THE EARLY PARISH AND ESTATE OF ICKWORTH,
WEST SUFFOLK

by MARY HESSE

THE WELL-KNOWN National Trust estate of Ickworth now consists of the Hall, built around 1800, and parkland which extends over and beyond the original parish. The Park was established by John Hervey (1665–1751), later first Earl of Bristol, in the early 1700s, but evidence of the former economy of the parish is preserved in two documentary surveys. The first was carried out in or a little before 1286, and is preserved in the archives of the Abbey of Bury St Edmund's. The second is a survey of 1665 by Thomas Cowell, made for John Hervey (1616–79), the first Earl's uncle, who had inherited the property of Ickworth in 1660. A printed copy of this survey was published by yet another John Hervey in 1893 (Hervey 1893, hereafter denoted by Survey). The original was formerly accompanied by a map, which is now lost.

Very few other documents are extant for the pre-17th-century history of Ickworth, either among the archives of Bury Abbey or of the Hervey family, but it is fortunate that the existence of the Park has preserved earlier earthworks. These retain traces of field-systems which might otherwise have been extinguished by subsequent ploughing. The first aim of this paper has been to reconstruct the 17th-century landscape as far as possible from the Survey and recent maps of the remaining earthworks (Phibbs and Gallagher 1980, Gallagher and Owen 1991), together with aerial photographs and other documents. Secondly, the 1286 survey of Ickworth has been used with the reconstructed map to throw some light on the medieval history of the Ickworth estate.

EARLY DOCUMENTARY HISTORY

Ickworth (‘Ica’s worth’, or settlement) is a small parish in the Hundred of Thingoe, to the south-west of Bury St Edmunds. The parish is unique among its neighbours in having been effectively in single ownership from at least the 10th century to the present day. It was acquired by the religious community of St Edmund (later Bury Abbey) in the mid-10th century, and was held from the Abbot in demesne by the de Ickworth family from 1100 until the Hervey family succeeded in the 15th century. They held Ickworth until it came to the National Trust in 1956.

The parish lies on the east slope of the valley of the river Linnet, which runs into the Lark along the southern boundary of the old town of Bury (Fig. 1). On the east, at its boundary with Horringer, Ickworth rises to over 300 feet on the watershed between the Linnet and the upper valley of the Lark. The map of soil-regions of Suffolk shows that the boundary between the Breckland sands ('Fielding') and the clay loams of high Suffolk occurs just to the north of the old Ickworth parish (Dymond and Martin 1988). This is also roughly the line between what Rackham (1986, 4) has called ' Planned Countryside', with a strong tradition of open fields with few woodlands, and ' Ancient Countryside', with a predominance of early enclosed fields and hedges, and much woodland. As we shall see, however, until at least the 14th century arable fields appear to have extended over most of the parish of Ickworth, including the poorly drained clay-top.

The first known documentary record of Ickworth, together with some of its neighbouring parishes, is in the will of Theodred, Bishop of London, dated between 942 and 951 (Sawyer 1968, 1526; Whitelock 1930, 2). He grants 'the estates at Nowton and at Horningsheath [later Horringer] and at Ickworth and at Wherstead to St Edmund's Church, as the property of God's community, for Bishop Theodred's soul'. The religious community of St Edmund became a Benedictine abbey during Cnut's reign in 1020 (Dugdale 1825, ii, 98; Davis 1954, ix), by which time it held all royal rights over Thingoe and the other seven and a half Hundreds in West Suffolk.
In Domesday Book (f.357b), Ickworth was held in demesne by St Edmund's for three carucates, with a church holding half an acre of land (the churchyard). It was alone among all the vills of the Hundred of Thingoe in having no mention of freemen or socmen, and subsequently no manors were hived off from the principal manor. But Ickworth did not long remain a demesne manor of St Edmund's. Some time after 1086 Wulfward of Wangford (in the Hundred of Lackford) surrendered land in Elveden to St Edmund's in exchange for Ickworth. He did homage directly to Henry I for this manor, but in 1197 Wulfward's successor, Sir Richard de Ickworth, acknowledged that he held of the Abbot of Bury, for one knight's fee (Gage 1838, 275-77). Confused disputes between the Crown and the Abbey about lordship persisted, however, until 1431, when the de Ickworth line failed, and the Crown decreed the inheritance by inquisition. Ickworth passed to the Drury family, then to William Hervey before 1470 (Gage 1838, 278-79), and thence to the Hervey descendents.

There may have been a small park in Ickworth in the 13th century. In 1254 the King granted free warren in Ickworth to Thomas de Ickworth (C.P.R., 37-38 Hen. III, Pt. ii), and Abbot Simon of Bury gave licence to ‘Thomas our knight . . . to make ditches round his woodland in the vill of Ickworth, and enclose said wood by a ditch within the bounds set between us and him’ (Gage 1838, 278). There is, however, no evidence that this park was ever in fact created, and it will be argued later in this paper that, if it existed at all in the 13th century, it must have been very small by medieval standards.

The present church dates from the 13th century, and was probably built by the de Ickworths, who had their manor hall about 100 metres east of the church, near the river. In the early years of
the 17th century the Herveys ceased to live in this hall, and the 1665 Survey shows it as being let to tenants. Shortly afterwards it seems to have become a ruin, and when in 1694 John Hervey returned to reside in Ickworth, he came to one of the farmhouses on the Green which was subsequently called Ickworth Lodge (S.A.H. Hervey 1894, 36, App. 4, Sec. v).

THE MISSING MAP OF 1665

The first Earl was primarily responsible for the emparking of Ickworth from about 1700, and bought up many of the remaining holdings of his Ickworth tenants, as well as extending his properties beyond the parish. The evidence of the Survey and its missing map is therefore crucial for understanding the structure of the landscape before 1700.

Attempts to reconstruct the map from the Survey have been made by a later John Hervey in 1946–48, by Phibbs and Gallagher in 1980, and by Gallagher and Owen in 1991. Of these attempts the most successful is the 1991 map, which makes use of the surviving earthworks surveyed by the authors. This map is, however, incomplete, since the acreages of the fields are not plotted, and there are areas of present arable where no earthworks remain, or have been obscured by later developments. By explicitly using acreages in the reconstruction, and including other sources of evidence, it has been possible to improve the 1991 map (Fig. 2).

The present reconstruction starts from three assumptions. The first is that at least some of the present earthworks are in fact pre-1665 field boundaries, and can be used as such if supported by the evidence of general topography, including acreages and abutments in the Survey. This assumption is supported by the occurrence on some of the earthworks of pre-1700 pollarded trees (mainly oaks), which probably indicate early field boundaries and perhaps former hedges (Rackham 1976, 171; 1980, 199). Second, it was assumed that field boundaries would respect the tributary streams of the river Linnet, some of which are now straightened, but remain within natural valleys. This assumption was supported by the fact that all but two of the ‘meadows’ in the Survey were found to lie along these streams, consistently with neighbouring fields as plotted from abutments.

The third assumption was that many fields would be about 220 yards (one furlong) long, when measured between ‘heads’ in the Survey (Hall 1982, 5–6, 30). Most of the fields were described in the Survey as lying between ‘heads’, the usual rubric being of the form ‘Field A lying between B to the north and C to the south, the east head abutting on D and the west head on E’. This rubric is the same as that universally adopted for strips in open fields, where the strip-directions go from head to head, and this suggests that many of the enclosed fields of Ickworth were originally carved from groups of strips. When plotted according to the evidence of the Survey, the assumption of a furlong length does work well for many (though by no means all) of the enclosed fields. The author of the Survey knows what he is doing when he occasionally drops the ‘head’ rubric, for in most of these cases the field shapes are not those of groups of strips, and were probably never parts of open fields. Their locations are shaded in Fig. 2, and will be discussed below.

It has been possible to reconstruct the relative positions and acreages of the fields from the Survey with a good deal of confidence, especially in the northern part of the parish, and along the river-valley which was predominantly arable (and is still partly so). Near the river the field-shapes are well-defined by tributary ditches and lanes, and confirmed by extant earthworks, for example around Lodge Close, Barrfield and Rye Close.

The actual shapes of fields elsewhere are more problematic, and Fig. 2 may give a false impression of rectangularity. Large areas of the recent earthwork survey are unhelpful, either because post-1700 developments have masked earlier field systems completely, as in Albana Wood and around the present Hall, or in the south where emparkment has produced boundaries of woods that may or may not correspond to former field divisions. In particular, plantations of the later Park have left the original bounds of Lound Wood and Choakes Wood uncertain.

There is additional help from aerial photographs of the area to the south-east of the present Hall,
Fig. 2 — The Ickworth field system, based on the 1665 survey.
and from the recent excavation around the old Hall to the east of the church (Filmer-Sankey 1986, 65). Otherwise field boundaries in the ‘masked’ areas have been drawn on Fig. 2 as conjectures, which, while preserving position and size, cannot be guaranteed as to shape.

**BOUNDARIES OF THE PARK AND PARISH: TITHES AND GLEBE**

The reconstructed Map permits an interpretation of many of the features of the Survey Book. The Book includes an Appendix of about 1702 entitled ‘The Admeasurement of Ickworth Park Pale’ (Preface and App. ii), describing a perambulation 6\(\frac{1}{2}\) miles 23\(\frac{1}{2}\) rods long (2,183\(\frac{1}{2}\) rods). The earliest map on which a Park Pale is drawn is that of Greenwood of 1825, which also shows a parish boundary similar to the present. Greenwood’s Pale is reproduced in Fig. 3, as far as his one-inch-to-the-mile scale permits. The resulting length of the perambulation is about 2,100 rods, which matches well both the measurements of 1702 and the boundaries of the 1665 fields as reconstructed in Fig. 2. It seems probable therefore that Greenwood’s Pale is essentially the same as that of 1702. It is not coincident with the parish boundary, so the questions arise as to which is the earlier, and what is the relation of the 1702 Park to the parish.

The present parish boundary has strangely straight portions, particularly in the east, where it cuts across many of the 1665 fields as reconstructed from earthworks. The boundary must surely be later than these fields. As defined by the Pale and by the Survey, the Hervey lands of 1665 overlapped the parish boundary in several places: along a north-flowing stream in Horringer to the east, in a portion of Great Common Field to the west, and along the southern boundary. The modern Ickworth parish boundary has a curious ‘peninsular’ extension of about forty acres to the north (‘Saxham Corner’). This is shown in a Little Saxham map of 1638 (see References for Maps, below) as being in Little Saxham, but by 1701 it was partly in Hervey ownership, and paid some tithes to Ickworth in 1701 (Survey, 66–67).

The parish boundary to the north and east was in place before the Horringer Enclosure Map of 1815. This map shows a ‘Timber Oak’ (which has since disappeared) at a distinct bend between two straight stretches of parish boundary in the south of Leyton Leys, suggesting that the oak was a marker introduced before the early 19th century. But there was great uncertainty about the tithe boundaries before this. As early as 1638, the tithe of Thistley Field in the north was said to be ‘parted by the sheaf by agreement [between Horringer and] the Rector of Ickworth anciently’ for a small pension to the rector (Redstone 1903, 289).

The straight portions of the boundary between Ickworth and Horringer have clearly been drawn somewhat arbitrarily, and were probably not determined before the end of the 17th century. Two of the rectors of Ickworth, John Locar in 1683/4, and Joseph Alexander in 1701, wrote ‘Memoranda concerning Tithe’, which were appended to the Survey Book (Preface and App. i). These Memoranda give an account of those tithes which ‘may be called in question if memory . . . be not preserved’ (Survey, 66), no doubt because the location of the parish boundaries was still vague.

Mr Alexander describes a division of tithe in Pestle and Thistley Fields, and in Leyton Leys, which was then in possession of the Gipps family of Horningsheath (Leyton Leys was bought by John Hervey in 1705: Survey, Preface). There was no mention of the tithe due from Leyton Leys in the agreement of 1638, but by 1701 it was necessary to describe Ickworth’s share as ‘about a dozen acres’ going ‘as far as two trees marked with a cross’. This suggests that the straight boundary had effectively been established by then, cutting Leyton Leys in half, and that perhaps the ‘timber tree’ in the south of Leyton Leys was one of those marked. There was a further division of ploughland ‘now enclosed in the Park’ next to Leyton Leys, of which ‘eighteen ridges that lay in Ickworth bounds pay whole tithe to Ickworth, but the rest of that field pay tithes to Horningsheath’. This ploughland clearly was then or had been ridge-and-furrow.

South of the ‘timber oak’, the straight north-south boundary cuts several of Hervey’s ‘Leys’, and land held by Kerrington and Godfrey which is mostly in Horringer. In 1702 the first Earl bought,
Fig. 3 - The Pale and the 1665 distribution of farms.
from Godfrey, land on the boundary which had been taken into the Park, and similarly the Brick
Kiln House and land in the same area were bought from Mistress Kedington [sic] in 1727. In 1674
the seven-acre Buxhall to the south of this is said to lie in both Great Horringer and Ickworth
(S.R.O.B., HA 429/3). In 1702 the first Earl also bought from Mr Underwood land in Ickworth
Common Field and the land on which the Pale stood to the south, where it is not coincident with
the present parish boundary.

The parish boundary was probably drawn in its present form early in the 18th century, to
regulate the tithes where Hervey property was already encroaching on Horringer, so that Hervey
was in any case paying the tithes on both sides of the boundary. It is likely that the Pale enclosing
all this land to the east of the parish was established for the new Park in 1701 when it was measured,
and when the tithe boundaries were still uncertain. It is probable therefore that the redrawn parish
boundary postdates the Pale. Its exact original location is, however, now impossible to determine.

The rector did not long retain a direct interest in the tithes. By 1706 the parsonage had burnt
down, and in 1712 it was decided that the parish was too small to warrant its rebuilding. The
parish was united with Chedburgh 'because of their nearness to one another' (though they are not
adjacent). On Lady Day of that year the rector, Joseph Alexander, leased the tithes and glebe of
Ickworth to the first Earl for 500 years at £40 per annum, 'that Rent being much more than the
tythes are worth' (S.R.O.B., 941/46/13).

At that time the glebe consisted of seven acres: a half-acre of churchyard (which was its total in
Domesday), a half-acre in Ickworth Common Field, five acres around the parsonage, and about
one acre in Chevington Prime Field. It is difficult to be precise about the location of the parsonage,
because the edge of Hall Field is an area where evidence has been destroyed by the surroundings
of the present Hall. A pond called Parson's Pond still lies beside the roadway which was Church
Green, but the evidence of abutments seems to place this pond within Godfrey's Home Close in
1665.

Two pieces of glebe land are marked on the Ickworth Tithe Map of 1839. One, of five acres, is
a rectangular piece lying across the former Church Field and Church Green, and various closes to
the north-east of the church. This is clearly an exchange for the five acres which previously included
the parsonage and was located nearer to the churchyard. A similar sort of exchange seems to have
been effected in the former Great Common Field, where the previous glebe strip of a half-acre has
been replaced in roughly the same position by a nearly square piece stranded incongruously on the
Tithe Map in the middle of parkland. Similar exchanges were effected between rectors and their
Hervey landlords in Horringer (1765) and in Chevington (1773). Although glebe land often retained
its traditional location throughout the vicissitudes of history, it rarely did so in seigneurial parishes
like Ickworth and its neighbours.

**COMMON FIELDS, ARABLE AND PASTURE**

The *Survey* gives details of seventeen tenants of John Hervey within or immediately outside the later
Ickworth Pale. One of them, Edward Baythorne, was then living in the old Manor Hall or 'Man-
sion', and had rights of sheepwalk over the common fields (when fallow) and the greens of the
Hervey estate. There were twelve other substantial farmers, holding between 160 and twenty-nine
acres each, and four smallholdings (called 'tenements') of less than eight and a quarter acres. Ten
of these held farm houses and other buildings from Hervey, and one of them (Robert Emyns) held
Ickworth Lodge, which appears to be on the site of the present Lodge. The Lodge and five other
tenanted houses stood near the Green about two-thirds of a mile north of the church. In 1665 the
land tenanted by the farmers was generally in consolidated blocks, many of them behind the front-
ages of their farms (Fig. 3). Three of them still had strips in Great and Little Common Fields.

By 1665, only these two common fields remain of what were probably extensive medieval open
fields. There is no remaining evidence of ridge-and-furrow in Ickworth parish in the earthwork
survey, but the survey does show such evidence close by (Fig. 2), at the extreme north in Little Saxham (also shown on the 1638 Little Saxham map), in the south of Great Common Field, where there is 'Chevington Field Plantation' on the 1882 O.S. map, and on John Pricke's land across the south-west parish boundary. In Ickworth itself, there is documentary evidence of former strip cultivation in Great Straightwells, next to Little Common Field, which is said in the Survey to have been 'formerly diverse pieces'. In addition two of the 'pieces of pasture' held by John Pricke in the south-east corner of the parish may be parts of an ancient open field (Survey, 15).

We shall see in the next section that arable, possibly in open fields, occupied most of the parish in the 13th century. But most of the open fields must have been enclosed well before the Survey in the 17th century. Angus Wainwright (personal communication) has found that almost all the pollarded and other pre-1700 trees appear to lie along earthworks that were probably former field boundaries. There are more of these boundaries than have been used in the reconstructed Map (Fig. 2), suggesting that some of the fields of the Survey were at one time divided into even smaller enclosed parts. Examples occur in Bansey Wood and Market Close, and particularly strikingly in Lodge Close, which will be described below. Such boundaries must have predated the Survey, because many of the pollards on them appear to be of the order of 400-500 years old. The oldest pollard in the Park (the 'tea-party oak') is said by Rackham (1980, 201) to be up to 700 years old.

In most cases the Survey specifies for each field whether it is 'arable', 'pasture' or 'meadow' (Fig. 3). A total of about 460 acres is said to be, or to have recently been, arable, and about 420 acres pasture and 76 acres wood, out of the grand total of 1,187 acres of Hervey's estate (some of it lying just outside the parish of Ickworth). Some transition from arable or meadow to pasture was still taking place in the mid-17th century; for example Tuft Close is said to be 'pasture lately layed', and Lound Field was 'formerly ploughed, now layed for pasture' (Survey, 3 and 5). Farmer's Queach, next to Choakes Wood, is 'wood lately stubbed up' (Survey, 12). In 1665 most of the arable land lies along the main river and stream valleys, with two concentrations of pasture to the east and south-east of the parish.

Three areas of the reconstructed field system are of particular interest. The first is the eastern pasture comprising Great, Middle, Little and Long Leys, all held by Kerrington in 1665 (Figs. 2 and 3). Here the earthworks indicate an almost continuous westward-facing bank on the west side of the Kerrington holding, dividing Great and Middle Leys from the two pieces of Great Link. Although the earthwork survey is incomplete further south, an aerial photograph shows a continuous feature (probably more recently a road) dividing Little and Long Leys from Old Link, and meeting the parish boundary north of Hunger Field.

If the line of the bank is completed in this way, it encloses a group of 'Leys' to the east, and is almost entirely surrounded to the west by a group of fields called 'Links', from Nether Link in the north to Old Link in the south. In 1665 all the Links are pasture, with several pre-1700 pollards which may have stood on earlier field boundaries. The word 'link' (OE hlinc) means 'bank' or 'ledge' (cf. 'lynchet': Gelling 1984, 163). This suggests some particular significance of the bank bordering them on the east. Perhaps the 'Links' were originally fields to the west of woodland which was banked and ditched, though evidence of ditching has disappeared. The only woodland in the area explicitly mentioned in the Survey (31, 77) is Buxhall or Buckstall (also held by Kerrington), lying next to the Pale which goes on a 'back lane round Buckstall and Cowell's corner' (Fig. 2). Buxhall Wood is still in 1665 'well planted with great timber', but Cowell's Wood was already divided between an arable and a pasture close (Survey, 8, 31, 77).

The evidence suggests that there was at some period before 1665 a substantial area of woodland of about seventy acres between the Pale and the banks of the 'Links'. This may have been the remnant of more extensive woodland, which had been subject to a sequence of assarts or enclosures, with the typical irregular sinuous and concave shapes seen in the boundaries to the north of Nether and Great Links (compare Rackham 1976, 112; 1986, 142). It is not possible to determine when such enclosures may have taken place, but we shall see in the next section that the 13th and 14th centuries mark a high point in the extent of arable in the parish. It is probable therefore that
asserting took place earlier than the 13th century, and that Buxhall and perhaps Cowell’s Wood were the only woodland remaining by the 13th century in this area. From the remaining earthworks and associated pollards, there appear to be a number of field divisions within the area which are consistent with small enclosed fields predating the consolidated fields of the Survey.

A second enclosure of particular interest in the earthwork survey is Lodge Close, on the east bank of the river. This has a unique pattern of parallel earthworks, with about fifteen surviving pollards and other pre-1700 trees. Phibbs and Gallagher (1980, Index, 65) suggest that this may have been part of the site of a 13th-century deer park, apparently because of the names ‘Lodge’ and ‘Laund’ in the vicinity. This seems a very slender ground for the suggestion, especially as a revised survey by Wainwright (1995, Map 4) shows that most of the old trees remaining are rather accurately sited in parallel rows along the scarps of the ridges, an arrangement not to be expected in a park, but more consistent with an origin in enclosure hedges.

It is likely that the Lodge Close earthworks represent a series of arable terraces or lynchets running down at right angles to the river, on land which also slopes down-river towards the north. The terraces are about 160 yards between headlands and enclose spaces of between a half and three-quarters of an acre. The explanation of their pattern may be that they were produced as strip lynchets, by ploughing along the line of ridge-and-furrow after consolidation and enclosure of two or three strips from an original open field. The probable age of the pollards, and the size of the lynchets, means that enclosure of the original strips probably took place well before the 17th century.

Across the river from Lodge Close an almost continuous extent of open fields seems to have persisted well into the 17th century. The abutments of Hible’s holding to the north (Survey, 55–57) show that there was a Common Field in Chevington to the west of Chevington Road, a remnant of which can still be seen on the Chevington and Chedburgh Enclosure Map of 1815 abutting Chevington Road south of the east-flowing stream. Chevington Common Field therefore probably extended south across the stream, to join up with Ickworth Great Common Field to the south, part of which is itself across the present parish boundary.

In 1665 there were two closessouth-west of the river, Rye Close and Horse Pasture, both abutting on Great Common Field to their south-west. On the north-west Rye Close is adjacent to the Common Field and to Chevington Road (Survey 28). There is clear evidence on the ground of a track bounding Rye Close here, which is aligned with the present parish boundary further south across Great Common Field (Figs. 2 and 4). There are no traces now of ridge-and-furrow in Rye Close or Horse Pasture, but they may both be very early enclosures which were originally part of the Common Fields.

Thus there seems to have been a large extent of open field facing Lodge Close on the west bank of the river, much of which was still present in the 17th century. By the time of the Survey, all the closes along the east bank were arable except Lodge Close which was pasture. The land to the north of Lodge Close is ploughed at the present time, and no features can be clearly distinguished in it. Lodge Close is therefore something of a fossil, whose historical reconstruction is of importance for the estate as a whole. The evidence strongly suggests that there was strip cultivation in early common fields on both sides of the river, on the relatively well-drained land. Probably as early as the 14th or 15th century, strips in Lodge Close were consolidated and enclosed with hedges in plots of two or three roods. Continued arable cultivation created lynchets along the hedges, until the whole close was layed for pasture, probably after coming into a single tenancy. The hedges were destroyed, leaving the pollarded trees. This was the situation in 1665, and remains so. It is not clear why this close alone among its neighbours retains this character, except that its topography as a spur sloping both to the river in the west and to the north produced the unique pattern of parallel lynchets visible today. But as we have seen, it seems likely that other parts of the estate had a similar history, where pollards and earthworks indicate early, but more rectangular, enclosures.

The third area of interest is Ickworth Green, where former boundaries show up quite well in remaining earthworks. As reconstructed in Figs. 2 and 5, the Green and adjoining Green Close appear to be remnants of what was probably a much larger common extending south along Church
Fig. 4 – Earthworks in Lodge Close and Church Field (revised survey by Angus Wainwright, 1995, based on Phibbs and Gallagher 1980).
Fig. 5 – Earthworks around Ickworth Green (revised survey by Angus Wainwright, 1996, based on Phibbs and Gallagher 1980).
Green. The earthwork survey shows boundaries on the north side of the Green with encroachments of several farms and their closes. There are also typical funnels of common land connecting the Green to neighbouring roads. For example, the Survey describes how the west head of Green Close ‘points upon’ Middle Close (40), and earthwork ditches indicate how Long Grove and The Laune ‘point upon’ two of the roads across the Green.

The conjectured boundaries of Green Close suggest that it originally formed part of the Green itself, which would then have been about a quarter of a mile long and 100 yards at its widest, totalling about twelve acres. Church Green lies along the wide road going south from Green to church, separated from the Green in 1665 only by Godfrey’s enclosed meadow. The whole area between church and Green lies on a poorly drained clay plateau around the 300-foot contour, and is typical of Suffolk greens in utilizing the poor conditions of the clay tops for grazing (Wade-Martins 1980; Warner 1987). Only two ‘meadows’ are found in the 1665 Survey that are not along the definite line of a stream, and one of them is Godfrey’s meadow north of Church Green, where depressions in the land surface continue to be boggy to this day.

MEDIEVAL FIELDS

In the next sections an attempt will be made to suggest, from various types of evidence, what may have been the structure of the medieval fields and settlements of Ickworth.

In 1665 the total of Hervey’s estate within the parish of Ickworth consisted of about 445 acres arable, 397 acres pasture and sixty-three acres wood. Fortunately there is also 13th-century evidence about the then total of cultivated land, both in the Abbot’s licence to empark at Ickworth (1254), and also in the Iter of Salamon, dated 1286 (F. Hervey 1925, ii, 30ff; hereafter referred to as Iter). This document gives details of the holdings of all the lords-in-chief, with their villeins, cottars and free subsidiary tenants, in the eight-and-a-half Hundreds of Bury and in Hartismere Hundred.

The Iter is sufficiently near in date to Edward I’s great land-survey called the Hundred Rolls (1279) to make it probable that it was compiled as a part-copy, for the purposes of Bury Abbey, of the (mainly lost) royal survey of Suffolk (Powell 1910, 1). The remaining Hundred Rolls for the Hundred of Thingoe mention only the King’s own holdings, and details of misdemeanours within the King’s jurisdiction. The Iter is therefore an invaluable supplementary source for the Suffolk historian.

Both the licence to empark and the Iter give the total of Thomas de Ickworth’s demesne as 450 acres of arable land (terra), nineteen acres of meadow and pasture and seventeen acres of wood, a windmill and the advowson of the church (Gage 1838, 278–79). There were also 115 acres of villein-land, and fifteen acres held by cottars. To these figures the Iter (169) adds details about twenty-seven other named land-holders. These include the Prior of Bromehill (in Weeting, Norfolk), to whom Thomas had granted land in free alms in about 1270 (Blomefield 1805, ii, 165); two freemen holding by part of a knight’s fee; six freemen by scutage dues; and eighteen other named holders, also presumably freemen, holding land by rent in very small pieces. Eight acres of meadow and pasture and eight acres of wood were also held between three of the freemen.

Summarizing the total acreages in the parish of Ickworth for 1286 and 1665, we get:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Arable</th>
<th>Meadow</th>
<th>Pasture</th>
<th>Wood</th>
<th>Closes &amp; other not specified</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1286</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>69½</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>68½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freemen</td>
<td>281⅓</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>297⅔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1286</td>
<td></td>
<td>980</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1665</td>
<td></td>
<td>445</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>c. 140</td>
<td>1138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The figure of 930 acres for arable (terra: see Latham 1965, 481) in 1286 was even greater than the total of arable and pasture together (842 acres) in 1665. It was in fact a very high proportion of the total parish, which, with the forty-acre addition from Little Saxham, is given in the 19th century as 1,257 acres (Kelly 1879, 884). The possibility must of course be considered that a non-standard ‘small acre’ is being used in 1286. This is unlikely on general grounds, however, because at this date official documents, such as the Hundred Rolls themselves, are generally found to use standard acres. In particular, Rackham (1968, 24; 1986, xv) has estimated from various medieval sources that in Eastern England a small ‘local acre’ might vary from about 88 per cent of a standard acre upwards. So even at the lowest estimate, the total arable in 1286 would be nearly 820 standard acres, which is still a high proportion of the parish area.

The twenty-seven acres under the meadow/pasture heading in 1286, and the twenty-five acres for wood, seem very little in comparison with arable. Similar proportional totals are given in the Iter for the parishes neighbouring Ickworth, and it must be assumed that widespread transformation to pasture on this part of the Suffolk clay-tops had hardly begun by the end of the 13th century. Today’s evidence of pre-1700 pollards can hardly be used to indicate wood pasture as far back as the 13th century. There was, however, extensive sheep-rearing at that time. Fairly high numbers of sheep were entered in Domesday for Ickworth and its neighbours: eighty for both Ickworth and Nowton, 100 for both Saxham and Wherstead, and 140 for Chevington; so during the two centuries after 1086 sheep fodder must have been mainly provided by fallow arable land, not by permanent pasture. In spite of the unpromising nature of the soil on the clay-tops, the demand for arable land was as great in these centuries in High Suffolk as elsewhere, and the frequent characterization of the region as ‘wood pasture’ country can apply only to the 14th and later centuries.

Where would something like 900 acres of cultivated land be found in 1286? The immediate thought is, much where arable and pasture were in 1665. It is unlikely that the woodlands, though apparently more extensive in 1665, were much displaced from where they were in 1286. Of the two woods in Ickworth parish mentioned in the Survey, Lound Wood has a Norse name (lundr is ‘small wood’: Gelling 1984, 207), and was probably present in a similar position in 1286, but smaller. The other wood, Choakes, has the name of a freeman in the Iter: Simon Choake was a considerable property holder in 1286 with three messuages. The latest occurrence of this family name is in the 1327 subsidy returns for Ickworth (Appendix I below), so it is probable that the wood with its name dates back at least to the early 14th century. There is therefore not much room left in the parish for radical resiting of cultivated land, and it is only reasonable to suppose that land found productive in 1286 remained so in 1665. There is not much room either for a deer park of any size on the estate during the 13th century, in spite of the licence obtained in 1254.

In considering the location of arable in the 13th century, the distribution of those holdings in the Survey which are explicitly described as lying between north-to-south or east-to-west ‘heads’ is significant. Some of these heads can be identified in the earthwork survey, particularly as boundaries of the more rectangular-shaped fields. Since the great majority of holdings are described as having heads, it is helpful first to consider those not so described. These include farm houses, drifts and small pightles, and more significantly some large fields which are mostly concentrated in two groups (Fig. 2). One of these groups, totalling seventy-six acres, is situated round the Hall and church, consisting of Church Field, Hall Field, and New and Old Links. The shapes of these fields are irregular, and suggest early enclosure of part of the lord’s desmesne. In 1665 all except Church Field are pasture, and are held by the tenant of the Hall. The second group, of fifty-seven acres, is situated on high ground in the south-east of the parish, and comprises part of Ashwell Ley, Farmer’s Queach, and Greater Ley. All these were pasture in 1665, and became part of ‘Lady Katherine’s Wood’ in the later Park. Their damp clay-top situation, as well as the absence of ‘heads’ in their descriptions, suggests that they were perhaps never arable. The remaining field with no ‘heads’ is Barrett’s and Avises, the fourteen-and-a-half-acre enclosure in the north of the parish, whose half-oval outline is very prominent in aerial photographs. Avis (‘Bird’), like Barrett, is a family name, and this enclosure may well have been outside the arable system, perhaps related to family settle-
ment at the east end of the adjacent Green. In 1665, Jane Barrett still has a tiny tenement of one rood and sixteen perches, with an orchard, nearby.

It is interesting to note that, of the woods listed in 1665, only one has no 'heads'. This is Choakes Wood, whose presence in the 13th century was argued above, and which can be assumed never to have been part of the arable system of the high Middle Ages. Lound Wood, on the other hand, had 'heads' in 1665. Since it lay between Great and Little Common Fields, it is possible that its present outer portions were once part of these open fields. It may be significant that the earthwork survey shows no pre-1700 trees remaining in the present wooded area in the south-west of the parish, except on the southern parish boundary.

It is tempting to conclude that those fields which retained their 'head' descriptions in 1665, which total about 860 acres, were indeed those that constituted the extensive arable of the 13th century. But it is impossible to be sure whether this arable was mostly to be found in open fields or in enclosures. The only clues remaining are the probable shapes of the fields. The apparent rectangular shapes of those along the river suggest open fields, and the irregular shapes to the east and north suggest enclosures, but this cannot be conclusive, since the shapes of the fields are often masked by later developments, and are the most conjectural elements of the reconstructed map.

There are several fields of pasture in 1665 which have concentrations of pre-1700 trees within them, and where earthworks indicate small field divisions. These include in particular Bansey Wood, Market Close,18 and Barrett's Grove and Avises, which may have been among the first to have been enclosed for pasture, and have remained pasture ever since. Several other field names in the area around the Green suggest early small woods or wood pasture: there are 'Grovers' and two 'Bearnes' (bearu, OE, means 'grove': Gelling 1984, 193); also two 'Bushey' Closes. To the north, Middle Close is said to include 'coppice wood or grove' (Survey, 46). All these remained pasture in 1665 except part of Middle Close.

Thistley Field, to the north of the stream, was certainly part of the open field system, and not the waste that its name conjures up. In 1550 (C.P.R. 1549–51, 318) it was a field of pasture called Scyfilgfeld, and in a similar list in 1552 (C.P.R. 1550–53, 238) it appears as Scistlg Field. The name was probably corrupted from an old form of 'Shift-ley-feld', referring to a shift, or unit of arable rotation in open fields (Bailey 1989, 57), and later to a pasture 'leyed' from the arable.

We are left with a picture of a heavily exploited 13th-century landscape, primarily devoted to arable cultivation. There were certainly strip holdings in open fields, of which Great and Little Common Fields and Great Straightwells were 17th-century remnants. If the 900 acres of arable in 1286 were all organised in open fields these must have extended over most of the parish, leaving small areas of wood, meadow and pasture. Choakes Wood was present, and perhaps some woodland persisting after assarting and enclosure along the boundary with Horringer. Lound Wood may have been present, but smaller than in 1665. The lord probably had an area of enclosed desmesne around the Hall and church (did this contain the crofts of an early village?). There is little or no sign at this time of the extensive 'wood pasture' which has been described as typical of the high claylands, and in Ickworth the present appearance of wood pasture seems to be due to trees established on boundaries, after enclosure of the open fields in the later medieval period.

MEDIEVAL POPULATION AND SETTLEMENT

It remains to consider who was farming this landscape in 1286, and where they may have lived. The population of Ickworth in 1665 was clearly very small, with only twelve households noted on Hervey's estate, which then covered practically the whole parish. In addition John Prick may have had the freehold of the moated site to the north-east of Martin's Green (Gallagher and Owen 1991), since he held 'proper' (that is, freehold) land on its north-east side, and about thirty acres of land from Hervey to the south-east of Martin's Green. This site was probably deserted by 1670, since it
is not noted as paying Hearth Tax (S. Hervey 1905, 157). If there were twelve or thirteen households in 1665, at the usual multiplier of 4½ there may have been a population of about sixty. In Domesday Book there were nine villeins, three bordars and four serfs. There is no mention of freemen or socmen, although these make up an average of a quarter of the labour-force for each of Ickworth’s nearest neighbours. In the 1180s William of Ickworth held as tenant-in-chief, and there is still no mention of other holdings of freemen or socmen (Davis 1954, 28). A century later however, in the _Iter_ of 1286, twenty-four freemen having messuages in Ickworth made their first appearance in the record, together with Thomas de Ickworth and his Hall, and an unknown number of villeins and cottars holding messuages and 130 acres between them (_Iter_, 170).

Information about population changes between 1086 and the 1670s can be found from a variety of sources, including the _Iter_, and household tax returns for six of the years between 1327 and 1674 (see details in Appendix I). There are various difficulties about using these figures to estimate the total population. For example, the _Iter_ is concerned with land-holders rather than inhabitants in Ickworth, and there is an unknown number of unfree tenants in 1286. In the tax returns, numbers of taxpayers probably give a low estimate of householders, since the poor did not pay tax. But a rough comparison of numbers of households over time can be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Taxpayers</th>
<th>Number of Messuages</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Taxpayers</th>
<th>Number of Messuages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1086</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1286</td>
<td>25 ±</td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>1674</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1327</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Insofar as the figures are comparable, they suggest some increase in population between 1086 and 1286, then a low point after the general recession of the 14th century, followed by a slight recovery by the end of the 17th century which is confirmed by the number of Hearth Tax payers in 1670 and 1674. Throughout the 19th century the population was not very different: the average of the figure over the decades is 78 (V.C.H. Suffolk, I, 692).

The freemen of 1286, or their predecessors, must have been at least partly responsible for the great extent of cultivated land in 1286. Some of them may even have belonged to villein families who had raised their status by such assarting. There are 130 acres of villein and cottar land with messuages in 1286, enough for a possible nine more inhabitants at an average of about fifteen acres each. But the individual holders of such land may themselves have been free rent-payers elsewhere. By the 13th century ‘free’ and ‘bond’ status was often becoming attached to land rather than to people, and it has been suggested that East Anglia was in the forefront of this development (Harvey 1984, 12). It follows that counting nine extra households in the 1286 population may be an over-estimate.

Six of the named freemen held between thirteen and eighty-eight acres each of free land, probably enough for a family’s living. The rest held eight acres or fewer, and in the case of four of them none at all. Some of these appear also as messuage- or land-holders in neighbouring villages; some may have held villein land in Ickworth; but some have occupational names which may indicate that their main source of livelihood was not land: Carpenter, Coopertor (equivalent to ‘coverer’ or Thatcher (Latham 1965, 114), a name still present in 1327), Gardiner, the Miller. In the tax returns of 1327 (see Appendix I) there were still twenty-six taxpayers, with a few more examples of occupational names: Barker (associated with tanning), Cooper (Latin _cuparius_, ‘cask-maker’), Cowherd, Shepherd, and Smith.

The _Iter_ gives a snapshot of 13th-century Ickworth, revealing much agricultural activity, a high proportion of freemen and rent-payers, and several tradesmen and craftsmen. There are far fewer complexities of tenant and sub-tenant relations than are found in neighbouring parishes, suggesting tighter control by the lord. By contrast, in Little Saxham, twenty-seven freemen ultimately hold from the Abbot of Bury or from Adam de Gedding, but often at three or four removes from the lord-in-chief on the ladder of sub-tenants. In Ickworth none is at more than one remove from
Thomas de Ickworth. But even so the number of sub-tenants shows that Ickworth was no exception to the lively land-market that is remarked upon in all parts of East Anglia in the 13th century.

Where did this population of more than twenty-five households live? Alternative suggestions have been Ickworth Green, where most of the 17th-century farms are found, or a possible village, later deserted, in the neighbourhood of the church and Hall. In 1665, even before the new Park was established, only one road (as opposed to a ‘drift’ or ‘way’) is mentioned in the Survey as going through the estate from side to side. This goes through both the possible settlement sites, from Puddle Wharf at Chevington Road in the west, through Ickworth Green, along Church Green to the north and west of the church (where Fig. 4 shows tantalizing earthworks), and then eastwards to Poulter's Lane. The line of the road is visible in earthworks, except in its last section, where it can be seen in aerial photographs to the west of the present woods, as the boundary between Old Link and Hunger Field.

The road probably met Poulter Lane at Sheep Green, to the south of Horringer village near Cowells Wood. In the Survey (8) Poulter Lane is said to go ‘from Sheep Green to Chevington’, and there is a ‘Market Stile at Cowell’s corner’ (Survey, 77), probably indicating that this is the way from the south of Ickworth to Bury Market. Sheep Green is the former site of an annual sheep fair, said to have been sixty acres in extent (Gage 1838, 524; M. Hervey 1930, 106).

It is surprising that no through road goes from Ickworth Green to Horringer church in 1665, although remaining earthworks show that such a road must have existed in the later Park. Part of its later course wound along the southern boundaries of Avises and Leyton Leas, but the Survey does not identify these boundaries as a road or lane, and further east the earthworks cut straight across the boundaries of Nether Link close. The absence before 1665 of a road linking the Green directly to Great Horringer village does something to undermine the suggestion that there was an early Ickworth settlement on the Green.

AN EARLY NUCLEAR VILLAGE?

Was there an early village settlement near the church and Hall sites? In a study of green-side settlements in Suffolk, Warner (1987, 29) has described how early parent settlements, situated near prime agricultural land, have given rise to secondary dependent tenancies beside greens on relatively water-logged clay tops. These were sometimes on parish boundaries, where there were rights of intercommon between parishes, and they often developed into the isolated ‘hall farms’ of substantial later tenants. The pattern is well exemplified on Ickworth Green, and on Martin’s Green in the south where the diverging routes of the Pale and the parish boundary (Fig. 3) suggest earlier inter-common between Ickworth and Chevington.

Ickworth’s green-side settlements may indicate dispersion from a primary ‘central place’ lying either outside Ickworth itself, or at a local river-valley site. Perhaps ‘Ica’s worth’ was originally dependent on a large centralised estate of Saxon or even earlier period, for which the only obvious candidate would be the town of Bury. The landscape south of Bury is one of scattered farmsteads, remnants of greens, and ancient intercommuning between parishes, where the relatively ‘nuclear’ villages cannot be assumed to be of great antiquity. But evidence of association of Ickworth and its neighbours with Bury is late and slight. It comes mainly from the grants of Theodred and Ealdorman Aelfgar in about 951 (Hart 1992, 473), and from the possibility that Bury (then Bedricsworth) was royal dowerland in the 9th century (Cam 1944, 100), which, if true, would have implied extensive holdings in the surroundings.

A somewhat stronger argument can, however, be made for an early ‘primary’ settlement of Ickworth near the church and Hall sites. It has often been remarked that understanding the landscape history of Suffolk depends crucially on the topography of its hills and river valleys, even though none of the former rise to much above 400 feet. In the neighbourhood of Ickworth important historical indicators of pre-historic, Roman and Saxon settlement are found predominantly in
valley-sites. There was a minor Roman settlement on the Linnet at Westley, and a substantial one at Sicklesmere in the upper valley of the Lark (Moore 1988, 12, 46), and there were three early Saxon cemeteries near the Linnet in the present south-west suburbs of Bury (West 1985, i, 155; ii, Fig. 304; see Fig. 1).

Later Saxon settlement seems to continue this pattern. If we assume that the Domesday churches to the south-west of Bury were on the sites of their present successors, most of them were situated within 700 metres of a stream (Fig. 1), and in each case a medieval hall site is close by. Great Horringer is an exception, but in Domesday there was only one church in Horringer, and it is possible that this was the subsequently ruined church of Little Horringer, and that the settlement was nearby overlooking the river. In Domesday Great and Little Saxham (two-thirds of a church) and Westley (one and one-third) appear to share their thirds of a church. This is probably the church of Little Saxham, which has a 12th-century tower, whereas there is no evidence of a comparably early origin for Great Saxham church. The rule for these settlements seems to be that the higher up a valley, the nearer the church and Hall are to a river or stream, probably because the belt of well-drained, fertile land gets narrower in an upper valley. The apparent rule suggests that, in most of these cases, there was original settlement above the fertile valley on the edge of the clay-top, near the lord’s seat and the church that he was perhaps the first to build.

Primary Saxon settlements on river-side sites in the neighbourhood of Ickworth are therefore by no means implausible. Unfortunately in the case of Ickworth the environs of the church are now almost all permanent pasture, and in the absence of excavation or the possibility of field-walking, the hypothesis of a village site under Church Field or Hall Field must remain conjectural.

CONCLUSION

Putting all the historical evidence back into chronological order, a reconstruction of Ickworth’s past can be attempted. Ica’s original *worth* may have been on the valley slope, near the later sites of the church and Hall. The vill was held by absentee ecclesiastical lords in the 10th and 11th centuries, during which time open fields with strip cultivation may have developed, amounting to three carucates of arable by 1086. If this can be taken to be equivalent to about 120 standard acres, the next 200 years saw it quadrupled, so that in 1286 arable fields must have covered almost the whole of the parish. This expansion coincided with the replacement of the Abbot of Bury as desmesne lord by the resident de Ickworth family, and with the first appearance in the record of twenty-four freemen and rent payers, with their messuages. These held between them nearly half the arable land; they included various craftsmen with smallholdings, but many of them were probably responsible for the new assarts.

After this high point in the extent of open fields, there was a decline in population, and if there ever was a ‘nucleated’ village near the church, it probably became deserted at this time. There is evidence of subsequent consolidation and enclosure of parts of fields and groups of strips, bounded by banks and hedges. Later still the small enclosures were themselves consolidated into the larger fields of arable and pasture described in 1665. Many of the trees remained from the hedgerows, but there is no evidence that extensive ‘wood pasture’ ever existed in Ickworth in the sense of early woodland used for grazing animals, without any intervening period as ploughland. By 1665 there were eleven tenant farmers with farmhouses mostly round the greens, holding consolidated farms in their hinterland. Arable was concentrated along the Linnet valley, with most of the clay tops layed down to pasture. This is the landscape, marked out in the present Park by ancient trees and earthworks, which may still be partially discerned by the educated eye.
APPENDIX I

THE POPULATION OF ICKWORTH AND ITS NEIGHBOURS

(Information mainly contributed by Nesta Evans)

1286 At least twenty-five messuages. Thomas de Ickworth, one ecclesiastical holder, and twenty-six named free tenants are listed, and an unknown number of villeins and cottars holding 130 acres of land. There were four occupational names: Carpenter, Coopertor, Gardiner, Miller.

1327 Twenty-six taxpayers. Six family names, including Choke, survived from 1286, and there were more occupational names: Barker, Cooper, Cowherd, Shepherd, Smith, Thatcher (S. Hervey 1906, 166). Two of the names on this list survived to 1524.

1428 Ickworth is the only vill in the Hundred of Thingoe to be listed as having fewer than ten households (Dymond and Virgoe 1986, 90).

1524 Thirteen taxpayers. John Hervey, gentleman, was taxed 20 marks (1 mark is 13s. 4d.) on lands, John Hervey junior, gentleman, £40 on goods, five others taxed on goods, five labourers taxed on wages, and one serving man (S. Hervey 1910, 341).

1568 Five taxpayers. William Hervey Esq. was taxed £30 on lands, and four others on goods. The tax was not levied as far down the scale as in 1524, and the numbers are therefore not comparable with those found earlier (S. Hervey 1909, 255).

1670 Eleven payers of Hearth Tax (S. Hervey 1905, 157). In addition there were houses with three hearths between them, presumably with three poor households, and one house demolished. The total of fourteen compares with eleven in 1665. Perhaps the ‘poor households’ are not mentioned in the 1665 Survey.

1674 Twelve payers of Hearth Tax and three others exempt through poverty (S. Hervey 1905, 157).

APPENDIX II

THE 1665 SURVEY TENANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Houses in Fig. 3</th>
<th>Page in Survey</th>
<th>Name of tenant</th>
<th>Acreage (a.r.p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Edward Baythorne</td>
<td>143.2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Arthur Goodchild</td>
<td>159.3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Robert Wykes</td>
<td>74.1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>John Pricke</td>
<td>48.0.14½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>George Strutton</td>
<td>83.3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>John Mayhew</td>
<td>113.0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Edward Godfrey</td>
<td>28.9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Robert Kerrington</td>
<td>40.3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Robert Emyns</td>
<td>102.2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Francis Evatt</td>
<td>93.3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenement on Green</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Jane Barrett</td>
<td>0.1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>William Heywood</td>
<td>72.0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>John Diaper</td>
<td>76.0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Thomas Welham</td>
<td>8.1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenement on Green</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Thomas Murton</td>
<td>2.0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsonage (site unknown)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>John Locar, Rector</td>
<td>7.0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevington:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>John Hible</td>
<td>58.1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenement</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Robert Day</td>
<td>0.3.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NOTES

1 A 14th-century copy (in the Album Registrum Vestiarii, or Pinchbeck Register) is in C.U.L., MS.Ee.iii.60. This was apparently compiled during the 1330s, but the Iter of Salamon de Roffiensis, which contains the surveys, is dated 14/15 Edward I (1286). Douglas (1932, xvi, note) warns that the extracts of text printed by Francis Hervey are not always accurate. The Iter has been used by Powell (1910, 1), who shows that some portions of it date from 1280.

2 The two names are essentially the same: 'heath' was formerly 'erthe' (OE erþ, 'ploughed land'; see Ekwall 1960, 251), and the equivalent forms 'Hornings[h]erthe' and 'Horinges[h]erthe' in The Chronicle of Ramsey Abbey (Macray 1886, 83–84). Domesday Book (f.356b) also has 'Horningesworda'. Ekwall suggests that OE hurning may refer to the winding Linnet to the north.

3 In his account of the deer parks of East Anglia, Farrer (n.d., 23) remarks that enclosed parks are not found where the King has granted free warren, but that licence to enclose a park was often granted (presumably to part of the estate) soon afterwards, as seems to have happened in Ickworth. Farrer (n.d., 89) assumes that the Abbot's licence for Ickworth was for a park, though no park of medieval date has been located, and none is marked on Saxton's Map of Suffolk of 1575.

4 S.R.O.B., HA 507/2/189, HA 507/3/788; and account books of Sir Thomas Hervey and the first Earl of Bristol, S.R.O.B., 941/46/15. I owe these references to Nesta Evans.

5 The Reports of Phibbs, Gallagher and Owen include not only the earthwork survey and plan, but also comments on the archaeological significance of the earthworks and a classified list of remaining ancient trees. My principal disagreements with their reconstructed map concern the area to the south of the Linnet, and in the north-east corner of the estate. These divergences are mainly due to their neglect of some relative acreages of the fields as given in the Survey. A further survey of the area between the church and the Green was initiated in 1996 under the direction of Christopher Taylor.

6 Apart from those noted in the List of References below, the principal sources were the Sites and Monuments Record, Suffolk Archaeological Unit, County Planning Dept, Bury St Edmund's; the ADAS aerial photographs of the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (copies available in the Ickworth file of the same Unit); and 'An indenture for the purchase of land, 1721', Horringer, S.R.O.B., E7/10/26.


8 S.R.O.B., Ickworth 806/1/87.


10 A ‘queach’ is a rough piece of ground adjoining arable, full of bushes and roots; a thicket (Forby 1830, 268). In Lancashire it is also known as a wet and swampy area (Halliwell 1860, 656). Either sense would fit Farmer's Queach, which is on the damp clay-top, and adjoins the 'lands' and 'pieces' of J. Pricke, which are possibly in former open field. I owe these references, and those in notes 12 and 17, to David Dymond.


12 'Buckstall' may refer to a 'deer trap' (Field 1972, 75); but more usually to the process of cutting down hedges to renovate them, or coppicing trees, perhaps leaving 'buck-headed' branches (Forby 1830, 42).

13 The spelling 'laund' (meaning 'clearing in a park'; Rackham 1986, 430) does not in fact occur in the Survey, where the wood and neighbouring fields are called 'Lound', meaning 'small wood'. Spellings are rarely consistent in the 17th century, but at least the use of 'bound' here cannot be used as much support for the presence of a deer park.

14 I am indebted to Sue Oosthuizen and Christopher Taylor for the suggestions in this paragraph. Strip lynches are rare in Suffolk, but another example has been identified by Dymond (1969, 42) on the Enclosure Map of Barrow, to the north-west of Ickworth.

15 The Oxford English Dictionary under 'pole' gives examples of a 'woodland' pole or perch at 18 instead of the standard 16 feet, which would appear to underestimate areas of woods by about 70 per cent. This value of the woodland perch is confirmed in West Suffolk by a 16th-century survey of Walsham-le-Willows (Dymond 1974, 203).
The average size of parks is said by Rackham (1986, 123, 126) to be about 200 acres, and those of much smaller area were probably not viable.

The names 'Avis' and 'Ayes' occur several times in wills of the 1630s in West Suffolk, see Evans 1987.

David Dymond suggests (personal communication) that use of the word 'market' (as also in 'Market Stile': Survey, 77) indicates a road leading towards the nearest chartered market, in this case Bury St Edmunds. There is earthwork evidence of a lane here, leading into Little Horringer parish, and thence to Bury.

It should be noted, however, that, as listed in a church survey (Anon. 1903, 5), the number of communicants and non-communicants in Ickworth in 1603 was 109, suggesting a larger population of adults at that time. These surveys should be a good estimate of the total adult population, since all were legally obliged to be communicants.

Hereditary surnames were far from universal in the late 13th century, so it is possible that many of these individuals were actually following the occupations denoted by their surnames (McKinley 1975, 15).

The following account of the Ickworth Greens is indebted to Peter Warner's monograph (Warner 1987). There are many surviving remnants of greens shown on modern maps of the parishes surrounding Ickworth.

The church of Little Horringer was in ruins by the mid-16th century; now only the site of the Hall remains as a farm. In 1286, however, there were thirty-eight land-holders and ten messuages listed for Little Horringer in the Iter (171). In Westley the ruined medieval church (dedicated to St Thomas a Becket) lies about 400 metres to the west of the present church.

REFERENCES

GENERAL


Dugdale, W., 1825. Monasticon Anglicanum, iii. London.


Phibbs, J. and Gallagher, C., 1980. 'A Survey of the Landscape of Ickworth, Suffolk'. National
Trust, unpublished.
Wade-Martins, P., 1980. 'Fieldwork and Excavation on Village Sites in Launditch Hundred, Nor-
folk', *East Anglian Archaeol.*, 10. Norfolk Archaeological Unit, Dereham.
West, S., 1985. 'West Stow: the Anglo-Saxon Village', *East Anglian Archaeol.*, 24. Norfolk Archaeolog-
ical Unit, Dereham.

REFERENCES FOR MAPS
Ordinance Survey, 6in to 1 mile, 1882.

Suffolk Record Office, Bury St Edmunds Branch (S.R.O.B.)
Suffolk
Chevington
Chevington and Wherstead
Chevington and Chedburgh
Chevington
Horringer and Westley
Horringer
Ickworth
Hervey, J., 1946–48
Little Saxham
Little Saxham

Greenwood, 1825 (586/18).
Saxton, 1575.
Volume of maps, 1771–1816 (FL 550/1/4).
Survey of Doveden Hall Farm, 1771 (1167/12).
Enclosure, 1815 (2323).
Copy Enclosure Award, 1822 (FL 550/1/9).
Tithe, 1839 (T 112/1, 2).
Enclosure, 1815 (FL 589/1/5).
Tithe, 1839 (T 106/1, 2).
Tithe, 1850 (T 12/1, 2).
Ickworth, Plan, 1665 (941/83/1A).
Plan, 1638, copied 1756 (1167/11).
Tithe, 1846 (T 32/1, 2).
Cambridgeshire Record Office, Cambridge
Ordnance Survey, 2in to 1 mile: draft 1st edn, 1819.

National Trust Office, Ickworth

ABBREVIATIONS
C.P.R. Calendars of Patent Rolls.
C.U.L. Cambridge University Library.
S.R.O.B. Suffolk Record Office, Bury St Edmunds Branch.