

FIELD SYSTEMS AND ENCLOSURES IN HAMPSHIRE.

By W. E. TATE, F.R. HIST. SOC.

Open Fields in Hampshire.

AS his map¹ shows, according to Prof. Gray almost all Hampshire apart from a corner in the extreme north-east falls within the limits of the area formerly occupied and cultivated under the open field systems of the types associated with village communities of the "Midland" variety. This is not of course to imply that the whole or a major part of the land in the shire was ever under two- or three-field cultivation. The recent researches of Dr. and Mrs. C. S. Orwin² have considerably modified the conclusions come to by Prof. Gray in his pioneer study of the question, and the map in their recent work markedly reduces the gross area of the County which came within the extreme limits of the open field system. His boundary line, according to their work, must be more steeply curved due west so as to cut off a further slice in the north of the County and to make a considerable inlet in the eastern boundary. They also note that there is little evidence of true open-field cultivation in a fairly extensive area upon both sides of Southampton Water. Of the scanty pre-Conquest references³ to open-field agriculture two occur in descriptions of Hampshire townships, Harewell c. 985 and Farleigh 987. Something like half the County seems, if Prof. Gray is right, to have remained in a primitive two-field condition until at any rate the 13th century. Of the 19⁴ Hampshire townships concerning which Prof. Gray collected evidence as to field systems at specific dates, seven are known to have been each in two fields, while 12 can be definitely identified as three-field. The places are: *Two-field*—Ansty 1431-2, Barton Stacey 1757, Bullingdon 13th Cent., Forton 1234, Hinton 1305-6, Middleton 1317-8, Week 1248-9, and Wherwell 13th Cent. *Three-field*—Andover 13th Cent., Bradley 1248-9, Charlton late 13th Cent., Drayton in Barton Stacey 1327-77, Enham late 13th Cent., Faccombe 1618-9, Church Oakley 1338 and 1398, East Oakley 1246-7, Hinton 1334-5, Lasham 1336-7, Nutley 1334-5, and Tystede 1334-5.

Hinton is particularly interesting. It will be seen that it occurs in both lists, so clearly if Prof. Gray is right the entire open-field structure must have been re-cast here in order to allow the creation of a third field at some time between 1305 and 1335.

1. H. L. Gray, *English Field Systems*, Cambridge Mass, 1915, Frontispiece.

2. Dr. and Mrs. C. S. Orwin, *The Open Fields*, 1938, pp. 64-6.

3. *Op. cit.*, p. 57.

4. *Op. cit.*, p. 70. I exclude for the present the Isle of Wight, which is dealt with separately below.

I have been able to find little concerning early enclosures or assarts in the County. It is however known that at Ansty⁵ by 1431-2 perhaps an eighth or a tenth of the demesne has been enclosed.

Hampshire was among the counties reported upon by Wolsey's Commission in 1517. The original returns for this County have in part disappeared, but there is a transcript in the Lansdowne MSS.⁶ Since Mr. Leadam edited the *Domesday of Inclosures* in 1897 the original returns in a very fragmentary condition have been unearthed in the Public Record Office.⁷ These, however, are still awaiting an editor, so the notes below are necessarily based upon the Lansdowne transcripts.

These relate to but eight of the former 37 Hundreds and eight liberties at which the County (including the Isle of Wight) was divided. The Hundreds for which enclosures are recorded are: Basingstoke, Crondall, Kingsclere, Mansbridge, Odiham, Redbridge, Shutterley (*i.e.* Chuteley) and Somborne, and the places mentioned are: Al(d)ington *recte* Aldington, Bewraper (Beaurepaire), Bramsyll "Breche and Sockborowe" (field names only?), Dogmersfelde (Dogmersfield), Erleston (Earlston), Ewurst (Ewehurst), Farley (Farleigh Chamberlayne), Ichill, "Loke Dewer," "Newtosberye," Wynsor (in Millbrook Parish?), and the total area is some 562 acres, with the greatest enclosure recorded that of 120a at Bramsyll.

Hampshire is not included among the 14 counties covered by the Depopulation Act of 1536, though curiously enough the Isle of Wight is.⁸ Leland⁹ visited the County in 1535-43, passing through the shire from Salisbury to Winchester and back again. He notes as follows: (From Salisbury by Buckholt Wood) "... Thens 8 miles al by champaign grounde baren of woodde to Stoke Bridge ... From Stoke to Winchestre 8 miles al by champaigne grounde baren of wodde ... From Winchester to Southampton x miles, that is 3 miles to Oterburn, and vij foreward. The soile in sum parte betwixt meately good and mouch dry feren ground, apter for brede of catelle than to bere corne. The most part of the ground betwixt enclosid and reasonably woddyd ... From Hampton to Hichin (Itchen) village ... Thens to Hamelrise (Hamel Rise) a fischar toun by much enclosid and hethy ground myxt with ferne a 3 miles ... Thens ... to Tichefelde (Titchfield) a 2 good miles by lyke ground. Yet in sum vaynes about Tichefelde is very good ground ... There is also a parke, the grounde whereof is sumwhat hethy and baren ... From Tichefeld to Gosport ... by much hethy and feren ground a vj miles ... The island (of

5. *Op. cit.*, p. 443.

6. I. S. Leadam in *Trans. Royal Hist. Society*, N.S. Vol. VI (1892), p. 294, Vol. VII, 1886, p. 277.

7. Prof. F. F. Gay in *Trans. Royal Hist. Society*, N.S. Vol. XIV, 1900, p. 238.

8. Miss E. M. Leonard in *Trans. Royal Hist. Society*, N.S. Vol. XLIX, 1905, p. 124, fn.

9. *Itinerary*, ed. Miss L. T. Smith, 1907, Vol. I, pp. 269-85.

"Portemath'-Portsea) berith good corne and grasse . . . it is partely enclosyd, fruteful of corne, and hath sum wood. From Portebidge (Port bridge), partely by Portdown, a playn ground, partely by woodde, to Southwike (Southwick) a 4 miles . . . From Southwike to Wikeham (Wickham) by enclosid ground 3 miles. From Wikham to (Bishop's) Waltham a praty town 3 miles by enclosid ground, good pasture; woode, and corne. From Waltham to Winchester a 7 miles, 3 by enclosid and woddy grounds, and 4 by chaumpaign." It will be seen that according to Leland a very considerable proportion of the County was in open field (champion) especially in the north of the shire. It was to some extent the enclosure of such open field which led the Hampshire men to take part in the agrarian and other disturbances of 1548-9.¹⁰ There is the authority of King Edward himself for the statement that the "Hampshier" men were concerned in the rebellion, though they seem to have been fairly soon pacified again. In May the Hampshire Sheriff and justices were ordered to use vigour in suppressing any commotions. It is a moot point how far the tumults which undoubtedly occurred were agrarian in origin and how far they had a religious grievance as their basis. If one may trust the depositions made after the rebellion, religious grievances bore a very large share in the responsibility for the revolt. "One ringleader, *e.g.* hoped to have help from all the bishops' servants and "the Ayde of the prestes on the close (at Winchester) and we shall have money inough." The local disturbances seem not to have been very serious, though a year later the County was among those where in 1550 men of the Boulogne garrison were distributed in order to maintain order.

It appears that enclosure was still taking place in the shire towards the end of the 16th century. At any rate Hampshire is among the counties where the last Depopulation Act, that of 1597,¹¹ was to apply. In 1607, however, it is still reckoned as "champion" and Norden speaks of "Dorset, Wiltshire, Hamshire, Barkeshire and other places Champion."¹²

Towards the end of the 16th century and throughout the 17th Hampshire was among the counties where extensive enclosure took place by Chancery decree. Miss Leonard gives, *e.g.* an extract from such a decree relating to the royal manors of Frodington and Portsey (Portsea) 1599-1600. However, before the 1630's the main variety of enclosure flourishing in Hampshire was the reclamation of the old forest area. This County was among those where the Crown lawyers of Charles I raised extra income by the

10. Dr. E. F. Gay in *Trans. Royal Hist. Society*, N.S. Vol. XVIII, 1904, p. 200 fn. 3, and pp. 203-4, fns. 3-4.

11. Dr. G. Slater, *The English Peasantry . . .*, 1907, App. D, p. 328, 39 Eliz., c. 2 (1597).

12. Miss Leonard, *op. cit.*, p. 138, and Slater, *op. cit.*, p. 238, citing J. Norden, *Surveyors Dialogue*, 1607 (not 1600 as said by Dr. Slater), p. 232. Prof. Gonner, *Common Land and Inclosure*, 1912, p. 172, rather doubts Norden.

enforcement of forest rights which had fallen into desuetude.¹³ In 1630 the Countess of Westmorland¹⁴ made certain fairly extensive enclosures in Hampshire by agreement with her tenants. Hampshire does not appear at all in the list of counties where compositions for enclosure and depopulation were paid in 1635-8. It seems likely enough that a good deal of early open field land had disappeared well before this date.

By 1675,¹⁵ when Ogilby compiled the road book which has proved a mine of information to historians as to the development of enclosure throughout the country, the roads of Hampshire—despite the waste area still remaining—were very largely in a fenced condition. Enclosure had developed since Leland's time in the south-east of the County and perhaps also in the west. If Prof. Gonner was right in supposing that the percentage of unfenced road in any county is in general a fair indication of the percentage of open land generally, Hampshire was three parts enclosed. It is 21st of the 37 counties listed by Prof. Gonner¹⁶ in order of the percentage of open land remaining. Its gross percentage of open land (or at any rate of open road) is but 29 per cent.

In 1697¹⁷ Leonard Meager includes the County among the enclosed shires where people "lived happily and were able to supply corn to the open field counties." Defoe¹⁸ in 1724 noted that a good deal of the Hampshire down country had been converted from sheep walk to wheat land. This was especially true of the twenty odd miles between Winchester and Salisbury. The secret of the improvement was the folding of sheep on the land. From Chertsey, Hartleroe towards Basingstoke however he passed through a "black desert," but before he reached Basingstoke he came to "a pleasant fertile country, inclosed and cultivated like the best of England." Another valuable source of information as to the 18th century husbandry of the County is made use of by Mr. Fussell. Hale¹⁹ in 1756 regarded Hampshire as a County whose agriculture cried out for further improvement, at any rate in its "starving parts" which like the similar areas of Wiltshire could be made as fertile as Buckinghamshire and Hertfordshire by enclosure. Lisle²⁰ knew the County well and described in considerable detail its husbandry both in open fields and in enclosures. A little later Young described the County in two of his *Tours*. He travelled through the district between Salisbury and Romsey. This was generally enclosed and the growth of turnips had made very

13. T. E. Scrutton, *Commons and Common Fields*, 1887, p. 112.

14. Miss E. M. Leonard, *op. cit.*, p. 107, fn. 2.

15. J. Ogilby, *Britannia* . . . , 1675, quoted by Gonner, *op. cit.*, p. 173.

16. Gonner, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

17. L. Meager, *Mystery of Husbandry*, 1697, quoted by G. E. Fussell in *Ministry of Agriculture Journal*, Jan. 1937, p. 944.

18. *Tour* . . . , 1724. *Everyman* reprint of 1928, pp. 180, 187.

19. J. Hale, *Compleat Body* . . . , 1750: p. 100.

20. *Observations* . . . , 2nd edn., 1757, quoted by Fussell, *loc. cit.*

extensive progress.²¹ Three years later Young²² noted the land between Southampton and Winchester as poorly cultivated, with unenclosed chalk hills near Winchester, though throughout the country he noted the prevalence of turnips, clover and sainfoin, infallible indications of improved husbandry.

The County Agricultural Survey was written by the Drivers,²³ who describe themselves as "of Kent Road, Surrey." They are sorry to observe in the County such immense tracts of open heath and uncultivated land, which tend to remind the travellers of voyages among the barbarians; they point out, however, that in this respect Hampshire is no worse than Wiltshire and Dorset, perhaps a trifle better. This is no excuse for it. Near Southampton²⁴ is a great deal of open land which if enclosed and cultivated will give good crops of corn. There are large downs towards Fareham and Warnford,²⁵ and much open land with some good down near Petersfield.

As to the forests and wastes,²⁶ the Drivers are astonished that the Crown Lands in particular should have remained so long in a state of neglect. If properly managed they would pay much of the interest on the National Debt. A general Act should be passed at once, preferably entrusting enclosure to the Commissioners of Crown Lands:

As to other open land, it might well not be worth enclosure for tillage, and still be worth taking in for planting. No "gentleman can sit down easy, and say he has discharged his duty to his family when he is conscious he has neglected to pursue those measures, which, in a few years, would increase his property so amazingly." Commonable land of every kind can be regarded as little better than waste, since everyone exhausts it, and no one pays the least attention to its support and improvement. "All this would be easily remedied by a general inclosure bill, which would reduce the expence of inclosures, and would be a spur to that improvement." Wool production would certainly not decrease on enclosure, every farmer in his own interest keeps as many sheep as he is able, and he can feed twice as many on land in severalty as on the corresponding area in common.

The principal commons in the County are: East Woodhay (Woodhey) near Newbury, c. 1200 a., producing some horses of little value, but some good cattle. Enclosed part of it would make good meadow, and would be worth 7s. 6d. per acre p.a. King's Clear (Kingsclere) c. 1000 a., also produces good cattle. Enclosed part would make tillage, part pasture, and a fair value would be 15s. p.a. Other waste lands adjoin the commons above named "which continue through the county towards Berkshire." Froxfield Barnet Common, c. 1000 a., at present produces little. Enclosed

21. A. Young, *Southern Tour*, 1768, pp. 167-81.

22. *Id.*, *Eastern Tour*, 1771, vol. III, pp. 204-41.

23. *General View* . . . , 1792. . . . 24. p. 12. . . . 25. pp. 14-15. . . . 26. pp. 29-32.

it would be worth 8s. or 10s. p.a. It would have been enclosed already, but the lord of the manor, who also holds the great tithe, has refused to accept land in lieu thereof, so the application has been dropped. Botley, near Southampton, is 7000 or 8000 a. Now it produces little. On enclosure part could be tilled, part planted, and it would be worth c. 10s. per acre p.a. Waltham Chase, c. 2000 a., ought partly to produce good timber, part to be converted into pasture and meadow, worth at least 20s. p.a., or cornland at 10s. or 12s. p.a. Bagshot Heath is partly in Hampshire, though mainly in Surrey. Perhaps 2000 or 3000 a. of it are in Hampshire. It should be planted with firs, when it would be very profitable. There was other waste land in the County, including 5,675 a. in the Isle of Wight, and excluding the forests, and the total area was some 104,845 a.

Of the Forests,²⁷ Parkhurst or Carisbrooke, in the Isle of Wight, c. 3000 a., is almost pure waste. It has not a tree of value and of the deer and the wood scarce a vestige remains. It ought to be planted. The true common rights attached to property adjoining the Forest should be commuted, and the usurped ones (all the freeholders in the Island claiming a right of common for black cattle) should be done away with.

The New Forest²⁸ is c. 92,000 a., of which rather more than two-thirds is still Crown property. Many encroachments have been made, both by the poor of the district and by neighbouring landowners. It is overstocked with deer, and in some places has also many rabbits and far too many swine, both ruinous to the growth of young timber. A special Act of Parliament should appoint commissioners to inquire into forest rights and to commute them at a fair valuation either in land or money. What still remains of the forest should then be replanted, and maintained under proper supervision as a nursery of timber for the Navy. The Forests of Alice Holt and Woolmer (Wolmer) occupy 15,493 a., of which 6,799 a. are private property, the remaining 8,694 a. belonging to the Crown. Alice Holt has about £60,000 worth of timber, but in Wolmer there is "none worth mentioning." Similar steps should be taken for this forest to those proposed for the New Forest. Bere Forest contains c. 16,000 a., of which about a third is enclosed, the remainder being open forest. The soil is in general good, and "it would certainly be much to the advantage of all parties if a general inclosure and division could be adopted."

Progress was in the air.²⁹ An agricultural society established at Odiham had already been of great service. Enclosures of down had recently taken place,³⁰ and in consequence of these it was supposed that the County's stock of sheep had been reduced by a third, though it was still very large. Prominent among local improvers was Mr. Tredgold of Chilbolton, 'a very understanding

27. pp. 57-8.

28. pp. 38-44.

29. p. 11.

30. p. 13.

farmer, much employed as a Commissioner in enclosures and in valuing land.'

On the whole then we may well rest content with Prof. Gonner's³¹ general conclusion. He points out that much of the County was naturally unsuited for husbandry in early times. In the east and north-east the downs, and in the south-west the New Forest, were wild areas, and these when at last they were enclosed were taken directly from the waste, and never passed through the common field state. Extensive open fields existed however in the south-east, but these were largely enclosed in the 16th century, and still more in the 17th century, perhaps partly under the influence of the contemporary enclosures of waste land which were still continuing. Enclosure both of waste and of common field continued throughout the 17th and early 18th century. Dr. Slater³² was satisfied that on the whole Hampshire was earlier enclosed than Wiltshire. Enclosure was spreading westwards from Surrey and Sussex into Hampshire and Dorset, so that the two counties last named were largely enclosed by the end of the 17th century. He was certain too that South Hampshire was enclosed earlier than the rest of the County. Dr. Slater³³ and Prof. Gonner³⁴ agree that Parliamentary enclosure of open fields covers some 6 per cent. of the County area. Prof. Gonner thinks that Parliamentary enclosure of waste accounts for another 5 per cent.—making 11 per cent. in all of the gross County area. The Parliamentary enclosures of Hampshire in the late 18th century onwards were but the conclusion and culmination of a process which had been in operation for centuries.

Late survivals of Open Fields and Commons.

Dr. Slater considers that perhaps the most valuable evidence available as to the agrarian state of the County in the late 18th century is to be found in Marshall's work.³⁵ He describes two journeys through the County. From Basingstoke to Salisbury, he says, "the state of inclosures varies. To the eastward the country is mostly inclosed, much of it in large, square, regular inclosures. More westward it is entirely open, as are the tops of the higher hills throughout . . ." From Ludgershall to Basingstoke "The country is entirely inclosed excepting a few plots to the right: mostly in large square fields, doubtless from a state of open down; the hedges in general of a Middle Age: some instances of vacant inclosures." Marshall notes that a casual traveller through the south-western counties, judging the state of enclosure by the mere appearance of the countryside, might easily be deceived,

31. *Op. cit.*, p. 242.

32. *Op. cit.*, p. 240.

33. *Ibid.*, p. 279.

34. *Op. cit.*, p. 268.

35. *Rural Economy of South of England*, 1798.

and consider as entirely in a state of severalty land which had been hedged or fenced, but which was still subject to common rights of pasturage. "From the more public roads the whole appears to be in a state of divided property. But, on a closer examination, much of it is found to be in a state of commonage."³⁶ When Sir Francis Eden visited the County in 1795 there were still commons to be seen. He refers to their presence however in but three parishes.³⁷ At Hawkley he notes, significantly enough, "No commons or ale houses," at Newton Valence he records two commons with a total area of 150 acres, at Southampton the common totalled some six or seven hundred acres.

According to Gomme,³⁸ "Several manors in Hampshire have peculiar customs, which appear to have come down from a remote time, before the manorial system had taken the place of the village community. The most remarkable instance is that of Ibthorpe, which is now a hamlet in the parish of Hurstbourn Tarrant, and is about six miles north of Andover. The people of Ibthorpe are lords of their own manor, and to this day exercise their manorial rights, in respect of which they have exclusive common rights on the seventy acres of common land at Pillheath, including a right to everything that grows on this common, with liberty to take it away for their use in Ibthorpe, but not for sale. They have also a right of pasturage in common with the Hurstbourn people on Hurstbourn Common. On the south of Hurstbourn Tarrant is a hill of considerable height above the village, now covered with wood, stretching away towards Andover, and called Doles Wood. From the circumstance that this part of Hurstbourn was subject to common pasturage to within recent time, it is probable that the ancient pasturage acres or Doles, which were held in community, and which can be traced in Wessex as early as the seventh century, as Mr. Seebohm has pointed out, were situated here. The wood itself, which now forms a beautiful hanger, is probably modern: but it was until recent times subject to the common pasturage, which the Hurstbourn commoners latterly maintained by annually driving a cow through Doles House, situated upon it."

There are some instances of the survival of open lands until much more recent years. If the Commons Return of 1874³⁹ is correct (it is fairly safe to assume that for Hampshire, as for other counties, it certainly is not) there were in 1874, of a total County area of a million acres, some 6,000 acres of open field and about 42,000 acres of common. Lord Eversley points out that the latter figure is certainly an under-estimate since the area of the New Forest alone occupies some 65,000⁴⁰ acres. It is highly probable

36. *Ibid.*, quoted in Slater, *op. cit.*, p. 236.

37. *State of the Poor*, 1797, reprint of 1938, pp. 194-9.

38. *Village Community*, 1890, p. 260, quoting T. W. Shore in *Antiquary*, Vol. XVII, 1888, p. 52. Webb, *Manor and Borough*, 1908, pp. 133-4 *fn.*

39. *P.P. (H.C.)*, 85 (1874).

40. *English Commons and Forests*, 1894, pp. 161-70.

that the first quoted figure is a gross over-estimate. There are interesting survivals of commons at Cadnam and Winsor (95 acres), and Wigley (460 acres). The latter have survived an attempt at enclosure by the lord of the manor in 1880, the evidence for its retention being supplied by an exemplification of an Elizabethan chancery decree, found in a closed box in the custody of a copyholder of the manor, and known to the tenants as 'the Monster.' Ewer⁴¹ was enclosed in 1887 under the Commons Act of 1876, the public being allowed the right of access to the entire area. Bournemouth common has been in part appropriated by the corporation of the town, under a private Act for use as a burial ground, but an extensive area was excluded from the operation of the Act, largely as a result of the influence brought to bear by the Commons Society. By far the most interesting of the Hampshire survivals of open land is, of course, that of the New Forest. This area was brought under the operation of the forest laws, much as tradition alleges, by William I, though whether King William actually created the forest, much less destroyed thirty-six parishes with their churches in doing so, is doubtful. The forest was extended by the Norman and early Angevin Kings to some thirty miles in length, but the extensive disafforestations of Henry III and Edward I reduced it again to maximum dimensions of approximately twenty miles by fifteen. A third of the present area is now enclosed and in private possession. The rest—about 65,000 acres—apart from about 2,000 acres of cultivated Crown demesne, is still open, and is still subject to common rights.

The forest suffered badly during the Civil War and again in 1698 when the Crown was given sanction by Parliament to enclose for planting 6,000 acres. This was to be carried out in annual instalments, the ground being thrown open again as soon as the trees were sufficiently well grown to be safe from damage by cattle. In 1851 powers were obtained to destroy the deer, the Crown taking the right to enclose another 10,000 acres in lieu of forestal rights. The Commissioners of Woods interpreted their grant very liberally, and embarked upon a policy of intensive afforestation, which seemed likely to lead eventually to the total destruction of the pasture. They assumed that their powers authorised them to enclose the whole area piecemeal, so long as they avoided having more than 16,000 acres at the same time within their hedges and fences. A commission which sat in 1854 found that 65,000 acres of land *not* in the forest, and in 63 different parishes, had common right over the forest area, and that the occupiers of 1,200 toftsteads had rights of turbary.

After a good deal of agitation, and the appointment of a Select Committee in 1875, the powers of enclosure given in the Acts of 1698 and 1851 were heavily restricted by an Act which also reorganised the ancient court of verderers, and established it upon a

41. *Ibid.*, p. 371.

democratic basis. There have been further attacks upon the integrity of the forest, notably one by the railway company in 1878, and another by the War Office in 1891, but these were repelled without a great deal of difficulty, and the future of the forest, both as a common pasture for those possessed of grazing rights, and as an open space available to the public at large is now safeguarded in perpetuity.

HAMPSHIRE ENCLOSURE ACTS AND AWARDS.

Wherever possible, place names have been given in their generally accepted *modern* forms. All acts in the official return¹ are included. Those in Dr. Slater's lists,² as including open field arable, are in list A. Those not in Dr. Slater's list presumably relate to meadow and waste alone. These are in list B. The 1836³ Act authorised the enclosure of open field alone, though it was frequently used to carry out the enclosure of open lands of other classes.⁴ Unless evidence to the contrary is available it is assumed here that the Act was properly applied, so that enclosures under it are of common field. These are in list C. This Act was extended in 1840⁵ to cover lammas lands, etc., 1840, and enclosures carried out under the 1836 and 1840 Acts are listed in list D.

The General Act of 1845⁶ authorised enclosure of lands other than common pastures by provisional order alone. This provision remained in force until the sixth Amending Act,⁷ with an exceptional clause in favour of enclosures actually in progress in 1852. So for some ten years from 1845 proposed enclosures not including the waste of a manor were not submitted to Parliament for approval. After 1852 all enclosures required statutory authorisation, and this was given in the annual General Act, Lists E and F cover enclosures in those two classes. The data have been obtained from the various official *blue books*,⁸ from the Enclosure Commissioners' annual reports, and from the Ministry of Agriculture memorandum, for awards from 1893 onwards.¹⁰ Enclosures by agreement listed in list G must be a very small proportion of these actually carried out. They are the ones of which formal written record survives either in the Public Record Office, or among the County records. It has not been possible to classify them like the others, into enclosures containing common field, and these consisting of common pasture and meadow, etc.

1. P.P. (H.C.), 399, 1914.

2. *The English Peasantry* . . ., 1908, App. 2.

3. 6 and 7 Wm. IV, c. 115 (1836).

4. Cooke, *Enclosures and Rights of Common*, 1864, p. 84.

5. 3 and 4 Vic. c., 31 (1840).

6. 6 and 7 Vic. c., 118 (1845).

7. 15 and 16 Vic. c., 39 (1852).

8. P.P. above cited, also P.P's. 455 (1893) and 50 (1904).

9. No. 702/LG.

10. Such local lists as are available have been consulted and the data have been checked by various gentlemen whose help is acknowledged elsewhere.

A. Enclosure by Private Act of Lands including Open Field Arable.

Date of Act.	Place(s).	Area.	Award.	Award Enrolled.	Notes.
1709	Ropley	-	?	?	I think that probably no awards were ordered by these early Acts. None are in Slater. In 1914 <i>Blue Book</i> as Dummer. Woodhey in the <i>Blue Books</i> . Public Act. Not in Slater. I do not know whether any open fields were included.
1730	East Wellow (M) and (T)	-	?	?	
1739	Odiham	-	?	?	
1740	Charlton (T) in Andover	-	?	?	
1741	Chawton	-	?	?	
1743	Dummer	-	1743	C.R.	
1749	East Woodhay and Hollington	-	?	?	
1753	Portsea	-	?	?	
1757	Barton Stacey (recte Barton Stacey)	-	?	Ch., 31 Geo. III, pt. 10.*	
1757	Burghcle(a)re (recte Burghclere)	-	?	?	This is presumably the place entered in Slater as Earlistone.
1759	Bishops Waltham (M)	-	?	?	
1774	Abbot's Ann als. Abassi Ann, (recte Abbots Ann) (M)	205	1775	C.R.	1914 <i>Blue Book</i> has one of its few errors in noting act as 1764.
1778	Grat(e)ley (recte Gratley)	-	1778	C.R.	
1780	Leckford Abbott(s) (recte Leckford Abbots), n.s. and Leckford Abbess	n.s.	1780	C.R.	
1781	Highclere and Burghcle(a)re (recte Burghclere)	n.s.	-	C.P., 24 Geo. III, 1783	Slater says H. als. B.,
1783	Kingsbourn (recte Kings Somborn)	1890	1785	C.R.	Kings Somborn in Slater and 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> . Act not 1784 as in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> . Not Andevor as in 1914 <i>Blue Book</i> .
1783	Andover	-	1785	C.R.	
1785	Upper Clatford	-	1786	C.R.	
1786	Upper Wallop, Hurstbourne Priors (recte Hurstbourne Priors) and Tuf(f)ton) recte Tufon)	n.s.	1787	C.R.	H. Priors in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> . Harsbourn in Slater.
1786	Basingstoke	-	1788	C.R.	
1788	Headbourn(e) Worthy (recte Headbourne 1400 Worthy)	n.s.	1791	C.R.	
1789	Broughton	-	1790	C.R.	

<i>Date of Act.</i>	<i>Place(s).</i>	<i>Area.</i>	<i>Award.</i>	<i>Award Enrolled.</i>	<i>Notes.</i>
1789	Odiham, Northwimbrough (<i>recte</i> North Wimbrough), Hillside, Rye and Stap(e)ly (<i>recte</i> Stapeley) (Ts) in Odiham	n.s.	1791	C.R.	Not R-S., etc., as in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> .
1790	Dibden	n.s.	1791	C.R.	
1792	Monk Sherborne	700	1793	C.R.	
1792	Shipton (i.e. Shipton Bellinger ?)	n.s.	1793	C.R.	Sherburne in Slater.
1794	Quarley	n.s.	?	?	
1794	Houghton (M) in Houghton (P)	n.s.	?	?	
1794	Crawley in Bishop's Sutton	n.s.	?	?	
1794	Upton Gray <i>als.</i> Upton Grey	n.s.	1796	C.R.	
1796	Mitcheimarch (<i>recte</i> Michelmerish), Braishfield, and Awbridge (Hs) or (Ts) in Mitcheimersh and Timsbury	n.s.	1797	C.R.	Not Braithfield as in the <i>blue books</i> .
1796	Nether Wallop	n.s.	1797	C.R.	
1796	Basing and Map(p)ledgerwell (<i>recte</i> Mapledgerwell)	n.s.	1797	C.R.	Separate awards for B. and M.
1797	Whitchurch	n.s.	1798	C.R.	
1798	Medste(a)d (<i>recte</i> Medstead) and Bentworth	400	1799	C.R.	Separate awards for M. and B.
1798	Rockb(o)urne (<i>recte</i> Rockbourne)	n.s.	1802	C.R.	Act includes also Wichbury (Whitsbury) Wilts.
1799	Easton	?	1800	C.R.	Not Eastbury as in Slater.
1802	West Aston <i>als.</i> West Yaston (<i>recte</i> West Aston) and Middleton (Hs) in Longparish	750	1804	C.R.	
1803	Kilmiston (T)	n.s.	1805	C.R.	Not Kilmiston as in 1914 <i>Blue Book</i> .
1804	Romsey Extra	n.s.	1808	C.R.	
1805	New Alresford	1410	1807	C.R.	Slater says 410a.
1806	Monxton	600	1807	C.R.	
1807	Ringwood	n.s.	1811	C.R.	
1808	Port(o)chester (<i>recte</i> Porchester)	1050	?	?	
1810	Eling and Fawley	n.s.	1814	C.R.	Slater says 680a.
1812	Ramridge (M) in Wey <i>als.</i> (<i>et recte</i>) Weyhill, and Appleshaw (T) (in Penton Grafton)	800	1818	C.R.	Winmering in Slater.
1812	Wymering, Widley and Cosham	800	1815	C.R.	

1812	Ovington and Halsea (Ts)	-	-	n.s.	1813	C.R.	
1812	Chalton (<i>recte</i> Charlton), Catherington, Clanchfield, Blen(d)worth (<i>recte</i> Beenworth) and Idsworth	-	-	2500	1816	C.R.	(Charlton near Andover?).
1813	Echinswell (M) and (Ch) in East Woodhay <i>als.</i> Wydney (<i>recte</i> East Woodhay) (T) in Kingsclere (P)	-	-	500	1820	K.B. I, Geo. IV, 1820*	1904 <i>Blue Book</i> says award with C.R. is 1850.
1817	Harbridge	-	-	n.s.	?	?	
1817	Beeton in Portsea (Portsmouth)	-	-	170	1822	C.R.	
1820	Preston Candover and Nutley	-	-	1800	1823	C.R.	
1822	Ellingham and Ibsley	-	-	n.s.	?	?	
1825	Roeschot(t) (<i>recte</i> Roeshot) in Christchurch and Milton	-	-	n.s.	1827	C.R.	
1827	Tangle	-	-	95	?	?	Slater says 296A.
1829	Sherburne St. Johns (<i>recte</i> Sherborne St. John)	-	-	1000	1832	C.R.	Sherborne in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> .
1842	Kingsclere	-	-	2300	1845	C.R.	

B. Enclosures by Private Act of Lands not including Open Field Arable.

1736	Old Alresford	-	-	?	1736	C.R.	
1744	North Stoneham	-	-	?	?	?	
1785	Burton (T) in Southsea in Portsea	-	-	?	1786	C.R.	Two awards : C. 1805, B. 1806.
1802	Christchurch and Burton (T) in Holdenhurst	-	-	n.s.	{ 1805	C.R.	Act not of course 1893 as in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> .
1803	Froxfield (Barnett)	-	-	780	1806	C.R.	
1803	Old Alresford	-	-	?	1805	C.R.	
1805	Fareham	-	-	435	1805	C.R.	
1806	Sherfield English	-	-	167	1807	C.R.	
1808	Colemore and Priors Dean	-	-	650	1808	C.R.	Amending Act, 1808.
1809	Hursley and Merton (M)	-	-	2850	?	?	
1810	Soberton, Hambleton (Hambledon), Catherington, Blendworth, Bedhampton, Kingston, Portsea, Farington, Wymering, Widley, West Boarhunt, Porchester, Wicor, and Wickham, etc. (in Bier), <i>als.</i> Great Bere <i>als.</i> East Bere Forest	-	-	8000	1812	C.R., and C.P., 55 Geo. III, 1814	Murdon in Slater and 1914 <i>Blue Book</i> .

Date of Act.	Place(s).	Area.	Award.	Award Enrolled.	Notes.
1810	Warblington	568	?	?	
1810	Eastney and Milton <i>als.</i> Middletown in Portsea	220	1813	C.R.	
1811	Farnborough	n.s.	1816	C.R.	
1811	Lockerley	280	1815	C.R.	
1811	Sway Quarr (recte Sway Quarr), Romsey and Arnewood (Ms) in Boldre and Hordle	1200	1820	C.R.	This is Sway Quarr (M) in Boldre, not Sway Quar S., etc., as in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> or Sway Quar, Sway Romsey, etc., as in 1914 <i>Blue Book</i> .
1812	St. Mary Extra and South Stoneham	800	1814	C.R.	
1812	Itchen Abbas	180	?	?	
1813	Fawley	n.s.	1815	C.R.	
1813	Elvetham	1710	1815	C.R.	
1813	Townhill <i>als.</i> Shamblehurst (M) in South Stoneham	n.s.	1815	C.R.	
1815	Hawley (T) in Yateley	n.s.	1817	C.R.	
1815	Bourne (now Bournemouth)	?	?	?	
1816	Ecchinswell (M) in East Woodhay	n.s.	1815	C.R.	
1818	Hurstbourne Tarrant	n.s.	1820	C.R.	
1819	Warblington, Chidham, and Westbourne	320		K., ¹ Geo. IV, Indexed as partly in Sussex. Here counted as 1821* and ² wholly in Hants.	
1820	Great and Little Allington (Ts) and (Ms) and Ewelme (H) in Bishopstoke and South Stoneham	n.s.	1824	C.R.	Geo. IV,* 1821
1824	Pamber and Inhurst (Ts) in Pamber and Raughurst	n.s.	1827	C.R.	Not Banghurst as in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> .
1829	Monksborne (recte Monk Sherborne)	220	1832	C.R.	
1829	Wootton St. Lawrence	115	1832	C.R.	
1829	Hill <i>als.</i> Hull (recte Hill), and Shirley (Ts) in Mil(l)brook (recte Hilbrook)	400	1832	C.R.	Award not in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> , but it is enrolled among C.R.
1829	Crookham and Ewshott (Ts) in Crondall	n.s.	1834	C.R.	Two separate awards for C. and E.
1839	Oxenbourn and Ramsde(a)n (recte Ramsden) (Ts) in Eastmeon (recte East Meon)	1395	1834 1851	C.R. C.R.	

1843	Litlington	-	-	-	-	n.s.	1844	C.R.	Award not enrolled with Clerk of Peace for County of Town of Southampton.
1844	Southampton	-	-	-	-	n.s.	?	?	Not under General Acts as in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> .
1847	Dippenhall (Riding) in Crondall	-	-	-	-	70	1848	C.R.	Do.
1847	Tadley	-	-	-	-	650	1850	C.R.	

C. Enclosures of Open Field, etc., under 6 and 7 Wn. IV. C. 115.

1836	Eastney Common Fields in North Hayling	-	-	-	-	?	1840	C.R.
1836	Oterbourne	-	-	-	-	?	1837	C.R.
1836	Salterns Duckerd in North Hayling	-	-	-	-	?	1840	C.R.

D. Enclosures of Waste, etc., under 3 and 4 Vic. C. 31.

Nil.

E. Enclosures including Open Field Arable under the General Acts of 1845 *et seq.*

(i) *By Provisional Order alone, not needing specific Parliamentary sanction.*

1845	Worthy Down in Kings Worthy	-	-	-	-	?	1852	C.R.
1845	East Meon (Oxenbourne and Ramsdean)	-	-	-	-	?	1851	C.R.

(ii) *By Provisional Order confirmed in pursuance of annual General Act.*

1845 } Binsted	-	-	-	-	-	990	1857	C.R.
1849 }								

F. Enclosures not including Open Field Arable under the General Acts of 1845 *et seq.*

(i) *By Provisional Order alone, not needing specific Parliamentary sanction.*

Nil.

(ii) *By Provisional Order confirmed in pursuance of annual General Act.*

1845 } Ellisfield	-	-	-	-	-	146	?	?	Award not enrolled among C.R.
1848 }									
1848	Newton Valence	-	-	-	-	163	1850	C.R.	
1848	Greatham	-	-	-	-	76	1851	C.R.	
1849	Headley	-	-	-	-	1532	1859	C.R.	
1849	Abbot's Wood in Frensham	-	-	-	-	172	?	?	Award not enrolled among C.R.

<i>Date of Act.</i>	<i>Place(s).</i>	<i>Area.</i>	<i>Award.</i>	<i>Award Enrolled.</i>	<i>Notes.</i>
1849	Rotherwick	-	158	1859	C.R.
1851	Twyford	-	630	1855	C.R.
1851	Owslebury	-	745	1861	C.R.
1851	Droxford	-	1240	1855	C.R.
1851	Bentley	-	108	1859	C.R.
1852	West End Down in Hambledon	-	200	1861	C.R.
1852	Upham	-	230	1860	C.R.
1852	Broadhalfpenny Down in Hambledon	-	494	1857	C.R.
1852	Morestead	-	92	?	This is now in Hambledon. I am obliged to Cdr. C. B. Roberts, of Hambledon, for the information that the terrier totals 486 a., the award 470 a.
1853	Stratfield Turgis(s) (<i>recte</i> Stratfield Turgis) and Stratfield Saye	-	160	1866	C.R.
1853	Stroud Wood Common in Bishopstoke	-	186	1857	Formerly partly in Berks. Duplicate (?) award in Berks C.R.)
1853	Aldershot	-	2610	1856	C.R.
1854	Curridge (T) in Bishops Waltham	-	320	1856	C.R.
1854	Bursledon in Bishops Waltham (M)	-	228	1857	C.R.
1854	Oakcuts Wood in Upper and Lower Clatford <i>als.</i> Goodworth Clatford (<i>recte</i> Goodworth Clatford)	-	80	1855	C.R.
1854	Buriton	-	915	1864	C.R.
1854	Cove (M) in Yateley	-	1120	1859	C.R.
1855	Sheet	-	270	?	Award not enrolled among C.R.
1855	Petersfield Heath in Buriton	-	38	?	Do.
1856	Steep	-	140	1866	C.R.
1856	Mappedurwell (<i>recte</i> Mapledurwell)	-	98	1863	C.R.
1856	Meonstoke	-	660	1863	C.R.
1856	Eastmeon	-	138	?	Award apparently not enrolled among C.R. though there is an East Meon 1851. This I have provisionally entered under E (i) <i>supra</i> .
1856	Wintershill Common in Durley	-	127	1858	C.R.
1856	Hurst Common in Liss	-	668	1864	C.R.

1857	North Baddesley	-	-	732	1867	C.R.
1857	Chilworth	-	-	12	1867	C.R.
1857	Petersfield Heath in Petersfield	-	-	7	1857	
1857	Wolverton	-	-	34	1861	C.R.
1858	Soberton	-	-	450	1867	C.R.
1858	Heckfield	-	-	564	1860	C.R.
1858	Greatham, Liss, Selborne, Kingsley, Headley and Bramshott (Woolmer Forest)	-	-	1200	1868	C.R.
1859	Botley	-	-	80	1865	C.R.
1859	Dibden	-	-	312	1862	C.R.
1859	Titchfield	-	-	750	1866	C.R.
1859	Newland (M) in Titchfield	-	-	12	1867	C.R.
1859	Crofton (M) in Titchfield	-	-	10	1867	C.R.
1859	Swanwick Common in Titchfield	-	-	410	1866	C.R.
1860	Ashley Great and Little Commons in Milton	-	-	156	1862	C.R.
1861	Newland Marsh Shoreland in Titchfield in Newland (M) in Titchfield (P)	-	-	9	1867	C.R.
1861	Crofton Marsh Shore Land	-	-	31	1867	C.R.
1863	Bishops Waltham	-	-	144	1870	C.R.
1863	Sandhill Heath in Fordingbridge	-	-	12½	1865	C.R.
1864	Eversley	-	-	1150	1868	C.R.
1864	Havant and Hayling North	-	-	886	1870	C.R.
1864	Avon Commons in Sopley	-	-	1200	1869	C.R.
1864	Ashley Heath in Ringwood and Harbridge	-	-	2521	1868	C.R.
1865	Hartley Winney	-	-	30	1867	C.R.
1865	Chidden Down in Hambledon	-	-	327	1871	C.R.
1865	Anthill Common in Hambledon	-	-	78	1870	C.R.
1866	Preston Candover	-	-	222	1870	C.R.
1866	Southey and Ridges Green in Selborne and Greatham	-	-	178	1868	C.R.
1868	Christchurch	-	-	282	1878	C.R.

Area (Cdr. Roberts) terrier 338a, award 326a.

G. Enclosures by Formal Written Agreement enrolled in County or National Records.

1798	Bashley Common in Milton	-	-	?	1817	C.R.
	Itchen Stoke Common Fields	-	-	?	1788	C.R.

Now Bashley Manor Farm.
In 1904 Blue Book as under General Acts.

<i>Date of Act.</i>	<i>Place(s).</i>	<i>Area.</i>	<i>Award.</i>	<i>Award Enrolled.</i>	<i>Notes.</i>
†	Lands, Down ground, Common fields, and other waste ground in Longparish were enclosed by agreement between Richard Widmore, lord of the Manor, and others of the said parish, by arbitration of John Duke of Sarson, and Thomas Gatehouse of Lower Wallop,	-	-	-	-
23rd July, 1742	-	-	-	435	?

The agreement is in the library of University College, Southampton.

† *Ex inf.* Dr. A. A. Ruddock.

CONTRACTIONS USED.

- * Enrolled copy of award has plan attached.
- a. Acres.
- Ch. Award enrolled on Chancery Close Roll in Public Record Office.
- C.P. Award enrolled on Common Pleas Recovery Roll in Public Record Office.
- C.R. Award enrolled among County Records in custody of Clerk of the Peace.
- E.K.R. Exchequer King's Remembrancer Roll in Public Record Office.
- (H.). Hamlet.
- K.B. Award enrolled on King's Bench Plea Rolls in Public Record Office.
- (M.). Manor.
- n.a. (area) not specified.
- (P.). Parish.
- (T.). Township or Tithing.
- (V.). Vill, or Village.

NOTES AND QUERIES :

I have not succeeded in identifying these Acts in the 1914 *Blue Book* :—Ellisfield 1848 ; Morestead 1852 ; Sheet 1855 ; Petersfield Heath and Buriton 1855 ; Eastmeon 1856 ; Petersfield Heath in Petersfield 1856, with awards in the 1904 *Blue Book* ; or these awards in the 1904 *Book* with the relevant Acts : East Stoke in North Hayling, 1867 ; Stoke 1874 ; Vernor in North Hayling 1876 ; Bramshott 1866 ; Selborne and Greatnam 1866. No doubt some of them must be alternative names of the same enclosures.

An award for part of the New Forest is enrolled E.K.R. 10 Geo. IV Trin., vo. 136, with Commissions, Affidavits, etc. Presumably this is under one of the Acts listed c. 1820-30 in list B. *Quære* Bishopstoke, 1824 ? The Act for Rockbourne 1798, includes also Wichbury (Whitsbury) Wilts ; Stratfield Mortimer, etc., 1802 is indexed as partly in Berks, so is Stratfield Turgis, etc., 1853. Both these are here counted in Hants. Wemblington 1819 includes also Chidham and Westbourne in Sussex. Abbotswood in Frensham 1849 is now counted in Dockenfield, Surrey. The 1904 *Blue Book* also indexes under Hants : Hampreston 1806, here counted as wholly in Dorset, and Parkhurst 1812, Norton in Freshwater 1853, Niton 1856, Chale, Amending award under Provisional Order only, 1852, and Easton in Freshwater 1861. All these are now in the separate County of the I.O.W.

The 1904 and 1914 *Blue Books* index a Burghcleare 1757 which does not appear in Slater, and Slater gives an Earlstone 1757 which does not appear in the *blue books*. Two names for the one place ?

There is only one amending Act, *Sherfield English 1806*, amended 1808. For Ewer in *Alverstoke* there is an Order of 1888 under Act of 1887, but this is for Regulation, not Enclosure.

Both the text (Pt. I) and the list (Pt. II) are preliminary drafts, although I have spent much time upon them. If any user of the work is able to furnish notes of inaccuracies, or to supply any omissions, I shall be very grateful to have his assistance. Such help will be properly acknowledged if, as hoped, the work eventually appears in one volume covering the whole country.

Whatever value the work possesses in its present form is largely due to much assistance already received from: F. V. Barber, Esq., Clerk of the Peace for the County of Southampton; Commander C. B. Roberts, F.S.A., of *Hambleton*; Mr. F. Warren, F.S.A., of the *Hants Field Club*; P. E. White, Esq., Clerk of the Isle of Wight County Council, and Professor R. Betts and Dr. A. A. Ruddock, of University College, Southampton, to whom I am very much indebted for their help. I am also very grateful to the Houblon-Norman Research Trustees and their Secretary, Mr. H. B. Mynors, for assistance in undertaking my inquiry.

APPENDIX.

Abstract of a deed deposited by the British Records Association at University College, Southampton, from the offices of Messrs. Torr & Co., and included in the *Widmore MSS.*

Agreement, dated 23 July 1742, between Richard Widmore, lord of the manor of Longparish, and others of the said parish, to partition certain 'lands, Down ground and Common fields and other waste ground' in 'East Yaston in Longparish' (Modern form—East Aston) by arbitration of John Duke of Sarson, and Thomas Gatchouse of Lower Wallop, Esquires.

This specifically mentions both common fields 'to plow and sow,' and Loam Down and Ham Down. The areas mentioned are as follows:—

Peter Haneker	-	87½ acres 37 poles in Down Field.
John Russell	-	149½ acres 21 poles in Middle Field and Further Field.
Thomas Mills	-	12 acres 22 perches in Ham Down.
Henry Clarke	-	69½ acres 7 perches in the Further Field.
John Rolfe	-	35 acres 1 perch in the Further and Middle Fields.
George Brown	-	11½ acres 3 perches in the Middle Field.
Christopher Jones	-	11½ acres also in the Middle Field.
Elizabeth Kemp, widow	-	11½ acres 27 perches arable land in the Middle Field.
	-	11½ acres 14 perches in the Hither Field.
	-	23½ acres also in the Hither Field.
	-	23½ acres 14 perches in the Hither Field.
	-	3½ acres 4 perches in the Middle Field.

N.B.—Only in one case is the above specifically stated to be arable land in the document (*i.e.*, John Rolfe's share).

For this abstract I am obliged to Dr. A. A. Ruddock, Assistant Lecturer in History, University College, Southampton.

ISLE OF WIGHT.

Early Field Systems in the Isle of Wight.

As his map shows, according to Professor Gray¹ the Isle of Wight lies on the outskirts of the great midland area formerly characterised by the prevalence of the two and three field systems of common field cultivation. Here, he says, the open field system existed in some completeness in mediaeval times. Dr. and Mrs. Orwin,² whose later researches complement and correct the conclusions reached in Professor Gray's pioneer study, agree with him that the open field system was at one time generally prevalent in the Isle, though unlike him they think there is little trace of the system in several of the coastal regions, especially along the north-west coast. It is certain enough that open fields in the Isle in general disappeared in quite early times. It may well be that, here as elsewhere, this is explained by the fact that the early field systems which had existed were in general of rather irregular types. Gray³ has noted evidence of field structure in but five townships. Four of these: Newtown and Somerford (1299 - 1300 and 1305-6), Niton (1608-9), Wellow (1608-9) were in two fields, and one of them, Wroxall (1299 - 1300), was in three fields. Such evidence as is available concerning field systems in the Isle in Tudor times seems to show that by then few open-field townships remained, and these few were largely of abnormal type. At Wellow in 1608-9 there was a very equal division of holdings between East and West Fields, though it seems exceptional to find the two-field system there at that time. At Knighton by the same year piecemeal enclosure had made heavy inroads on the fields.

Early Enclosure in the Isle of Wight.

The history of enclosure in the Isle of Wight is of particular interest, since it is well known that the first anti-enclosure and anti-depopulation Act in England was passed in respect of this area. This is dated 1488,⁴ and precedes by a year the more general Act applying to the whole country "agaynst pulling down of Townes." The Statute recites that this "Isle is late decayed of people by reason that many Townes and vilages been lete down, and the feldes dyked and made pastures for bestis and catalles and also many dwelling places fermes and fermeholdes have of late tyme ben used to be taken into oon mannys hold and handes that of old tyme were wont to be in many severall persones holdes and handes." The remedy in the latter Act was that owners of houses let to farm with twenty acres or more within the three years preceding the Act

1. Prof. H. L. Gray, *English Field Systems*, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A., 1915, Frontispiece.

2. Dr. and Mrs. C. S. Orwin, *The Open Fields*, 1938, Frontispiece and pp. 64-6.

3. *Op. cit.*, p. 467.

4. I. R. Leadam, *Domesday . . .*, Vol. I, pp. 6-7, 1897, and *id.* in *Trans. Royal Hist. Soc.*, N.S., Vol. VIII, 1894, p. 279, 4 Hen. VII, cc. 16 and 19, 1488 and 1489.

or at any future time should maintain the houses and buildings necessary for tillage. The penalty was forfeiture of the premises to the King or the lord of the fee. The Isle of Wight Act was hardly so drastic, so one would have imagined that it would be even less effective than the other (admittedly rather futile) Statute. It did not prohibit enclosure, but limited engrossing and consolidation by enacting that no one person should be allowed to hold more than one farm of the value of ten marks yearly rent. The motive for the Act was largely a military one—the Isle was becoming de-populated and therefore incapable of defence. It is interesting to note that the Statute seems to have been efficacious in this respect.⁵ At any rate an attack by the French was beaten off by the men of the Isle in 1544.

The 1517 Domesday returns were thought to have perished,⁶ but since the time when Mr. Leadam issued his *Domesday* in 1897, the returns for Hampshire in a very fragmentary condition have been unearthed in the Public Record Office. It is not clear whether or not these cover the Isle. The Lansdowne MSS.⁷ include transcripts of the 1517 returns relating to Hampshire, and these were edited by Mr. Leadam before the publication of the *Domesday*.

It is surprising to find a very small area indeed returned as enclosed in the Isle since 1488. Either the legislation already referred to had been much more effective than was once supposed, or alternatively, enclosure in the Isle had been largely completed before 1488 the date of the Act, or 1485 the retrospective limit of the Commissioners' enquiries. The places mentioned are "Chalcom," "Esthamlode," "Lyttell paune," "Hassebourne," and "Stepelhirst," with a total enclosure of 355 acres—a very small acreage but twice as high a percentage of the grass area as in the rest of Hampshire. Leland never visited the Isle in 1535-43, so it is not possible to obtain from him information as to its agrarian state.

The Island, unlike the rest of Hampshire, is included in the counties to which the 1536 Depopulation Act⁸ was to apply. Like the rest of Hampshire, the Isle was included in the counties covered by the last Depopulation Act, that of 1597.⁹ It seems clear then that the enclosure problem must still have been a live issue in the area. There is little mention of it in subsequent enclosure returns and commissions. There is other evidence that by this time the Isle's enclosure was almost complete. Wellow, for example, was only about a sixth enclosed by 1608-9, but about the same time Niton was perhaps two-thirds or three-fourths in severalty,

5. Ref.

6. Prof. E. F. Gay in *Trans. Royal Hist. Society*, N.S. Vol. XIV, 1900, p. 238.

7. I. R. Leadam in *Trans. Royal Hist. Society*, N.S. Vol. VI, 1892, p. 294, Vol. VII, 1893, p. 277.

8. Miss E. M. Leonard in *Trans. Royal Hist. Society*, N.S. Vol. XIX, 1905, p. 124 fn.

9. 39 Eliz., c. 2, 1597, G. Slater, *The English Peasantry* . . . 1907, App. D., p. 328.

"Uggeston" was almost entirely in severalty, and Thorley was certainly quite completely enclosed by the same time.¹⁰

Probably it was partly in consequence of this early and almost complete enclosure of the area that the Isle earned and received such handsome eulogies from the 18th century topographers.¹¹ They perpetuated a legend that it produced enough corn in one year to feed its population for seven. Lisle¹² describes in some detail the husbandry here as in the rest of Hampshire, and Young¹³ says that in 1771 improved courses were general throughout the Island. Probably it is safe to assume from this that only in very rare and exceptional instances did any vestiges of open field cultivation survive into the early part of the 18th century, while still more rarely did they remain until the beginning of the movement for Parliamentary enclosure.

Isle of Wight Enclosure Acts and Awards.

It will be seen that I have been able to find very little trace of the survival of either open fields or commons in the Isle into the 18th and 19th centuries. Sir Francis Eden¹⁴ visited the Isle in 1795, and he goes into great detail concerning the management of the poor in the House of Industry at Newport. Contrary to his usual practice, however, he says nothing concerning the existence of open lands in the area. There are no references whatever in Lord Eversley's work¹⁵ to open lands existing in the County to-day. And, since in 1874 the Isle was still included in Hampshire, the commons return of this year,¹⁶ which, with all its notorious inaccuracy, is occasionally of use in tracing open lands elsewhere, is useless for trying to identify such here. The Board of Agriculture commissioned an agricultural survey of the Isle, and this duly appeared among the quarto draft reports in 1794.¹⁷ In the octavo final reports the Isle is included with Hampshire. The official return¹⁸ says: "There are no Inclosure Awards or copies thereof deposited with the Clerk . . . of the Peace or of the Council . . . of . . . the Isle of Wight." It will be gathered from what has been said above that there are two reasons for this state of affairs: (a) there are but few Parliamentary enclosures of land in the Isle, and (b) the Isle is a recently created County, so

10. Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

11. G. E. Fussell in *Ministry of Agriculture Journal*, Jan. 1937, p. 944.

12. *Observations* . . . , 2nd edn. 1757, quoted by G. E. Fussell *ut supra*.

13. A. Young, *Eastern Tour*, 1771, Vol. III, pp. 204-41.

14. *State of the Poor*, 1797, Reprint of 1938, pp. 199-203.

15. G. Shaw Lefevre, *English Commons and Forests*, 1894.

16. P.P. (H.C.) 85 (1874).

17. A. and W. Driver. By the Rev. X. Warner, appended to *General View* . . . , 1794. Though this does not appear in the standard list, that by Sir E. Clarke in *Journ. Royal Agricultural Society*, Ser. III, Vol. IX (X), reprinted by Dr. H. C. Taylor *The Decline of the Landowning Farmer in England*, Madison, Wis., U.S.A., 1904, p. 64. C. Vancouver, *General View* . . . , 1810.

18. P.P. (H.C.) 50 (1904), LXVII, 545, p. 2.

that what few awards there are will be found enrolled not at Newport, but among the Hampshire County Records at Winchester. Although the awards are so few in number I have thought it worth while, for the sake of uniformity with my other County studies, to list them below under the seven headings used elsewhere.

Enclosure Acts and Awards for Lands in the Isle of Wight.

- A. ENCLOSURES BY PRIVATE ACT OF LANDS INCLUDING OPEN FIELD ARABLE.—NIL.
- B. ENCLOSURES BY PRIVATE ACT OF LANDS NOT INCLUDING OPEN FIELD ARABLE.—NIL.
- C. ENCLOSURES OF OPEN FIELD, ETC., UNDER THE GENERAL ACT OF 1836.—NIL.
- D. ENCLOSURES OF COMMON PASTURE, ETC., UNDER THE GENERAL ACTS OF 1836 AND 1840.—NIL.
- E. ENCLOSURES OF LANDS INCLUDING OPEN FIELD UNDER THE GENERAL ACTS OF 1845 *et seq.*
- (i) By Provisional Order not needing specific Parliamentary Confirmation.—NIL.
 - (ii) By Provisional Order confirmed in (annual) General Enclosure Act.
- | <i>Date of Act</i> | <i>Area est.
in Act</i> | <i>Date of
Award</i> | <i>Award
enrolled</i> |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1845 and 1856. | | | |
| Niton Head Down and
Common Fields | - 449 | 1889 | Hants C.R. |
| 1845 and 1861. | | | |
| Easton in Freshwater | - 37 | 1866 | Hants C.R. |
- F. ENCLOSURES OF LANDS NOT INCLUDING OPEN FIELDS UNDER THE GENERAL ACTS OF 1845 *et seq.*
- (i) By Provisional Order not needing specific Parliamentary Confirmation.
 - (ii) By Provisional Order confirmed in (annual) General Enclosure Act.
- | | | | |
|----------------------|------|------|-------------------|
| 1845. Chale | - | ? | 1855 (Hants) C.R. |
| 1845 and 1853. | | | |
| Norton in Freshwater | - 84 | 1859 | (Hants) C.R. |
- G. ENCLOSURES BY FORMAL WRITTEN AGREEMENT ENROLLED IN COUNTY OR NATIONAL RECORDS.—NIL.