crops possible without the necessity of a particular number of fields. (Taylor 1975 pp71-2)

Little is known of early cultivation within Iwood but during the Anglo-Saxon period, in common with many farmsteads, it probably used an infield/outfield system, from which arose the right of common on Broadfield Down. This right, carefully preserved, would have considerably strengthened its economy and given it some independence after inclusion in Congresbury, because Congresbury had little if any such upland pasture either within the pre-Conquest estate or the later Norman manor. Congresbury's demesne agriculture in 1086, besides grain production, included pigs, goats, cattle and a relatively large number of sheep. It is likely that Iwood too would have raised sheep especially with Broadfield Down providing the pasture. As a part of Congresbury manor, Iwood's post-conquest agriculture probably differed little from the manor's, but there is no further information until 1228.

In 1228 Iwood became a totally independent unit outside the control of Congresbury manor, with rights of common both on Broadfield Down and by then also over Congresbury's common grazing. This changed Iwood's status and was to greatly affect the organisation of its economy.

It seems necessary, first, to define Iwood's area. Iwood has no known early deeds, manorial surveys or extents. Available information, from 1228, about Iwood's area is inconsistent and mixed with that of other properties and at different times described in a variety of units, carucates, virgates, acres, with variations even in the nineteenth century. Map 6 is an attempt to show the medieval lands of Iwood. This map, based on the 1885 25" O.S. map includes information from the earliest list of Iwood's fields (Bristol Journal 1805), Congresbury's maps, two small areas on those of 1736-9, (BRO: 04480 & BMC/4/PL1/1 & 2) small parts of the enclosure map, 1816 (SRO D/P/con 20/1/1) and the 1840 tithe map (SRO D/D/Rt Congresbury), which includes Iwood's earliest complete cartographic record, and field names from Iwood's accounts, 1341-52, (BL Add Roll 7663-7669).

The position of the customary tenants' lands of 1228, particularly those "within the moor" has already been discussed and possible areas are shown on Map 6. Congresbury's late 15th and 16th century manorial records also mention

`

moorland with Iwood (SRO DD/CC 131919 no.6 & DD/SAS BA3,4 & 5). Tenants' meadow could have been in Riding Mead, "Rudyngsham", or the unidentified "Erdlesham", or elsewhere near the river. Rudyngsham suggests land clearance (Ekwall 1977 p387) in that area, consistent with a nearby Anglo-Saxon settlement, with "ham" meaning "flat low-lying meadow on a stream" (Ekwall 1977 p214), which aptly describes the land.

Iwood manor also included Congresbury's West Mill with a withey bed, an aldergrove called "kingsalre" and a fardel of land, all outside the Iwood area. The aldergrove is the field called Le Alres in Iwood's accounts and Green Earls in 1736, which remained appurtenant to Iwood at least until 1840. The withey bed has been identified as Leg Orchard in 1840, near West mill. The fardel, probably "Trivett's tenement" in 1767, once "part and parcel of the manor of Iwood alias Iwood Yatton" (Deeds of the Plough Inn Congresbury) has not been identified.

Ignoring manorial lands outside the Iwood area, Iwood, constructed from its accounts, 1341-52, consisted of the demesne arable, meadow, pasture, the messuage, an orchard and garden and the customary tenants' land, a total of just over 111 modern acres. Demesne land, (campus domini = demesne (Latham 1994 p66)) mentioned several times, can only be positively identified once, as land south of Wrington Road. The only land outside the Iwood area mentioned was pasture near the West Mill and Le Alres, later Green Earls. The field called "Iwood Oak" in 1805 was probably the wood which supplied 52 oak trees in 1345/6, underwood on other occasions and pannage for pigs each year. The field "Woods" was being cultivated in the 1340s having been assarted by, possibly, Bartholomew in the 13th century although its name in 1840, Wood Chartley, perhaps suggests some earlier clearance. Several of the fields were already enclosed by 1341, shown by references to hedges by the "croft" of la Derhern and around La Hame and to ditches dug between the demesne and "the close". "Croft" in this case, since there is no evidence of any sort to indicate occupation there, means "a piece of enclosed land used for tillage or pasture" (Ekwall 1977 p131), further demonstrating early enclosure. The "herne" of Derherne probably refers to the positions of the two fields in the "corner" of the estate (Ekwall 1977 p236) and "der" to the presence of deer in the area.

The accounts give areas harvested in acres "by estimation", so acres sown were probably also "by estimation". These medieval acres are unlikely to have been equal to modern ones but Andrew Jones suggests that in southern England the conventional acre was often between two-thirds and three-quarters of the modern acre (Jones 1979 p11). From 1342-7 the area of demesne sown with crops varied from 55 to 65.5 acres, see Appendix 6, which, using Andrew Jones' suggestion, convert to 37 to 49 modern acres.

Looking at Map 6 it is perhaps easy to assume that the two largest areas (coloured yellow) north of the river and either side of the lane, were by the 14th century, the fields forming a two-field rotation system, common in parts of Somerset (Aston 1988 p84). Neither side has any evidence of ridge and furrow cultivation, but aerial photographs show some evidence of activity, already noted, in the field called Green Lease. On the western side, the area coloured yellow is 35 acres, according to 1840 tithe map figures. That includes the area containing occupation sites 4 and 5, Map 3, so that the arable area could have been less than 35 acres. The eastern side, omitting the area around and immediately south of Iwood Manor House and the Iwood Oak field, has an area just under 31 acres. Neither side is therefore sufficient for the total area sown in any year. Fallow was sold in some years, for varying sums, and in the other years used as grazing, so there was clearly some rotation of the crops grown, wheat, barley, oats and beans. Unfortunately only the 1350/1 account names any fields where crops were sown, two acres of oats in Parthederherne, east of Iwood Lane, and 1.5 acres of drage in Middelfurlong (unidentified). It seems clear therefore that there must have been cultivation on both sides of Iwood Lane each year and that there was no recognisable system as such. This is as irregular, if not more so, as Congresbury's cultivation system which also apparently had no common open field system.

Iwood's mid-14th century agricultural economy.

Iwood's accounts (BL Add Roll 7663-7669) for a tiny lay manor in a small estate appear to be a very rare survival. Indeed Britnell says of Langenhoe in Essex, the sole manor of a minor knight, with a sown area of 200 acres in the 1340s, more than treble Iwood's sown area then, "that accounts from a lay estate as small as this are a great rarity" (Britnell 1966 p380 & 38).

Searches in Somerset and Bristol record offices and elsewhere have failed to find comparable records for any small lay estate in the pre 1974 county of Somerset, neither were any found for the Devon Blewet manors in Exeter record office. Extant medieval manorial documents are overwhelmingly those of ecclesiastical and institutional manors or of large lay estates, particularly those which passed to the crown (Harvey 1984 pp9-10). Because of this little is known about how small manors were managed (Miller & Hatcher 1992 p189).

Complete accounts survive for Iwood for 1341-2, 42-3, 44-5, 45-6 and 46-7, all presented by Richard Perkynes, the bailiff. The earliest account shows arrears from the previous two, and the appointment of the bailiff Perkynes in 1340. Only a few corrections were made at audit suggesting both a competent bailiff and reeve.

Perhaps even more unusually the accounts straddle the Black Death, but unfortunately both accounts post Black Death are incomplete. That of 1350-1 covers the Iwood and Yatton manors together, but the second half of the account is missing; that of 1351-2 covers Iwood alone for only four months from Michaelmas 1351. The situation after the plague is considered in a later section.

Because the period covered is short any conclusions drawn and comparisons made must be viewed with circumspection. Since harvests naturally varied considerably over time and place the best comparisons would be with neighbouring manors, particularly Wrington, Congresbury and Yatton where weather conditions and soil types were similar. Reeve's accounts for 1344/5, 1345/6 and 1352-5 exist for Glastonbury Abbey's Wrington (BRO AC/M10/5-9), but nothing comparable apparently survives for Congresbury, Yatton or any other manors of the Bishop of Bath and Wells.

(Wrington appears to have been typical of the 14th century Glastonbury manors, with a large demesne and a correspondingly large work-force consisting of considerable numbers of villein tenants supplementing their rents by working on demesne land (BL Egerton Ms 3321/F). These rents, works and other payments, to the larder, churchscot, hearthpenny etc provided a regular reliable income for the Abbey.)

John de la More was three years old when he inherited Iwood, Yatton and Oldland manors and land in Loxton in 1340. His mother, Maud, later married Sir Simon Basset of Uley, Gloucestershire, escheator for that county (Ellacombe 1867 p195 & 1883 pp290-1). John's estate was managed by the Bassets, several accounts mentioning Iwelegh (Uley). Simon's seneschal visited Iwood manor, usually annually, to hold a court with Simon and Maud visiting only occasionally.

The accounts are arranged in the standard manner for the period and the demesne's agriculture was also that of the period, in that cereal production was the main aim.

Iwood was the collection point for money due from Yatton and Loxton, and sometimes from Somerset lands held by Simon Basset, or his sons. Iwood's accounts mention Yatton's but none survive from Yatton except in the dual account of 1350-1. There was some trading of stock and grain between Iwood, Yatton and Oldland, but Iwood was largely managed as a separate distinct unit, with profits paid in cash and some produce to the Bassets at Iwelegh.

The workforce 1341-7.
Regular annual receipts included rents, 27s 8d, presumably from customary tenants, 6d for rent of unspecified "moorland", 13s 4d from the dovecote's farm and millers' payments of 8s. The tenants paid Peter's pence, 5d being the maximum in any one year, and Churchscot, each of four tenants paying one cock and three hens. Five tenants mowed "Mullemede" (unidentified) each year. As already discussed there were four possible house sites in Iwood besides the manorial messuage and the mill. Taken together the information shows therefore a likely four tenants at Iwood and the fardel-holder near West Mill, the same number as in the original grants.

Iwood's tenants had few customary services to perform, although the smallholders, with 28.5 acres between the four of them, were perhaps never liable for many. Works consisted only of mowing half a medieval acre each, costed at 0.5d each and harvest works, never more than 21 in total. Annual receipts from the sale of two tenants' harvest works were 2s 9d and in 1347 customary works in one un-named field were sold for 1s 8d. The grazing of fallow land was either sold or used by Iwood's animals, so tenants were not

forced to graze their stock, if any, for the benefit of the demesne's fertility. With only a small rental income, few customary works to sell and insignificant court perquisites, Iwood's revenues were dependent on its agricultural produce and its mills. The 5 tenants originally granted do not appear to have been a valuable work force and as usual there is no information available about tenants' cultivation.

No ploughing, harrowing, manuring or weeding is mentioned in the accounts, so this work was presumably done by Iwood's two full-time servants as well as some sowing, the remainder being done by piecework. Mowing, harvesting, threshing and winnowing was certainly done as piecework, payment being in cash and kind. Women are specifically mentioned as planting beans, a common female task (Penn 1987 p2), but their wage-rate cannot be calculated. Piecework rates at Iwood were similar to Wrington's and to those for the west of England given by Thorold Rogers; see Appendix 5.

The two full-time servants, a driver, or ploughman and a holder, received annual wages in cash, of 5s and 4s respectively, and 8.625 quarters of mixed grain, usually barley and beans, between them, plus milk when available. A shepherd received 4s in cash and 3.875 quarters of mixed grain and a part-time servant was paid only in mixed grain. The bailiff received a bushel of pilcorn "for his potage" and 6.5 quarters of wheat. Wages paid in grain protected the work-force from the extremes of prices due to variable harvests and any surplus to requirements could be sold. The vast majority of the work was therefore done by a few servants and by piecework, probably providing employment for Iwood's smallholders.

Crops and their cultivation.

Descriptions of repairs show Iwood had at least one manorial plough and probably two harrows. At Wrington, around 200 acres were sown each year, according to accounts 1343-5, and only two demesne ploughs are mentioned. The 65 acres or less of Iwood's demesne sown each year (see Table 1) should therefore have been easily ploughed with just the one plough.

At least six oxen and two draught horses were available. Walter of Henley had recommended, about 75 years earlier, that a plough team of oxen with two horses increased the ploughing speed and could be used even on heavy soils

suitable for an all-oxen team (Oschinsky 1971 p161). Whether Iwood used horses and oxen for ploughing is however unknown. Iwood's horses were definitely used for harrowing, specifically mentioned in the 1342-3 account and probably hauled the carts, also mentioned in the accounts. (As early as the 13th century 75% of all haulage was by horse and nearly 90% of all manors had a horse-drawn cart (Langdon 1986 p272).)

No pattern of crop rotation is apparent in the areas sown but wheat and oats predominate; see Table 1. Sales of pasture on fallow land, when not used for Iwood's stock, produced variable sums, for example, 1s 6d in 1341-2 and 1s 8d in 1342-3.

Table 1

Areas, in medieval acres "by estimation", of Iwood's crops sown 1341-7. Each area is also given as a percentage of the year's total.

Year	1341-2	1342-3	%	1344-5	%	1345-6	%	1346-7	%
Wheat	not	24.0	37.2	28.0	42.7	21.5	37.4	17.5	31.8
Oats	separately	28.0	43.4	25.5	38.9	22.5	39.1	24.0	43.6
Barley	given	6.5	10.1	5.0	7.7	7.0	12.2	3.5	6.4
Beans	7.0	6.0	9.3	7.0	10.7	6.5	11.3	10.0	18.2
TOTAL	65.0	64.5	100%	65.5	100%	57.5	100%	55.0	100%

Most manors in England grew the same crops, but in different proportions. See Appendix 6. Wrington's accounts, 1343-5, show the same crops grown but wheat was much the major crop, sown on 69-76% of land cultivated, whereas Iwood grew wheat on only 32-43% of its land. At Ham, Gloucestershire, a Berkeley family's manor, accounts 1343-9 show wheat being sown on a higher proportion of the land than at Iwood, but considerably less than at Wrington. (Harvey undated pp338-40).

Proportions of the crops grown depended not only on soil suitability and fertility but also probably on the different requirements of manorial lords, and it is instructive to examine the crops' usage. See Appendix 7. The outstanding feature of these figures is the large proportion of its crops that Iwood sold, compared with other manors. This was probably because Iwood had

no resident landlord and household and only a few servants to feed. Langenhoe, a manor producing for the market and home consumption, (Britnell 1966 p381) sold only 29.9% of its wheat crop whereas Iwood sold 61.2% and Cuxham 56%. Langenhoe and Ham both had lay households to support and considerable proportions of the crops were used by the households, particularly so at Ham. In the case of Wrington, a tiny proportion was sold with large amounts going to Glastonbury Abbey for the monks and lay brothers there, whereas Cuxham, also an "institutional" manor, but without a community to feed, needed cash not produce. Clearly the proportion of grain sold each year depended on how much surplus remained after household or community had taken its requirements.

The accounts make no mention of where Iwood's grain was sold but Congresbury had been granted a weekly market in 1227 (Charter Rolls Vol I p16) and there were many others, Backwell, Ubley, Wrington, Shipham, Wells etc within easy reach (Richardson 1981 p240). Bristol too was possible; a Glastonbury official stayed in Wrington on his way to buy wine in Bristol. Possible too, is that knowing Iwood regularly sold most of its produce, purchasers bought directly from the bailiff.

Dates of Iwood's sales were only occasionally noted, but those occasions make it clear that several different deals were involved. However, selling at one price could also have involved several transactions. Attention was obviously given to maximising Iwood's sales income, as some grain was kept back to sell when prices rose and in some years crops were sold at three or four different prices. See Appendix 8. Apart from seed grain, each account shows no grain remaining at the year's end. Sales could have been timed to produce a regular cash flow, or made when cash was specifically needed. Iwood was, however, in a worse position than large manors with cash reserves which could afford to wait until prices were higher still. Also apparent is that total income from grain, although it varied with the quantity harvested, fluctuated much less that the harvests. For example 64.8 quarters of grain in 1341-2 sold for £10 3s 4.5d, but 115.6 quarters in 1344-5, a 78% increase in volume over 1341-2, produced £14 16s 0.25d, an increase of only 46%.

Appendix 9, an analysis of cash receipts, shows how very dependent Iwood was on its grain sales, which include its own produce and mill receipts.

Wrington's cash receipts show a very different picture, with grain sales hardly registering and the vast majority of Wrington's cash income coming from rents, court payments and sales of works. The contrast between the tiny lay manor and its neighbouring large monastic manor is sharp and shows how vulnerable to a disastrous harvest a small manor might be .

Grain yields. See Appendix 10

Large fluctuations occurred in harvests from year to year and from place to place and with only 5 full accounts surviving for Iwood, comparisons may well not be valid. With that said Iwood's wheat yields seem to have been generally higher in the 1340s than any of the other areas considered, although oats, barley and beans compare less favourably. Wrington had much poorer yields, but only yields for 1343-4 are available, a year when Iwood's yields are not, but also a year with poor yields of all grains (Dyer 1993 p262). Today, for comparison, farmers expect to get a yield for wheat of 36 times the volume sown (Exhibition of Bakery at Combe Sydenham House 1995), a huge increase in productivity over the average of 3.9 for wheat, at the Bishopric of Winchester manors 1300-49 (Titow 1972 p4).

Wheat being the most profitable crop there was certainly an incentive to concentrate manuring on the wheat field (Outhwaite 1986 p6). However Iwood had very limited numbers of stock, as the accounts and sales of fallow land and pasture illustrate. It is possible, however, with only 65 acres or less ploughed each year for crops, the fallow could have been ploughed more often than usual, eradicating weeds and improving yields, since chronic weed infestation possibly reduced medieval grain yields (Harwood Long 1979 p469). Additionally some of Iwood's demesne lands were enclosed, and hedges can definitely prevent some weeds spreading. Perhaps these factors account for Iwood's relatively high yields of wheat.

Stock.

Cultivating grain was the main agricultural task of this period and animal husbandry a secondary consideration, but essential for haulage and manure as well as providing meat for consumption. At Iwood however, little stock was raised. Although some oxen and horses were exchanged between Iwood, Yatton and Oldland only one or two animals were bought or sold each year.

Poultry and a few pigs were produced, with surplus pigs sold or sent in payment, for what is not stated, to Yatton and Oldland and on one occasion ten were sent for "the lord's larder". Customary payments of Churchscot and sometimes court perquisites were made in poultry and capons and hens were regularly sent to Iwelegh for the Basset household.

Despite the availability of grazing on Broadfield Down, sheep were kept only from 1343-6 during the period of the accounts. In 1344-5, Iwood had 329 sheep, of which 123 ewes were sold because they had still-born lambs, or lambs dead soon after birth. For 1345-6 only 196 sheep are recorded and of those 107 died of "murrain". Tar, used particularly for sheep scab (Thorold Rogers 1866 p7), and grease were bought to treat various ailments, but obviously without success at Iwood. These two disastrous years were probably the reason for sheep-raising being discontinued, for a time at least. This unfortunately possibly distorts Iwood's economy in 1340s, making Iwood's dependancy on grain receipts greater than usual.

Indeed the analysis of cash receipts (Appendix 9) shows how insignificant was the livestock side of Iwood's income. Only in the years 1343-6 when sheep were raised did animal husbandry make much contribution. At Wrington, too, there was very little cash income from livestock, but Wrington's cash sales are misleading. They show neither the large quantities of grain nor wool produced on the manor, because most of both were sent to Glastonbury. But as at Iwood, there was little animal husbandry at Wrington apart from sheep. In the Essex manors of Carbonel and Langenhoe and particularly at Langenhoe livestock produced a significant cash income, greater than that of grain, perhaps reflecting different agricultural priorities.

Other revenues.

The occasional sale of underwood, in 1345-6 the sale of 52 oaks and annual pannage produced usually small but variable sums each year. Thorns from hedges were sold, presumably for temporary fencing and the garden produced pears and apples, rather intermittently. The fruit was sold or turned into cider and in 1342-3 cider sales produced 33s, which at 10s per 252 gallons (Thorold Rogers 1866 p448) meant more than 800 gallons. Ox hides were occasionally sold, prices varying from 1s 6d to 3s 1d, and sheepskins from the

murrain-ridden flock fetched 17s 9d in 1345. These sales, however, made only a small contribution to Iwood's income.

Repairs and investment. Was Iwood well looked after?
Regular repairs to implements, carts and the mills were carried out and also some improvements including the building of a new cattle shed. In 1341-2 ditches were dug around a number of named fields and in 1342-3 it is specifically noted that the two ditches dug were new ones. The same year two men spent 26.5 days digging stones out of demesne land. In 1344-5 a sawyer and a thatcher mended the grange's roof and a carpenter repaired its door and the lord's room.

Day-rates paid are given in Appendix 5. Craftsmen's rates were low compared with Wrington, where carpenters and thatchers earned 25% more than in Iwood, and lower still when compared with wages in England. Clearly there was no shortage of craftsmen.

In 1345-6 £3 3s 7d was spent on building what appears to have been a substantial new cattle shed, with four doors, a thatched roof and twelve wagon-loads of stone at a 1d each for foundations and walls. With 500 laths, costing 2s 4d, listed among the materials, the upper parts of the walls were probably lath and plaster. In 1356-7 the carpentry of a new wagon house cost 3s 4d and as no costs for sawing wood or for nails etc appear it must have been a flimsy building, made with secondhand materials. In contrast a new door to the court that year cost 7s 2d.

The cattleshed was a capital investment, as was the wagon house. Digging new ditches and the previous year's ditch-digging, if not new, would have improved drainage. Fifty-three man-days spent digging stones from a field should also have improved the land somewhat. These give a total "capital" expenditure of £4 1s 11.5d, 8.9% of total profits (£45 11s 2d see Appendix 11). The cattleshed costs alone, however, represent 7.0% so without that, investment drops to only 1.9%. According to Dyer buildings were the main form of agricultural capital investment but took up less than 5% of profits pre 1349 (Dyer 1993 p80) so by that criterion Iwood was better cared for than many places at that time.

The demesne messuage.

The accounts show the existence of a manorial building with at least a court room and a room where the lord or officials could stay and, probably some accommodation for the bailiff, if not for the servants, who may also have been tenants. With a thatched barn or grange, a cattleshed, wagon house, dovecote, garden, orchard and a close, the demesne messuage would have covered a quite considerable area. As mentioned earlier, no archaeological evidence has been found, suggesting the site was that of the present Iwood Manor House.

During this period Iwood would thus appear to have been a reasonably well managed estate, using a considerable amount of paid labour, producing mainly grain, as much as possible of which was sold, with an eye to maximising profits and providing a regular cash flow.

Was Iwood a manor in the accepted medieval sense?

A medieval manor was a single administrative unit, often one part of a larger landed estate. All land was originally held from the king, but considerable subinfeudation meant that frequently there were several layers of tenure between king and local manorial lord. Manors gradually acquired jurisdictional rights over their tenants, through private courts, which courts came to define manors in the later medieval period: a manor was only a manor if it held a court (Harvey 1984 pp1-2).

In the 14th century Congresbury, in common with most large manors then, included demesne and both free and bound tenants' land. The demesne's cultivation was overseen by a bailiff, with the work done by servants and bound tenants as part of their rent for their own holdings. Regular manorial courts controlled land tenure, common agricultural arrangements and tenants' behaviour, largely by local custom, providing also additional income for the lord.

At Iwood a manorial court was normally held only once a year, so regulation of tenants' land and cultivation would usually have been by order of the bailiff. Tenants had very few customary services to perform and the demesne was worked almost entirely by servants and paid labour, not the situation common on large manors. Neither was the structure of Iwood the same as that of a large manor. The proportion of Iwood's demesne was extremely high, the

number of customary tenants low. Iwood had no influence in Congresbury, apart from holding its mill, and was never accorded the status of a manor in Congresbury's manorial records, where it was described a freehold estate. Kosminsky found such features to be common in his study of small manors of minor landowners in the 13th century (Britnell 1980 pp9-10), so Iwood was apparently not unusual in this respect. Iwood did however exert jurisdictional rights over its tenants who were definitely unfree, as shown in 1346/7 by payments of wax from each of a tenant's two sons for a licence to dwell outside the manor. Iwood cannot perhaps be considered a "fully-fledged" manor, but it satisfied the requirement of holding a regular court, so it was indeed a medieval manor.

The mills and their contribution to Iwood's profits.

Domesday Book says that Congresbury's two mills were worth 17s 6d (Thorn & Thorn 1980 1.21). Did those mills have horizontal wheels not vertical ones? Horizontal wheels worked best in narrow rushing streams and such a description cannot be applied to Congresbury's river Yeo. Horizontal mills were relatively inefficient but easy and cheap to construct and repair and could be moved fairly easily. They were common where peasants were allowed to operate and own their mills legally. The more efficient vertical mills being much more expensive to build and operate needed more capital than peasants could raise. In England however with its feudal system promoting monopolistic seigneurial control there were lords with that capital and the power to make the mills profitable by legally enforcing tenants' use of them. (Holt 1988 pp119-21)

Was this the case in Congresbury by 1086? Whether the two surviving mill sites in Congresbury, see Map 1, are those of the two Domesday mills is probably impossible to prove. Any evidence was almost certainly destroyed by extensive river works done in the 1920s and after the 1968 floods.

At Iwood, because of the river's small water fall, only an undershot wheel was suitable, once a vertical waterwheel was installed. Undershot wheels need only limited technology and suggest that the Iwood mill site, if not the West Mill site, was an early one. (Bodman 1993 p10). The Yeo was tidal up to Congresbury Bridge until the 19th century and the 1.5 miles from there to the

Wrington boundary plus the river's small vertical drop gives little scope for significant changes of site. Since new mills needed major investment mills were often rebuilt or replaced on the same site for centuries (Keil S&DNQ vol 28 p181).

Evidence shows the continuing existence of both mill sites from 1228 to the end of the nineteenth century, although possibly there were times when one or other was out of use. See Appendix 4. Although they were probably only ever used for grinding corn, an 1829 advertisement suggested Iwood mill could be adapted for use in cloth production (Felix Farleys Journal 1829).

Returning to the 14th century mills, the accounts are not consistent in the treatment of receipts and expenses, sometimes combining figures, sometimes listing them separately. Information for the relative value of each mill is found in three accounts, where each mill's corn receipts are recorded separately. See Table 2.

TABLE 2

	1341-2		1342-3		1344-5	
	Iwood	West Mill	Iwood	West Mill	Iwood	West Mill
wheat	2q 7b	4q 1b	5q 1b	5q 6b	4q 7b	8q 4b
tollcorn	13q 2b	15q	11q 2b	15q 5b	16q 4b	20q 1b
malted corn	4b	1q 7.5b	1.5b	2q 5.5b	5b	2q 1b
malted drage	1q 4b	10q 2b	1q 3b	8q	2q 6b	10q 7b
pilcorn	5b	6.25b	not divided - total 1q 1b		1b	2q 3b
TOTAL	18q 6b	32q 0.75b	17q 7.5b (ignoring pilcorn of only small significance)	32q 0.5b	24q 7b	44q 0b

The ratio of total grain volumes Iwood : West Mill in 1341-2 = 1 : 1.71
1342-3 = 1 : 1.79
1344-5 = 1 : 1.77

The West Mill also ground grain from Congresbury's demesne free of toll, a condition of its grant, but no quantities are given. The surprisingly consistent results above do, however, show that the West Mill ground, at the very least, 80% more grain than Iwood and was much the more important of the two mills.

The mills, as part of the manor, were regularly repaired. In 1341-2, West Mill's mill-house was rebuilt and in 1344-5 Iwood mill was rethatched and weirs at both mills were regularly cleared of obstructions. But the commonest problem was the mill spindles, since millstones ran at over 100 revolutions per minute the supporting spindles were under considerable stress (Holt 1988 p123). In the five accounts, Iwood's spindle broke five times and Congresbury's twice, needing the smith and expensive iron to repair them.

In 1344-5 a new millstone for Iwood cost 6s 8d and in 1346-7 two new millstones for West Mill cost 14s. For some comparison, the average price for 5 millstones bought pre 1348 in Buckinghamshire was 11s 8d, but only 1s for one from Monmouthshire, ex carriage costs (Thorold Rogers 1866 p510). As prices must have reflected size as well as quality, Iwood's millstone costs indicate that the millstones bought were rather small, consistent with the relatively small quantities ground.

Between 50% and 100% of the mills' tollcorn was sold each year. This was very unusual. Lords seldom sold large proportions of tollcorn, normally given to servants, being the poor quality grain produced by local peasants (Holt 1988 p77). At Iwood, however, only two full-time servants received inferior grain (the bailiff received wheat) and casual payments to others varied with their time employed, leaving a considerable quantity for sale.

The mills contributed significantly to Iwood's economy. They had an average annual income between them of £7 18s 5d although an average profit of only £2 13s after deduction of running expenses and rent (arbitrarily put at 7 of the 8 marks rent paid for the whole of Iwood manor), but provided, over the five years of accounts, 29% of the manor's profit; see Appendix 11.

Was Iwood profitable? See Appendix 11

The short answer is yes, Iwood made a cash profit each year, varying from £4 5s 11.5d in 1341-2 to £13 4.75d in 1344-5. Including values of poultry, wool and livestock, the average annual profit increases to £9 2s 5d. However, as Appendix 9 shows, arrears and sales "super compotum" had increased considerably by 1346-7 so not all the profit was being taken. Iwood and Yatton provided an average of about £18 annually, rather different from their official joint value, £10, twelve years earlier, illustrating perhaps the

difficulty of comparisons between different types of documents. With Loxton's annual rent, usually £2.50, and income from Oldland, larger than Iwood and Yatton combined, John de la More was an affluent child. An annual income of £10 c1300 meant a man was wealthy (Dyer 1993 p29) and a rough guide to price changes shows no significant difference between the periods 1300-7 and 1340-7 (Munby 1989 p26).

Although the two mills were a valuable addition, overall the profit : effort ratio favoured Yatton which returned a similar average profit but without the problems of keeping mills in working order.

After the Black Death.

The Black Death was rife in Dorset by October 1348 and in Somerset by December; the Bishop of Bath and Wells retired to his house in Wiveliscombe in November where he remained until May 1349. Other Somerset clergy, however, appear to have put themselves at greater risk than most of the population by continuing with their responsibilities to the sick and dying. Indeed about 48% of Somerset clergy are estimated to have died of the plague, suggesting that between a third and a half of the population died. (Ziegler 1991 pp95, 97 & 99)

In Congresbury, the vicar Henry de Insula was succeeded on April 2 1349 by William Newport, who in turn was followed by Thomas Bowet in the same year, so perhaps the two clergymen died within a short period (Cran 1983 p33).

For Iwood no 1348-9 account survives, or perhaps it was never made. An account for 1349-50 was certainly drawn up as that for 1350-1 shows the arrears, £2 3s 3d, owed by John, the previous bailiff. Had Richard Perkyns, the bailiff in 1348, and John both died of the plague?

The combined 1350-1 account for Iwood and Yatton shows only 38.5 acres sown at Iwood, compared with 55 in 1346-7 and 65.5 in 1344-5. Iwood's rents were the usual £1 7s 8d but for a year and three-quarters, not a year. Only 1d, of the usual 5d, was paid in Peter's pence, suggesting four tenants were dead and indeed two people paid "new" rents. No rent was paid for the mills, so the millers were dead or their rent waived and the dovecote produced only 8s instead of 13s 4d.

Total revenues from Iwood and Yatton were £20 6s 5d but profits cannot be calculated as only half the account survives. Total grain sales were just under 26 quarters, whereas the worst known harvest produced sales from Iwood alone of 52.625 quarters. The high prices paid for the grain, higher even than after the bad harvest of 1346-7 and the sale of "old" beans and chaff (Appendix 8) are indications of considerable privation in the immediate area. From the lord's point of view, corns sales produced only £6 14s 4.5d, about half the average of earlier accounts.

Two years later at Wrington there were 14 vacant tenements. In 1352-3, 162 acres were sown and in 1354-5 only 117, compared with 209 in 1344-5. Yields were also down and grain was purchased to pay servants. In 1352-3 customary works of 35 tenants were sold, seven times the number before the plague, perhaps the result of reduced labour needs and the Abbot's need to compensate for lost income, a method not available in Iwood. Or perhaps this indicates retreat from demesne farming; if so it would appear to have resulted directly from the Black Death. The Black Death, not surprisingly, was still affecting the area four years on.

10 IWOOD : 1364 TO THE 19TH CENTURY.

By 1364 a short court roll (BL Add Roll 7670) shows Iwood again had five tenants and a bailiff's presence indicates the demesne was still farmed directly. Decreasing availability of labour and decreasing grain prices in the late 14th century (Miller 1991 p141) would however have been strong incentives to change to pastoral farming rather than grain production which was much more labour-intensive. Leasing the demesne would have produced regular income with little effort, an attractive proposition for Iwood's absentee landlord.

Iwood's last medieval document is another short court roll, of 1461 (BL Add Roll 7671). Two tenants made default, a house needed repairs and there was an argument over who held it. One of the mills, unnamed, was newly leased for £6 a year and the demesne had probably been leased for some time as the 1441 IPM (PRO C139/105) mentions only the manor's value.

Not until the 19th century do further surviving documents deal solely with Iwood. For post-medieval farming at Iwood it is necessary to look at Congresbury.

In Congresbury's 1567 survey tenants listed for areas called "Above the Yeo" and "Venny Street", adjoining Iwood, had only 33% of their holdings in common fields. A large majority of the land was thus already enclosed and had probably been so for some time, as at Iwood. Arable land was 29% of this same area, with 22% meadow and the remainder pasture, indicating mixed farming. The area above the Yeo, including Iwood, was reckoned as "second best" and that including Iwood's "Green Earls" was "worst", with "best" land outside the present parish. (BRO 04235)

Sixteenth century wills (SRS Volume 40) show that wheat, barley, beans and teasels were grown and oxen, for ploughing, cows, sheep and horses were raised. Malt was produced and no doubt ale. Two inventories of 1581, one of them that of a yeoman who probably held land adjoining Iwood, show dairy and beef cattle, horses, pigs, sheep (just 2), poultry, bees, wheat, hay, beans, cheese, butter and apples (SRO D/D/Ct Inventories 1581). This limited information confirms a mixed farming economy, but there was still enough grain grown to support both Iwood and West Mill. (Most of Somerset's wills and inventories were destroyed in World War 2.) A single surviving glebe terrier of 1634 confirms this mixed farming and shows that by then hops were also being grown (SRO D/D/Rg No 75).

In 1601 Congresbury's manorial trustees sold "one messuage or tenement with thappurtenances and 82.5 acres of lande meadow and pasture" to Mr John May, lord of Charterhouse (BRO 04793). This included land called "Urcheywood" and "Urchinwood" and was the foundation of Urchinwood Farm, sometimes called a manor, which adjoins Iwood. See Map 1. The early estate cannot be delineated because after 1601 it receives only minor mentions in Congresbury's manorial records, in common with Iwood and the Rodney area. Not until the enclosure map is it fully surveyed and only the 1840 tithe map completely determines its extent. Ownership has been traced from 1601 to 1840, the landlord never resident from the late 17th century, and it is clear that farm land was both bought and sold. The house, probably early 17th century with later 17th century additions had 13 hearths in 1664, the largest house in Congresbury

(SRO DD/V AXR 16.1 & Dwelly 1916 p143). No archaeological evidence for occupation earlier than the present house has been found (Broomhead : forthcoming).

By 1664/5 Iwood's manor house was also substantial as the hearth tax shows ten hearths (Dwelly 1916 p143), suggesting probably some considerable extension or even rebuilding since the 14th century. Perhaps Iwood had been leased on a long lease, to lessees prepared to invest. Certainly John Allott, son of a one-time lord mayor of London, lived there during the period c1604 to 1643 and paid £2 in the 1622 lay subsidy, by far the largest sum of any Congresbury inhabitant; see appendix 2. Such a family would have had the necessary capital. The house was either rebuilt or further extended in the 18th century.

Iwood's large house increases its superficial similarity to Urchinwood; both have imposing houses and were owned, as country estates of minor gentry, for many years by absentee landlords. But whereas Urchinwood is of totally modern origin and its farmland varied in area considerably, Iwood's origin is pre-Conquest, and its lands remained unchanged from the 13th to the 18th century, and with only minor alterations into the 19th.

Congresbury's 1736-9 survey with maps (BRO 33041 BMC/4/PL 1,2 & 4) shows most of the land enclosed with a small amount of arable and only two areas of moor remaining as common pasture. Surviving bills, 1743-64, from Urchinwood Farm, show large quantities of cheese, eggs and poultry, (pigeons, ducks, chickens, turkeys), but no red meat, indicating dairying not meat production. Cider and apples were sold and apple trees purchased. Clover seed was bought to improve the fodder crop and much attention was paid to hedging, ditching and "griping" (a local term for field drainage). (WRO 1178/682) In 1797 Billingsley said that the north Somerset Levels, part of which lie in Congresbury, produced "luxuriant herbage" but the Bristol Channel "fills the air with watery vapours unfavourable to the ripening of corn ..... [which] induces a preference in favour of grazing and dairy husbandry". (Billingsley 1795 p14)

Iwood's 1805 advertisement (Appendix 3) shows arable land as 11%, pasture 25%, meadow 57% and orchards 7%. Clearly agriculture was biased towards cattle and/or dairying and an 1829 advertisement, (Felix Farley's Journal) states

that 100 hogsheads of cider, (5250 gallons), could be produced annually, a vast increase over the 800 gallons or so sold in 1342-3. The 1840 tithe award confirms the cider making, as nearly 9% of Iwood's land was orchards. Pasture covered 80%, meadow 3%, this large reduction resulting perhaps from better drainage or perhaps just a classification change. Arable was down to only 6%. Thus Iwood, almost entirely arable in the medieval period was by 1840 almost totally pastoral. With some improved understanding of soils and crop requirements Iwood could produce what it was best suited for.

11 COMPARISONS WITH OTHER SMALL SETTLEMENTS.

In Congresbury, the Honey Hall area, occupied in Roman, pre-conquest and medieval periods may have been, like Iwood, continuously settled. Much of this small hamlet, still with a distinct identity, but part of Congresbury manor's customary land, was sold in the early 17th century, becoming a private estate, which split in the late 18th century into smaller farms. The area acquired its present name in the early 1800s after Honey Hall was built. The Dean and Chapter manor, formed, like Iwood in the 13th century by Bishop's grant and of similar area, also, like Iwood, an independent sub-manor, was nevertheless very different from Iwood. Its land was spread around the parish and with no demesne its income was provided entirely by its tenants. It no longer exists. Congresbury Rodney was different again; formed by purchase in 1313, it was a freehold estate, probably just a farmstead, owned by the original family until the 17th century, its remnants surviving today in Park Farm. Urchinwood, outwardly similar to Iwood in that it has a substantial "manor" house, formed like Iwood and the 17th century Honey Hall estate from customary holdings, is however of totally modern origin, with its land area varying considerably since its creation. Iwood has been the most durable of all, still having, like Honey Hall, a distinct and separate identity. These five areas demonstrate very clearly, the wide variety of origin, development and survival of small settlements within a single parish.

Comparing Iwood manor with its associated manors within estates proved difficult due to lack of surviving records. Yatton, associated with Iwood for 400 years had perhaps a similar area and produced similar crops and profits in the 1340s but beyond that nothing can be said. Oldland had only half a

mill or none, was much larger than Iwood, with many more tenants and apparently had a regular three-field rotation system and was thus very different from Iwood. With regard to the Blewet lands so little has been found that comparisons are not worth making beyond the relative position of Iwood within the estates, as already considered.

As to comparing Iwood's economy with other small lay estates, the major difficulty has been in discovering any such with surviving records with which to make comparisons. Wherever possible, within the confines of the aims of this discussion, references have been made to different types of settlement and manorial management, but Iwood, if not unique in its surviving records appears to be extremely rare.

12 CONCLUSION

Iwood is an area with an identity possibly going back as far as the Roman period. Continuous settlement within Iwood from the 3rd and 4th centuries, when there was certainly an occupation site there, to the 11th century when occupation can once again be definitely identified by archaeological means, cannot be proved. Nevertheless, less certain evidence combines to show a high probability of occupation and agricultural activity there from the 9th century and perhaps from the 8th. This considerably reduces the period in which possible occupation can at present only be surmised.

Iwood therefore existed as a discrete settled area from the 11th century and its existence from the 9th century or earlier is extremely likely, with a continuous identity from the 3rd century possible but unprovable. It was not until 1228 that it was separated from Congresbury's customary land to become a completely independent unit with its own economy. The grant of 1228 gave an obscure settlement an independence unusual for such a small area.

Nothing can be said about Iwood's economy in the Roman and post-Roman period and in the Anglo-Saxon period it can only be suggested that an infield/outfield cultivation system was used. The rights on Broadfield Down, however, when Iwood was part of Congresbury, probably gave the settlement some

advantage over others, perhaps making it a more self-contained unit and so ensuring its survival as such.

After becoming an independent agricultural unit in its own right, it was, in the second half of the 13th century developed and enlarged by assarting, with the knowledge that any investment would not be lost but could be passed on to descendants, a clear incentive to improve the land. With those descendants still holding Iwood in the mid-fourteenth century Iwood was reasonably well cared for. Being by then part of only a small estate, it was important to ensure continuous, effective and profitable exploitation.

The surviving accounts show how a small manor could be organised to produce for the market, providing rare information about a tiny lay manor. Although not a manor of the standard medieval pattern, its organisation within the confines of medieval agricultural knowledge regularly produced a profit from its somewhat irregular system. Its economy was particularly dependent on grain sales and mill profits during the period of the accounts. However, the lack of sheep raising was possibly an aberration due to a severe outbreak of murrain.

Never of great value, its importance waned when it became part of a larger estate, although it continued to make a significant contribution to the estate's income. When the change to leasing the farm and the predominantly grain orientated agriculture ceased is unknown and there is no evidence of the owners taking an active interest in Iwood after 1461. Its distance from the majority of the Bluet lands probably contributed to its neglect and indirectly to its long survival as an independent unit. Held by the Bluet family from the early 15th century, those who cultivated Iwood, whether tenants or sub-tenants, had little incentive to improve the land, although the obviously substantial house of the 17th century suggests investment in that if nothing else. Shorn of the West Mill and associated land, Iwood became the country estate of an unimportant gentleman in the early 18th century. By the 19th century Iwood produced virtually no grain and dairying predominated, in common with most of the area, and in complete contrast to the medieval period.

Never, probably, having been of any great importance, the survival of rare information makes Iwood now a hamlet of extraordinary interest.