain and on the continent of Europe, leading to the battle of Camlan where Modred was killed and Arthur wounded: '*Inclutus ille Arturus letaliter vulneratus est, qui illinc ad sananda vulnera sua ad insulam Avallonis evectus*' (the famous Arthur too was wounded to the death and borne thence for the healing of his wounds to the Isle of Avalon). In Geoffrey's text and also on the leaden cross Arthur ended his life there, in both he is *inclitus*, famous. It is of course possible to imagine that a tradition,

otherwise unknown, led the monks in the 10th cent. to inscribe Arthur's name on a leaden cross and that 200 years later the same tradition, that had eluded William of Malmesbury, inspired Geoffrey. My view is that whoever decided the wording on the cross had read Geoffrey of Monmouth.

Glastonbury

S. C. MORLAND

216. DROVERS AND MOVEMENT OF LIVESTOCK IN N. W. HANTS 1770-1840 (*SDNQ*, XXXI, 323). The Editors are obliged to those who have reported that articles by the same author, drawing on the same sources, appeared also in 1983 issues of *The Hampshire Family Historian* and the *Hampshire Field Club Local History Newsletter*.

QUERIES

217. HARKNESS, MARGARET. This Dorset writer, b. 1854, was the daughter of Robert Harkness, rector of Wimborne St. Giles, 1865-86. She wrote, sometimes under the pseudonym "John Law", books on the conditions of the poor in London's East End, and on other subjects. Perhaps her best known work is *In Darkest London*, 1891, on the Salvation Army. Information on Margaret Harkness, particularly on when and where she died, would be welcomed by Dr. Joyce Bellamy, Dept. of Economic and Social History, The University, HULL, HU6 7RX.

BOOK REVIEWS

218. B. J. MURLESS. *BRIDGWATER DOCKS AND THE RIVER PARRETT*. (Somerset County Library, 1983, Pp. 50. £2.75). Bridgwater Docks were opened in 1841 after 30 years of abortive schemes to overcome the Parrett's tidal problems; they prospered through the 19th cent., but thereafter gradually declined until they were finally closed in 1971. Appropriately, when they have now been saved and seem likely to take on a new lease of life with the development of a marina facility, their history too has been rescued and pieced together from scattered and somewhat fragmentary sources.

As befits one prominent in the field of industrial archaeology in the county, Mr. Murless has played to his strengths, concentrating on problems of construction and maintenance and the various bridges associated not only with the docks but also with road, river and rail communications locally. He looks

briefly at the nature and volume of trade, at shipbuilders and shipowners and other business activities which the docks brought to the town, but leaves the full exploration of these sources to others. The illustrations are well chosen to support this interesting account, and Mr. Murless quietly points the irony that the silt, which posed a perennial threat to the docks, was itself the basis for the town's prosperous brick and tile industry.

D.M.M.S.

219. R. BUSH. *JEBOULT'S TAUNTON*. (Barracuda Bks. Ltd., 1983. Pp. 116, illus. £12.95). Edward Jeboult was known to his Victorian contemporaries in Taunton as a successful man of business; nowadays he is remembered (if at all) as the author of *A History of West Somerset*; but within his family circle he was noted also as a compiler of albums relating to both town and family. A happy stroke of serendipity took Robin Bush early in 1982 to lecture in Devon, where Jeboult's granddaughter was able to introduce two from an original eleven scrapbooks to the person presently best endowed to interpret them. The result, 18 months later, is this *Victorian Retrospect* which presents an extensive selection from the sketches, prints and, above all, the fascinating collections of Jeboult's own photographs, many from the 1860s, with which he had illustrated his albums. Forgivably, some are less clear than one would hope, but at the same time the impression remains that they do not always do full justice to the quality of the re-photographing of the originals.

Neatly interwoven are nine chapters on the growth of the town, its business and trade, its churches, local government and leisure interests and the Jeboult family itself, written largely from their standpoint in local society: so, the tangled history of the College School is unravelled, whereas the spread of elementary education is omitted. The style is unashamedly corny (numbers plummet, values rocket, church walls are hallowed), but it does permit a mass of information to be concisely presented in a readable form. The specialist will note an occasional slip — two, for example, on road maintenance on p. 64 — and compression can produce an awkward conjunction of facts within one sentence, but these can be forgiven when so much is offered.

D.M.M.S.

220. A. SANDISON. *RIMPTON IN SOMERSET*. (Sherborne, 1983. Pp. 46. £1.95 plus 21p. post from Abbey Bookshop, Sherborne.) Mrs. Sandison has remained faithful to her Somerset/Dorset border country and has now added a third to

her previously published parish histories of Trent and Over and Nether Compton. Rimpton belonged to the Bishopric of Winchester through nine centuries, providing a handy staging post on the route to his manor of Taunton, with which it was linked for manorial and administrative purposes. Surviving sources, therefore, do not conform to the normal and are the less easy to use and, perhaps for that reason, this is a slighter work than, for example, her *Trent*. Within these limitations, *Rimpton* follows closely the pattern there established, echoing not only its chapter headings and the chronological arrangement over 1000 years of the village's history, which in a postscript the author extends from her 1939 terminal point to the present, but also its very title. Unfortunately, like many another, Mrs. Sandison has relied on Weaver, whose source was a secondary one, for her list of incumbents and has thereby repeated its errors in names and dates.

D.M.M.S.

221. R. DUNNING. *A HISTORY OF SOMERSET*. (Phillimore, 1983. Pp. 128, 51 illus. 12 maps. £7.95). By way of contrast to the concentrated focus required for the Victoria County History, the Somerset Editor has written a more individually orientated history of the county ranging, in under 100 pp. of text, from the neolithic period literally to the present day. He achieves the impossible by combining a sparsely written general commentary with specific examples, whether of persons or places, drawn often from the areas researched in his professional capacity but also from all other parts of the historic county, to which he remains true. Thus, he can conjure up a picture of medieval agriculture by references from customs for three contrasting manors in Brympton in the SE, Bleadon in the N and Stogumber in the W of the county. Elsewhere, however, the writing can be less taut, perhaps paradoxically in the attempt to cover so much ground in so few pages: there are awkward transitions from topic to topic and strange bedfellows ('Whatever the state of the roads, news travelled fast ... and Dr. Claver Morris made a good living...'); 'Unknown numbers fought...' adds nothing; and six pages on Monmouth are surely excessive in this context.

Those who have read Dr. Dunning's previous work under the same title published in 1978 will inevitably find many echoes here (and at least two contradictions), but all will find this at once a readable and a scholarly account of a gently changing land and people. The illustrations, seven in colour, are all of high quality, and every margin has been delightfully decorated by Carolyn Lockwood with drawings supporting the text alongside, the aerial photographs among the former and the

benchends among the latter being particularly noteworthy. The work concludes with 11pp. listing county and diocesan dignitaries, which could perhaps have been put to better use, and a more relevant short chapter describing sources for further study.

D.M.M.S.

222. M. McGARVIE. *FROME PLACE-NAMES*. (Frome Soc. for Local Study, 1983. Pp. 40, 12 illus. 2 maps. £2 from Hermitage, Gentle St. Frome). For a town of its size Frome offers a rich vein of curious place and street names, and a monograph on their origin and meaning forms an obvious successor to works produced in recent years by the Society's members in general and Mr. McGarvie in particular. He begins appropriately with the medieval street pattern radiating out from the market, dating the first reference found and giving variant forms. He then progresses outwards, as the town itself did, and is notably strong in identifying the local personages, many connected with the cloth industry, whose names were given to the streets of the 18c. and later developments. One name still unhonoured is that of Cable, whose long association with the town went back to Domesday. Mr. McGarvie, finally, looks selectively at the streets and farms of the extensive rural area, and illustrates the whole with a series of views dating almost exclusively from before 1914.

An index permits the isolation of specific references, but Mr. McGarvie has managed to introduce variety into his narrative, where a repetitious form could so easily have produced monotony, to allow the book to be read profitably as a whole.

D.M.M.S.

223. R. MACHIN (Ed. *THE BUILDING ACCOUNTS OF MAPPERTON RECTORY, 1699-1703*. (Dorset Record Soc, 1983. Pp. xiv + 36. £3.75). Among smaller dwellings parsonage houses are perhaps the best served in the survival of original architectural evidence, but much of this relates to 19c. building. Mapperton provides a rare instance where complete building accounts survive for a house constructed a century previously, and the publication in full of these accounts, therefore, is to be welcomed. Moreover the house still exists and Mr. Machin has made ingenious use of the payments for plastering to produce a conjectured ground plan which he compares with measured drawings of 1938 and 1983. In his introduction he pieces together a picture of the progression of the work, which the accounts, being arranged by craftsmen, cannot show, analyses costs, wages and sources of materials and suggests practical and financial reasons for the prolonged period of building.

As an added bonus, appendices give a room by room inventory of the earlier rectory and examples of contemporary building contracts. The whole is completed by a glossary of technical terms found. There are occasional minor slips, chiefly numbers and dates, but the book makes lively reading itself and will provide a ready guide for those interested in buildings or the records of buildings in the region.

D.M.M.S.

224. G. M. CHAPMAN. *DALWOOD: A SHORT HISTORY OF AN EAST DEVON VILLAGE*. (Published by the author at High Grange, Dalwood, Axminster, Devon, 1983. Pp. 51, maps and illus. £1.25 post free.) Until 1844, Dalwood was in the county of Dorset, and the author may be right that because it lacks antiquity for Devon historians they have ignored it, and because it is no longer part of Dorset, their historians ignore it. In his Foreword, the author nails his colours to the mast by saying that 'this is primarily a book ... for the people of Dalwood ... rather than the serious historian.' He is right, for he has given us not so much a history as an affectionate glimpse of the village's past. Listed under headings like 'the Parish Hedge', 'Dalwood Church', 'The Village Hall' and 'The Annual Ploughing Match', each vignette has its own chronology. I recommend it to Dalwood people.

G.J.D.

225. D. HAWKINS. *AVALON AND SEDGEMOOR*. (Alan Sutton, 1982. Pp. 192. £4.50 pbk.). Although this book does not say so it is a corrected reprint of one published by David & Charles in 1973. No copy was then received by us but it was favourably reviewed elsewhere and this new printing is welcome. The title words do not stand for romance and reality but for physical divisions of the area — Avalon for the moors between Mendip and the Poldens and Sedgemoor for those south and west of the Poldens. The original work was described as "Undoubtedly the best guide to central Somerset". This may well be true, but it is far more than a guide book. It is a well written and illustrated scholarly, but most readable, work dealing with the history and legends in which the area is so rich, with the land and its people and productions including cider, cheese, eels, willows, peat, teasles, sheep and shoes. Glastonbury, Arthur, the Lake Villages, Alfred and Athelney, and much else from the earliest times, have informed and careful treatment in a fascinating book which, apart from a few misprints, is well produced.

J.P.

226. C. & F. THORN (Eds). *DOMESDAY BOOK: DORSET*. (Phillimore, 1983. cased £10. limp £6.50). In thirty-five volumes, Phillimore have set out to publish the complete Domesday survey of England. The Dorset volume, first announced in 1975, is number seven in the series, and is, in the main, based upon printed editions of the survey made in 1783 and 1816. Domesday has been extensively referred to, and reproduced, in Hutchins *History*, but this publication produces, in the original 1783 type-face, the Domesday entries paralleled by the modern English translation. Usefully, the editors have included extensive notes on the text and translation, an index of persons, and of places, maps of the Dorset Hundreds, and a glossary of essential terms. In the English translation the editors employ variations in type-face to indicate sources of information, and this is useful to the scholar without being a distraction for the general reader. The text is not paginated as in a normal book, but numbered and divided according to the manuscript folios. The index, however, makes it very simple to find almost immediately the information required.

The survey of 1086 has always been a fundamental source for English history, and it would be unusual to find a local historian who has not been called upon to consider Domesday. Undoubtedly, this volume will be extensively referred to by all those interested in Dorset's history. The editors are to be congratulated on a production of an attractive volume which has a readable, well spaced text, translation, and notes. I believe that a proper balance has been struck between an appeal to the general reader, and the demand of the history scholar. Altogether, this is a most appealing volume.

G.J.D.

N.B.—All replies to advertisements to be sent to
the named addressees

DEVON AND CORNWALL NOTES AND QUERIES

A Journal devoted to the
LOCAL HISTORY, ARCHAEOLOGY, BIOGRAPHY
and **ANTIQUITIES** of the Counties of Devon and Cornwall.

£3.50 a year post free.

The Editor will be glad to receive suitable material relating to the History,
Archaeology and Antiquities of the two Counties.

This should be sent to Mrs. M. Rowe, 21 Clyst Valley Road,
Clyst St. Mary, Exeter. EX5 1DD

THE SOMERSET AND DORSET FAMILY HISTORY SOCIETY

Founded in 1975, the Society is a member of the Federation
of Family History Societies and aims to promote and further interest
in all its aspects in the area covered by the counties of Somerset and
Dorset.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

U.K.: £3.50 full membership; **Overseas:** £4.50 air mail delivery
of the Journal, £2 extra. For particulars of membership write to
Mrs. J. D. Gane, The Rock, Stoford, Yeovil, Somerset, BA22 9UD.

FRANCIS BROWN, BOOKBINDER

24 Camden Way, Dorchester, Dorset.

Tel: Dorchester 66039

ALL TYPES OF BOOKBINDING, REPAIRS

Magazine and thesis binding (cloth or leather) undertaken.

Estimates given.

(If calling, please phone for instructions to workshop)

C. R. EASTWOOD

ANTIQUARIAN BOOKSELLER

- ◆ I have an extensive stock, especially of books on Somerset.
- ◆ I am prepared to search for, and report on, out-of-print books on ANY subject.
- ◆ I will buy, at fair prices, libraries or single copies of important books on any subject, but especially West Country local history.

**SOUTH RIDING
32 RIVERTON ROAD
PURITON
BRIDGWATER
SOMERSET
TA7 8BP**

**Visitors by appointment
Tel. Puriton 683894**
