

A history of
Westbury Manor
Compton, Surrey

Philip Gorton
2003



Philip Gorton

Specialist in historic buildings research
11 Orchardfield Road, Godalming, GU7 3PB.
(01483) 420763

www.house-history-research.co.uk

© Text 2003 Philip Gorton

Printed by Craddock's of Godalming, Surrey. www.craddocksprinting.co.uk
Bound by the Abbey Bookbindery, Camberley, Surrey. ww.bookbinders.co.uk

Contents

Acknowledgements	4
Introduction	5
The medieval owners of the manor of Westbury	6
The demesne lands of the manor of Westbury	7
The origins of the house	10
The medieval house	10
The dissolution of Dureford Abbey	12
Elizabethan Westbury	14
The farm in 1570	16
Changes to the house and farm	19
The eighteenth century	23
The sale of the house	25
Victorian times	28
The twentieth century	31
Appendix 1a	33
Appendix 1b	35
Glossary	37

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the help of the staff of the Surrey History Centre (SHC), the Hampshire Record Office (HRO), Godalming Museum Library (GML), the London Metropolitan Archives (LMA), the Historical Manuscripts Commission (HMC), the Victoria and Albert Museum (V&A), the Public Record Office (PRO), John Young of Godalming, Jack Rhodes, late of Compton, and Martin Morris of Alton. Finally, I would like to thank my wife Sally for patiently reading and checking the manuscript.

Illustrations are reproduced by permission of the More-Molyneux family and Surrey History Centre.

Introduction

Westbury Manor was built during the fourteenth century and has, at its heart, a timber framed, medieval open hall. From the early fourteenth century, the manor of Westbury was one of the possessions of the Abbey of Dureford, a monastery that lay near Petersfield in Hampshire. After the dissolution of the abbey in 1536, the house continued to be but a small part of much larger estates, principally that of the More family of Loseley in whose ownership it was to remain for 300 years. Thus, although it was undoubtedly the principal house of the manor of Westbury, the place where the manor courts were held for at least 500 years, it has never been the home of the lord of the manor.



Westbury in the early twentieth century by Cecilia Lady Boston.

Throughout that period, Westbury Manor and its land were leased to a succession of farmers who lived in the house and cultivated its land. This remarkable period of continuity came to an end in the late 1830s when James More-Molyneux sold Westbury to the owner of Eastbury House.

It is important to distinguish between the building itself and the ancient jurisdiction that is the manor of Westbury. Throughout this work, therefore, the house will be referred to either by its current name of Westbury Manor or as Westbury Farm to distinguish it from the manor of Westbury.

The medieval owners of the manor of Westbury

At the time of the Domesday Survey of 1086, there was just one manor of Compton with territory that coincided approximately with the boundaries of the parish. Subsequently, however, the processes of buying, selling and inheriting had, by the early fourteenth century, led to its division into the five separate manors of Polsted, Westbury, Eastbury, Field Place and Down Place, names that are still familiar to the twenty-first century inhabitants of Compton.

The history of Westbury as a separate manor can be said to date from 1291 when John de Brudeford granted a life interest in half of his manor at Compton to Henry de Guldeford. This part became known as Compton Westbury, whilst the part retained by John became known as Compton Eastbury. Henry was a man of some importance for, as well as being the rector of Compton, he was an important clerk in the service of Edward I and Edward II. He was also wealthy for he not only held Westbury but also the manor of Field Place and other land in Surrey, Sussex and Kent.¹

Monasticism is as old as Christianity in England: St Augustine and his followers who came to Canterbury in 597 lived by the Benedictine rule. The Viking invasions of the ninth and tenth centuries destroyed most of the Dark Age monastic communities but they were revived after the Norman invasion of 1066. During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, new orders sprang up and with them grew the churches and the vast estates that supported these new communities. The estates of the monasteries grew, helped greatly by the pious giving by those such as Henry de Guldeford who wanted to ensure the well being of their souls in the afterlife.

Henry died in about 1311 and he bequeathed a large sum of money to endow the Abbey of Dureford, the purpose of his bequest being to enable the abbot to maintain a chantry at Compton church where masses would be said in perpetuity for the repose of his soul. By 1330, John de Brudeford once more held Westbury and it was during that year that he conveyed the manor of Westbury, together with the advowson of St Nicholas church to the Abbot.² Thus began a regime that was to last for over two hundred years until the monastery was suppressed in 1536.

Dureford Abbey belonged to the Premonstratensian order of monks. They were comparative newcomers to England who were founded in Premont, France as an offshoot of the Cistercian order. The “White Canons”, as

¹ Victoria County History of Surrey

² Compton Parish Church, Alan Bott, 2000.

they were known, established their first house in England around 1140 and expanded their presence over the next fifty years or so, helped by endowments from the growing class of powerful administrative men such as Henry de Guldeford. They had a number of abbeys in England, many of which were quite poor; indeed the order was noted for their frugal diet, heavy labour, “pitiably poverty” and “abundant want”. Moreover, they were known to wear vermin infested clothing as a penance.³ As a consequence of their ostentatious piety and dedication, their prayers were considered to be of especial value and they attracted many endowments to maintain their houses and chantries.

The demesne lands of the manor of Westbury

Manors were an important source of revenue to their lords. Generally, manors had two distinct parts to their territory from which the manorial lord derived his income. One part was cultivated by the lord himself as his home farm and was known as the demesne. The other part was held by the tenants of the manor for rent and was cultivated by them. The lord’s income from his land would, therefore, come from the direct produce of his demesne and from the rents, both in money and in labour services, paid by his tenants. There were two classes of tenant: freemen of the manor who paid a money rent for their holding and the villeins, or customary tenants, who were obliged to provide a set number of days work per year on the lord’s demesne in addition to paying their rent.

The extent of the Westbury demesne land in the early fourteenth century is described by the *Inquisition Post Mortem*. This was written following the death of Henry de Guldeford which records that it consisted of 40 acres of land, 1½ acres of meadow and four acres of woodland. The distribution of this land is unknown. It may have been spread around the open fields that once existed in the parish or it may have been in the form favoured by the Cistercians who consolidated their estates into coherent, ring-fenced holdings. The proportion of demesne land to tenanted land varied from manor to manor, as did the way the estates were managed, and we cannot be sure how the monks ordered their interests in Compton.

By whatever means the Abbot’s managed their estate at Compton, the coming of the Black Death in the summer of 1348 would have made changes. The pestilence had a profound effect on the social and economic structure of the country and, in particular, on the relationship between landlord and tenant.

³ The Abbeys and Priories of Medieval England, Colin Platt, 1984.



*Part of Westbury Farm in 1777.
 Almost half of its fields lay scattered on the south side of the downs and in the moors but the majority of the farm lay between Priorswood and the road from the farmstead to Hurtmore as shown in this map.
 It is possible that this is the extent of the demesne land of the medieval manor of Westbury.*

Before the Black Death there was a surplus of labour, manorial tenements were all occupied and the lord could demand high rents and labour services from his customary tenants. The population was growing and much marginal land was being taken into cultivation. Within a year or two of the arrival of the plague, the population of the country had been reduced by between one-third and one-half leaving many farms and tenements unoccupied.

Medieval Westbury

"He [Henry de Guldeford] held in his demesne the day he died the moiety of the Manor of Compton, with the advowson of that church, and there is there a certain messuage worth nothing beyond reprises. There are 40 acres of land worth yearly 6s. 8d. There is there one acre and a half of meadow, worth yearly 18d. There are four acres of wood worth yearly 12d.

"There are three free tenants, who owe yearly on rents of assize 6s. 4d. whereof two owe suit of court every three weeks. There are six customary tenants who owe yearly a rent of assize 15s. 2d. whereof four owe to carry manure in the autumn for four days without refreshment, and worth yearly 2s. The aforesaid six customary tenants owe to carry the lord's corn for two days before dinner without refreshment and worth 6d. and they owe to mow collect and bind the lord's corn for four days, the lord providing refreshment."
Inquisition Post Mortem of Henry de Guldeforde, 1312.

Those who survived now had the whip hand. Manorial lords had great difficulty in finding new tenants to take on their property and, rather than letting them go to ruin with the consequent loss of capital and income, they reduced the rent. They were also unable to demand the labour services with which they had previously worked their demesne land. These were particularly unpopular with tenants, as the lord required their services at the same time that they needed to work their own farms. As a result, many lords gave up directly farming their demesne lands and found more financial security in leasing out their estates to tenant farmers. It is almost certain, therefore, that if the White Canons were not already leasing their demesne land and the house at Westbury to tenant farmers, the Black Death prompted the Abbot to follow this course, thus establishing a practice that was to continue for almost five hundred years.

The successive lords of the manor leased only the house and land to their tenants of Westbury Farm and they were careful to retain the valuable manorial rights to themselves, i.e. they continued to collect the rents and other dues from the free and customary tenants of the manor. They also made it a condition of the lease that the tenant of Westbury Manor Farm was to allow the annual court to meet in the house and also to provide

dinner for those attending, a tradition that was to continue until the house was sold in the 1830s.

The origins of the house

Manors such as Westbury, where there was no resident lord, frequently had a principal house where the sub-tenant lived and where the periodic meeting of the manor court took place. The *Inquisition Post Mortem* of Henry de Guldeford describes the manor in 1312 and it indicates that there was a capital messuage included in his demesne at that time. However, we cannot be sure whether this is a reference to the current house or to one of its predecessors.

From their study of the structure of the building, the Domestic Building Research Group has estimated that the oldest part of the house was built during the fourteenth century.⁴ Certainly, the passing braces in the two southernmost trusses of the building are typical medieval features and the widths of the floor joists at the southern end of the house also suggest a fourteenth century date.⁵ However, dating houses on stylistic grounds is an inexact science and a dendrochronological survey of the house would be necessary to find the exact date of construction and of the various alterations that have occurred subsequently.

But when and why was the house built? It may have been built early in the fourteenth century, soon after the manor was created, as the principal house of the new manor of Westbury. It is more likely, however, that it was built later in the century and that the competitive land market that existed in the period following the Black Death prompted the Abbot of Dureford to provide a new house to attract a superior tenant to his manor of Westbury.

The medieval house

The oldest part of the building was a four bay, open hall house in the standard tripartite pattern i.e. a central hall of two bays open to the rafters with a two-storey bay at each end. This style of house was well established by the thirteenth century and all levels of society lived in hall houses, great and small, until the late fifteenth.

The hall was the centre of life in the medieval house for it was here that the family and servants lived and ate. The layout of the hall reflected the

⁴ Joan Harding for the Domestic Building Research Group, Surrey, report no. 2851, 1983.

⁵ Hampshire House 1250-1700, their dating and development. Edward Roberts, Hants CC, 2003.

hierarchy that existed within the household. At the "high" end was the master's table. Often, there were decorated cloths hanging from the wall behind and other embellishments that reflected the master's status within the household. His private rooms lay in the two-storied bay behind the table known as the "solar". At Westbury, these private chambers were in the southernmost end of the house that caught most of the heat and light of the sun. The service rooms, where food and beer were stored, and where the household utensils were kept, were at the shadier and cooler northern end. Often there was provision at that end of the medieval house for cheese and butter making and for salting meat to preserve it for the winter. The room above the service rooms was usually a chamber, typically used for additional sleeping space for the rest of the household or the servants.



The interior of the Bayleaf farmhouse at the Weald and Downland Museum in Sussex with the table and benches at the high end of the hall. The door to the solar can be seen on the right.

The "low" end of the hall was the area where the younger members of the household, and those of lesser rank, ate and where the food was prepared. Also situated here was the entrance to the house via a door and cross-passage that ran along the wall opposite the master's table. The fire was

placed in the middle of the hall on an open hearth and its smoke filled the hall, finding its way out of the building where it could. The rafters of these ancient houses are often still coated with the soot from their medieval fires and Westbury is no exception. Occasionally, there was a separate building near to the house that served as a kitchen and a reference to a kitchen in a probate inventory of 1570 suggests that this may have been the case at Westbury.

This was the classic form of the hall-house and an example may be seen at the Weald and Downland Museum at Singleton, Sussex, where the Bayleaf farmhouse from Kent has been reconstructed and furnished in the style of about 1540.

The dissolution of Dureford Abbey

For the farmer and labourer of the medieval countryside, the workings of kings and governments so often had little direct effect on their lives as they strove to extract a living from the soil of their parish. However, this change was huge. The vast estates of the monasteries and the church were seized by the Crown and sold into lay hands in a massive redistribution of land.

The years leading up to the reign of King Henry VIII (1509-1547) saw many monastic houses in decline and it was commonly acknowledged that some reform was necessary. The Act for the Dissolution of the Smaller Monasteries of 1536 required the suppression of those houses with fewer than twelve monks or nuns and an annual value of less than £200. At the time, only a partial reform of the monastic houses was intended and Henry saw it as a way of bringing much needed money into the royal coffers. However, the process gathered its own momentum under his Vicar-General, Thomas Cromwell, and in 1539 there followed another act to dissolve the remaining larger houses. Their property was sold into lay hands, the buildings and communities destroyed and their inhabitants dismissed with a pension.

The change was swift: in April 1536, there were more than 800 monasteries, nunneries, friaries, and more than 10,000 monks, canons, nuns and friars scattered throughout England and Wales. By April 1540, there were none.

The abbots of Dureford had owned the lordship of Westbury for over two hundred years. Their abbey, which lay just to the east of Petersfield, was small, never rich and it was reported to Thomas Cromwell, Henry's Vicar-General who supervised the dissolution of the monasteries, that it

“was far in debt and in great decay”. Consequently, Dureford was one of the first to be suppressed as a result of the Act for the Dissolution of the Smaller Monasteries of 1536 and little remains of it today.⁶

Following the dissolution, the possessions of the abbey, including the manor of Westbury, passed to the Crown and, in 1537, Henry granted them to Sir William Fitz William, his Lord Admiral, who was made Earl of Southampton that same year. Sir William also acquired the monastic possessions of Waverley and Easebourne, all of which were conveniently placed for his new residence at Cowdray.⁷ When Sir William died in 1542 with no heirs, the manor of Westbury reverted to the Crown and it was sold to Sir Christopher More of Loseley in 1545.



Dureford Abbey had long been converted to a private house by the time that this drawing was made by Samuel Hieronymus Grimm in 1782.

The tenant of the farm during that turbulent time was William Wynter who had been granted a lease by the Abbot in 1533. However, he had apparently been dispossessed, possibly at the time of the dissolution, because in 1542 Thomas Westbrooke was tenant of the farm.⁸ Consequently, Wynter came to the manor court in 1545, the same year

⁶ Victoria County History of Sussex, Vol. II, p. 89.

⁷ The Dissolution of the Monasteries in Hampshire, John Hare, Hants CC, 1999.

⁸ Boston, op. cit.

that Sir Christopher More bought the manor of Westbury, to claim his tenancy – unsuccessfully, it would seem as the Westbrooke family were still in possession of the lease in the 1560s.⁹

Elizabethan Westbury

After the dissolution, the house and farm continued to be sub-let to tenant farmers. Thomas Westbrooke was tenant in 1542 and, in 1564, James Westbrooke, who was possibly his son, was granted the lease of Westbury for a period of 21 years.¹⁰ Sadly, he did not enjoy possession for long as he died in 1570. However, it is our good fortune that not only has James's will survived but also with it a probate inventory that lists his furniture and personal possessions (Appendix 1). The will is particularly colourful and it paints a picture of his home, farm and relationships whilst the inventory itemises the assets of the house and farm. Together, they give us a privileged glimpse into the home and work of a Compton farmer at the height of Queen Elizabeth's reign.¹¹

James had been widowed, possibly recently, and he had three adult sons, another son who was under twenty-one years old and an unmarried daughter. The eldest, William, was not only his father's executor but he also inherited the lion's share of the estate including the farming implements, the oxen that were the motive power of the farm and most of the growing crops. The other sons, John, George and young Thomas, all received a few acres of the growing crops as well as a share in the animals. In addition to a dozen sheep, for instance, both George and Thomas were each bequeathed a black cow, one named Swallow and the other called Joy. There are no large money bequests in the will: there were two of 3^s 4^d, whilst the two overseers of his will were to receive ten shillings each.

As is usual, the inventory commences with a description of contents of the hall, which was the principal room of the building. It was very sparsely furnished, even by the standards of the day and contained just one table, two cupboards, one form, and a couple of benches. Often, halls were made a little more comfortable with painted cloths that hung as a wall covering at the "high" end of the hall behind the master's table and form. Westbury Manor, however, lacked even this luxury. This was where the manor courts were held, with the steward and clerk seated at the high table and the tenants of the manor sitting on the benches in the body of

⁹ LM345/119, SHC.

¹⁰ LM/348/30, SHC.

¹¹ 1574B1180/1,2, HRO.

the hall. It was also where the traditional court dinner was held following the formal proceedings.

The arrangement of the rooms within the house is not apparent from the inventory as only the hall and bed chambers are specified. However, the reference to “bacon hogs in the roof” indicates that the house still had at least one bay of its hall open to the rafters. In the majority of medieval houses, cooking took place in the hall but occasionally a separate structure was built apart from the main house to house a kitchen because of the risk created by open fires. A specific reference to a kitchen in the inventory suggests the possibility that this may have been the case at Westbury.

There was a typical collection of cooking utensils including cauldrons, kettles and pans together with the equipment for cooking over a fire: pot hangers and hooks, a spit, a frying pan, two trivets and a gridiron. Strangely, there are no knives listed in the inventory and the only cutlery in the house were four-dozen tin spoons. The house was lit partly by candles and there were two candlesticks in the house. However, the main source of light would have been the open fire in the hall.

James Westbrooke had a small collection of pewter that consisted of five platters and three dishes that were probably reserved for family use. There were also forty-eight wooden trenchers that, together with the set of spoons, were almost certainly employed to serve the court dinners that the Westbury tenants were obliged to provide.

Compared to the bare, wooden furniture of the hall, the bedchambers were furnished with a degree of comfort. There were four bedsteads in the rooms but it appeared that they were not all in use as there were only three woollen mattresses and three coverlets. These, together with the three pewter dishes, suggest that James lived at Westbury with just two other people. They were probably his youngest son, Thomas, who, being less than 21 years old was to be placed under the care of care of his uncle after his father’s death, and Agnes who was still unmarried.

Many of his late wife’s possessions were left to Agnes including her chest, her best kerchers (head scarves) and her best hat. Agnes also inherited her mother’s wedding ring, clasps and a silver pin. On a more practical note, she also was left a pewter platter, a candlestick and a little cauldron. Like her brothers, she too received her share of growing crops, sheep and a cow.

The late sixteenth century was one in which the prosperity of the country was growing considerably and this was changing the lives of ordinary

people, a phenomenon observed by William Harrison in his *Description of England* written in the 1570s. The standard of living was improving and they were upgrading or rebuilding their houses and acquiring more possessions. Although the pewter plates, tin spoons and flockbeds described by Harrison had found their way into Westbury, the house was still very spartan and essentially medieval. It would be the building of the chimney and division of the open hall that occurred over the next few decades that would dramatically increase the comfort of the house.



A wooden trencher, spoon and bone cup laid ready for the annual court dinner.

The farm in 1570

The earliest detailed description of the lands of Westbury Farm dates from the 1670s and indicates that it included about 60 acres of land adjacent to the house itself, another 60 acres or so on the south-facing slope of the Hog's Back together with Fowlers Croft and Westbury Mead. The will of James Westbrooke suggests that the farm was established in this form by the mid sixteenth century whilst a survey of 1777 indicates that it was little changed at that time.

The heart of the farm was the land that lies to the west and south of the house. It consisted of the line of fields on top of the greensand ridge that are adjacent to Prior's Field Lane and stretch from the Jackson's Corner interchange of the A3 to Priors Field School. Also included were the

Extract from William Harrison's Description of England 1577-1587.

"There are old men yet dwelling in the village where I remaine, which have noted three things to be marvellouslie altered in England within their sound remembrance. One is, the multitude of chimnies latelie erected, wheras in their yoong daies there were not above two or three, if soe manie, in the most uplandish townes of the realm . . . each one made his fire against a reredosse [the back of an open hearth] in the hall where he dined and dressed his meat. The second is the great amendment of lodging, for (said they) our fathers and we ourselves have lien full oft upon straw pallets covered onlie with a sheet under coverlets made of dagswain or hopharlots (I use their owne termes,) and a good round log under their heads in steed of a bolster. If it were so that our fathers or the good man of the house, had a materes or flockbed, and thereto a sacke of chaffe to rest his head upon, he thought himselfe as well lodged as the lord of the towne. Pillowes were thought meet onlie for women in childbed.

The third thing they tell of, is the exchange of treen platters into pewter, and wooden spoons into silver or tin. For so common were all sorts of treene stuffe in the old time, that a man should hardlie find foure peeces of pewter in a good farmers house . . ."

scarp slope below these fields together with Round Hill, Brixbury Wood and the small meadows close to the house. There were also lands on the southern slope of the Hog's Back. Loseley estate surveys and surviving leases show that the extent and area of the farm remained remarkably constant throughout the post-medieval period and, because it has always been associated with the house itself, it is tempting to conclude that at least some of this land was the medieval demesne land of Henry de Guldeforde's manor.

Westbrooke's probate inventory reveals that Westbury was a mixed farm producing mostly rye, wheat, cattle and sheep. There are cattle of various kinds listed in the inventory with a total value of £15 13s 4d and they made up the most valuable part of Westbrooke's business. The cattle bred for production were the five kine (including Swallow and Joy) that were the milking animals of the herd, and four heifers. In addition, there were also the four oxen, which were used as beasts of burden, and one steer, a young ox that was growing to replace one of its elder brothers in due course. James also owned a bull from which he bred his next generation of stock.

The sheep were the next most valuable asset on the farm and his flock of 116 animals were valued at £13 10s. Most of the income from these

animals would have come from their wool. The Surrey woollen industry was still very important in the late sixteenth century and the wool from his flock would have been made into cloth locally and then sent into Guildford or Godalming for finishing and exporting.

James's other animals were his horses - two geldings and three mares - and his pigs. The latter were valued at only £2 which, compared to a similar inventory of 1575 from Shamley Green, suggests that he had about a dozen beasts.¹² Judging by the five bacon flitches curing in the roof, these were largely produced for home consumption.

The wool trade

The towns of Guildford and Godalming had become wealthy by the thirteenth century. It was a prosperity that was based largely on the wool trade that still thrived during the early seventeenth century. It was the Cistercians, founders of Waverley Abbey, who introduced commercial wool production in southwest Surrey during the twelfth century. The downland and commons supported vast flocks of sheep and the cloth was produced in the villages and farms around the town. It was then sent into the towns for finishing. Firstly, it was washed and pounded with fuller's earth in the town's fulling mills to remove the grease. It was then dyed and dried on racks, the drying-frames that gave their name to Racks Close just off Quarry Street in Guildford. The nap was raised with teasels and then sheared off to give a smooth surface. The cloth, which was known as kersey, was then ready for sale with much of it going for export to the continent.

By the end of the seventeenth century the cloth trade had all but died in Guildford but the historic importance of the wool industry is still acknowledged today by the woolpack that appears on the coats of arms of both Guildford and Godalming.

The arable side of the business was also significant. James's crops consisted of ten acres of wheat, five acres of rye, ten acres of barley, eight acres of oats and three acres of tares (a cultivated vetch) that were valued at £11 9s 4d. Some of the previous year's harvest was still piled in the barn. The will reveals that Westbury Farm included arable land on "the Downe" where James was growing wheat, barley and peas. This was on the southern slope of the Hog's Back "above the marlpitts". Marl is a mixture of chalk and clay that was used to give heart to lighter, sandy soils. This indicates that the pits were at the bottom of the south slope of the Downs where the gault clay outcrops under the chalk. The farm also

¹² Will & probate inventory of John Gosden. Doc. no.1575B28/1 & 2, HRO.

included a separate arable holding, Fowlers Croft (where the twentieth century housing estate now stands), on which grew three strips of tares.

Seven years after the death of James Westbrooke, Henry Verowe and his wife Agnes took on the lease of the farm for the usual period of twenty-one years. This raises the question of who was farming Westbury during the years immediately following Westbrooke's death. Was it one of his sons, possibly William, who had inherited the lion's share of the capital equipment or was it someone else for whom the lease has not survived? Also, was Agnes Verowe perhaps the daughter of James Westbrooke in which case the farm had thus stayed in the family?

Henry Verowe held the lease of Westbury for the full term and it was renewed in 1600, this time for the period of his life. He left the farm some time in the early seventeenth century and, by 1625, Henry Peytoe and his son-in-law Robert Harding were the tenants.¹³

Changes to the house and farm

The years following the death of James Westbrook were to see alterations to the house, changes that were typical of the time, which would bring it up-to-date and make it more desirable to any prospective tenants.

First came the chimney. As Harrison noted in 1570, the late sixteenth century saw many new chimneys sprouting out of old roofs. These were a very significant improvement on the old way of having an open fire on the floor of the hall. Not only was the smoke channelled neatly out of the house but also the narrow flues of the chimney made the fire draw, burn and radiate heat more effectively. Moreover, it was possible to have a hearth in more than one room in the house, including those upstairs. The reintroduction of bricks into England was instrumental in this change. A fireproof building material, they had had begun to be imported into this country from Holland during the sixteenth century and, for the first time since the departure of the Romans, bricks were once more being made here. They were initially expensive and reserved for the most prestigious buildings. However, as production increased so prices fell and they became more commonly available.

The building of the chimney enabled the open hall to be removed. The fashion for open halls passed suddenly and dendrochronological analysis of Surrey houses has shown that no new hall houses were built after

¹³ LM/350/1, SHC.

1540.¹⁴ As the sixteenth century progressed new houses were being built with two storeys throughout and with either a smoke bay or smoke hood to channel smoke out of the building. At the same time, older houses with open halls were being converted to the newer style by having a floor inserted to create an upper storey within the hall space. This was often done one bay at a time, creating one extra chamber within the hall whilst leaving one bay open to channel the smoke out of the house. Whether this occurred at Westbury is not certain but we do know that at least one bay was still open in 1570 as James Westbrook had some bacon fitches being smoked in the roof when he died.

Brick making

During the seventeenth century, brick making became very much a local industry and the common of Pease Marsh had a number of brick kilns around its edge. The nearest was at Brickfields on the eastern boundary of the parish near Binscombe but there were others at Littleton and by the Old Portsmouth Road. The industry continued until the beginning of the twentieth century. The clay pits still survive as a reminder of Compton's industrial past, although they have reverted to meadow and woodland.

Why were these changes made? Was it just a response to the desire for an improved standard of living and more living space or were there other factors at work? Perhaps social changes following the reformation made the hierarchical structure that was embodied in the layout of the open hall old-fashioned or could it be that the worsening climate also had a hand in prompting the alterations? The climate of the British Isles deteriorated rapidly during the late sixteenth century and into the seventeenth with the winters becoming dramatically colder. It reached a nadir in the mid to late seventeenth century and, during the 1660s, winters were cold enough to freeze the tidal Thames sufficiently for fairs to be held on the ice. It is perhaps no coincidence that by the mid seventeenth century, new houses were being built with integral multi-flued chimneys, ceilings and draught-excluding wood panelling. Existing homes were also adapted and chimneys were installed in most of the older houses.

The seventeenth century was to see further changes to Westbury Manor. Around 1660, a new east wing was built of bargate stone with brick dressings at the corners, windows and doors, a common construction method of that period. The roof of the old house was also renewed and

¹⁴ Rod Wild & Andy Moir, *Key dating features for timber-framed dwellings in Surrey*, Vernacular Architecture, vol. 44 (2013).

the staggered butt-purlin construction of the roofs of both wings is typical of the time.

These improvements were made by the owner in order to keep up the standard of accommodation required to attract a good class of tenant to the farm. Traditionally, landlords would provide their tenants with the fixed capital for building and land improvement whilst the tenant supplied the working capital such as seeds and implements. Consequently, landowners who wanted to attract good farmers in order to maximise the return from their land did their best to upgrade their property accordingly.

Throughout the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, some aspects of the Westbury Farm leases were similar but details indicate that farming practices, and the farm itself, were changing. The house and land were always let with the condition that the manor court was to be held at the house and that the lessee should provide the dinner following the court. As in previous centuries, the lord kept the manorial dues from the court itself, i.e. the rents from the manor of Westbury tenements, together with the fines, heriots and quit rents that were due to the lord when the properties changed hands. The lord also retained the rights to hunt, hawk and fish and to cut timber trees whilst the tenants were allowed to take timber for the specific purpose of repairing the buildings but for no other reason. The tenants were also permitted to take “firebote” and “hedgebote” i.e. they could cut the underwood and pollards for firewood and for repairing hedges.

The area of land let with the house increased during the seventeenth century. When the farm was leased to Henry Peytoe and Robert Harding in 1625, it included an additional eight acres of pasture and a nine-acre close in Polsted called Mellershes.¹⁵ When John Wakeford was granted the lease of Westbury in 1672, the area of land in Polsted had risen to 33½ acres.¹⁶

The century also saw a shift in emphasis away from the farming regime of James Westbrooke’s time. It is evident from his will that, although his was very much a mixed farm, animal husbandry was the most lucrative part of his business and that, consequently, a considerable area of his land must have been under meadow or pasture. A century later, the picture was different. Of the 148 acres of land farmed by John Wakeford in 1682, only the eight acres of Westbury Mead remained under grass. The rest consisted of 118 acres of arable and 22 acres of woodland. This apparent

¹⁵ LM/350/1, SHC.

¹⁶ LM/351/63/1, SHC

reduction in the area of grassland may be a reflection of the reduced importance of the wool industry in the area that, by the 1680s, was very much in decline.¹⁷ The farming economy was moving rapidly away from a subsistence and local economy of small farms towards a regional market-driven economy led by the demands of the growing urban areas, particularly London. There was an emphasis on increased production and improved varieties of both arable crops and livestock.



An extract of the map of Loseley estate of 1777 showing Westbury manor farm house and its outbuildings. The areas marked in blue were not a part of the estate.

For the tenants of Westbury, too, there were economic changes. Their wealth increased during the century and they appear to have had commercial interests beyond Westbury Farm. The wills of Peytoe and Harding show that they were very much richer than James Westbrooke. When he died in 1633, Henry Peytoe gave large monetary bequests: £2 each to his grandchildren and £30 to his son for the education of his grandson over three years. Moreover, his ownership of valuable items such as bowls, a large salt and spoons, all of silver, indicate a standard of comfort far above that of Westbrooke's time sixty years earlier. Peytoe's lesser household items were not considered worthy of mention suggesting

¹⁷ Survey of Loseley estate 1682, LM/1847/5, SHC.

that, unlike Westbrooke's humble belongings that were counted down to the last table napkin, they represented but a small proportion of his total wealth and were too numerous to enumerate individually.¹⁸

Robert Harding's will of 1648 also indicates a level of affluence that would be unimaginable to his Elizabethan forebears. Again, there are large monetary bequests of £50 each to his children and there is no reference at all to his farming interests or to his personal effects. Moreover, his will was proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, the court used by the wealthier members of society. Undoubtedly, he had prospered.

In 1672, John Wakeford took the lease of Westbury and he was to be succeeded 21 years later by his son who had established a farm in Busbridge.¹⁹ Like his predecessors, John the father left considerable monetary bequests to his son, daughter and grandchildren in his will of 1696.²⁰ Also, typically for the time, there was an emphasis on his bedding with beds, bolster, pillows, coverlets and blankets all carefully passed to various members of his family, even though no other household goods are mentioned. Wills from this period frequently dwell on what were evidently regarded as very important items. This was understandable, perhaps, in an era of long, very cold winters.

The eighteenth century

Throughout the seventeenth and into the eighteenth centuries, agriculture was increasingly driven by the demands of the market. It became more efficient and competitive whilst land holdings became larger with farms increasingly producing food for the growing conurbations. Many farmers became wealthy during this period. Some began to style themselves as gentlemen and they looked for houses that suited their perception of their social status, together with suitable, well-appointed farmsteads. And they expected landlords to provide them: a draft lease of April 1716 records that the owner of Westbury Manor, Sir Thomas-Molyneux, undertook to build a further extension to the east wing of the house and construct new stables as a part of the agreement to lease Westbury Manor to Francis Denyer of Thursley.²¹ However, Denyer did not take on the farm and the agreement was never signed, perhaps because the promised building had not been started.

¹⁸ DW/PA/7/12 f.187r-189v; DW/PA/1633/103, Surrey Archdeaconry Court, LMA.

¹⁹ Leases: LM/351/63/1 and LM/353/16, SHC.

²⁰ DW/PA/7/17 pp358-60; DW/PA/5/1698/77, Surrey Archdeaconry Court, LMA.

²¹ LM/356/9, SHC.

In May 1718, another lease that was drawn up when John Goddard was to rent the farm indicates that work was underway and that the foundations of the house extension had at last been laid.²² Goddard was evidently satisfied with the proposal and took on the lease for the usual period of twenty-one years paying £73 per annum plus two fat capons at Christmas.

Westbury Farm must have suited the Goddard family for they were to remain there for the next seventy years. During that time, the area of the farm changed when the land at Polsted was detached from it in around 1760 and incorporated into the Mellersh Farm holding. The 1777 survey of the Loseley estate shows that John Goddard was renting the adjacent lands, together with the fields on the side of the Hog's Back.²³ He died during that year and his widow, Mary, continued to hold the tenancy of Westbury. During her last few years, it was probably her son-in-law, Thomas Woodham, who ran the farm for it was he who took on the tenancy after Mary died in 1786.²⁴

The survey indicates that Westbury and the other farms of the Loseley estate were predominantly arable at that time, continuing the pattern that had been established early in the previous century. It was evidently the favoured regime of the tenants but when a new landlord inherited the estate, he began to see other possibilities.

James More-Molyneux inherited Loseley and the lordship of the manor of Westbury in 1802. He was to take an active interest in the farming of his estate and, as the years passed, he became very cynical and critical of his tenants' methods, particularly those of Thomas Woodham:

“If chalk was not to hand my sand-tenants would be complaining that they could not farm the sands to advantage without lime but as it is to be had at an easy price this tenant [i.e. Woodham], John Whitbourn and Greentree seldom ever use it.”

In 1816, possibly because of the changed economic circumstances following the end of the Napoleonic Wars, he was concerned about the lack of pasture on his estate and on Westbury Farm in particular. There was just 16 acres of pasture out of a farm of 158 acres and he wrote (apparently to his land agent) specifying that the Homefield, three acres next to the farmstead, and 7½ acres in the Bummoors were to be returned to pasture. He was resolved to change their agricultural practices and was

²² LM/356/22, SHC.

²³ LM/806, SHC.

²⁴ DW/PA/7/30/ pp 417-8, DW/PA/5/77/14, Surrey Archdeaconry Court, LMA.

intent on imposing his will on the tenant, Thomas Woodham, and on his other farms:

*“I will force the tenant into a better system of modern and improved agriculture and lead him to depend more on livestock, particularly sheep, than our tenants do at present. All my farms have good turnip lands but this advantage is lost from the present deficiency of pasture to receive the sheep when the turnips are fed off. We must remedy this improvidence”.*²⁵

This may have been a reaction to the sudden change in circumstances brought about by the end of the Napoleonic Wars at Waterloo in 1815. Napoleon’s defeat saw the end of a period of plenty for British farmers. The French blockade of the British coastal ports had reduced the import of foreign food and home agriculture had expanded in an attempt to provide the country with the produce it needed. The end of the war enabled grain imports to enter the country once more and prices slumped. This ushered in a period of depression in the industry that was to last for decades. It seems likely that More-Molyneux’s outburst was a reaction to this change, perhaps believing that animal husbandry was a safer option, as the technology did not then exist to enable the importation of meat products. Times were becoming increasingly tough and in 1817, when Woodham’s lease was renewed, it was not for the usual twenty-one year term but merely six months notice either way. He was not there for much longer and, in 1819, Richard Hammond had become the new tenant of Westbury.

The sale of the house

Whether James More-Molyneux was successful in his endeavours, we cannot tell. He died not many years after making this declaration and, in 1823, his son, James, inherited the estate, together with the manor of Westbury, its farm and house. It was a difficult time for landowners and farmers because the slump in agricultural prices had caused many farmers to go out of business. They lost income, they could not service loans and many farms ceased to be viable. Consequently, during the 1820s and the “Hungry Thirties” much land went out of production.

The manor court feast

By the late eighteenth century, the tenant of Westbury no longer prepared and served the feast and, instead, the company retired to Thomas Whitlaw’s inn, The Good Woman, just down the Street. The dinners seem to have been convivial affairs for bills from this period show that food, together with beer, punch and tobacco, was typically provided for about 18 people. The Good Woman, was renamed The Harrow when John Kerry became the licensee in 1824.

It was during his period of ownership that the most profound changes for over 500 years were to affect the house and farm, changes that were prompted by the continued agricultural depression. Since the acquisition of the manor of Westbury by the Abbot of Dureford in the fourteenth century, the house had not only been the home of a succession of tenant farmers but also the venue for the meetings of the manor court. Every year, the steward and the tenants of the manor met in the Hall, and in later years the parlour, of the farmhouse and reported the property transactions that had taken place since the previous court. Each sale of a Westbury manor tenement or the death of one of its tenants was recorded in the court rolls and the properties were ceremonially passed to the new holders. Then, when the formal proceedings were finished, the company partook of the traditional court dinner.



Compton Street by Edward Hassell, 1830

All this was to change three years after James More-Molyneux inherited the property when, in 1827, he leased the southernmost portion of Westbury Farm's land to George Smallpiece, the owner of Field Place. The house itself was not included in this transaction and so, although still in the same ownership, it was separated from its traditional land holding.

About ten years later, the manor house was to be parted from the jurisdiction that was, and still is, manor of Westbury. In the mid 1830s, James More-Molyneux bought Eastbury Manor, its house and lands. Shortly afterwards, in 1837, he sold it to George Best along with Westbury Farm, the ancient house and its adjacent land. The lordship of the manor of Westbury was retained by More-Molyneux.

The new owner of the Eastbury House and Westbury Farm was neither a farmer or from an ancient landowning family but a successful lawyer. Best came to Compton from Chertsey and purposefully set about building up a landed estate. Despite the poor income that could be derived from agriculture, possession of land, with a country house and park, imbued an aura of power and influence. Consequently, many wealthy men in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries sought to create for themselves this ultimate status symbol. And the 1830s was a good time to do it for the agricultural depression meant that land was cheap.

William Cobbett

In the early nineteenth century, Cobbett railed against the growing concentration of land ownership. In his Political Register he declared that land speculation had "driven the real property of the nation into fewer hands . . . moulded many farms into one . . . [and] almost . . . extinguished the race of small farmers" whose houses were now occupied by labourers.

Although but a single transaction, the sale of Westbury can be seen as a part of a general trend towards concentrated property ownership occurring at that time. Throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the tendency was for land to be owned by fewer people. Small farmers were becoming increasingly marginalised and many who had relied on common grazing rights found that their livelihood was destroyed when common lands were enclosed. Locally, the Pease Marsh common was enclosed after an Act of Parliament of 1803 and hundreds of acres of previously free grazing were denied to the local small farmers. Some of these former smallholders moved to the burgeoning industrial cities whilst others emigrated to the new colonies. Others, the less adventurous perhaps, joined the ranks of the landless labourers, an ever-growing pool of labour that vied for employment on the remaining farms.

These changes were partly due to the increasing industrialisation of agriculture and due to farmers seeking greater efficiencies to drive down costs to compete with foreign imports. Little by little, land that had previously been owned by many small farmers became concentrated into the hands of the few. The growth of the Eastbury estate was a part of this

pattern with its owner acquiring smaller Compton properties as they became available. These were the traditional manorial tenements that had been held from the lord of the manor since medieval times. Typically, they consisted of a house in the Street, and a few acres of land elsewhere in the parish. One by one, they were incorporated into the Eastbury estate, their land becoming a part of its farm, park and gardens whilst the houses themselves became the cottages for the estate servants and labourers.



Westbury manor house and the cart barn known as Abbots Stable photographed by Benjamin Brecknell-Turner in the early 1850s.

Victorian times

Demotion to the status of workers' dwellings was the fate of many of the old timber-framed houses of Surrey. Originally the homes of independent farmers, by the eighteenth century many had been superseded by modern brick or stone houses which were more comfortable, less draughty and built in a style more befitting the occupants' perception of their social status. Moreover, the reduction in the number of farms led to an increase in the number of redundant farmhouses. This, together with the growth in the population of agricultural labourers, led to the old houses being converted into cottages for the growing population of rural poor. Such was the fate of Westbury Manor. By the time of the 1841 tithe survey and

census the house had been split into two cottages and had become the homes of two families of estate servants.

In the timber-framed, south wing of the house lived Jonathan and Phoebe Matter with their four young children. They were aged about thirty and their eldest child, James, was eight years old. Jonathan was employed as a servant but there is no other information given about his occupation. Their neighbours in the east wing of the house were John and Sarah Chandler. John was in his late fifties and Sarah was four years his senior. He too was classified as a servant but the 1851 census is more specific revealing that he was an agricultural bailiff – in modern terms, a farm manager. As a senior estate worker, he had been assigned one of the better houses in the village.

The estate water supply

In the late nineteenth century, the estate had constructed a water and sewage system to serve Eastbury House and the estate cottages in the Street. A single-cylinder diesel engine housed in the building at the bottom of Stoney Walk each morning pumped water from a borehole and up the hill to a reservoir above Brixbury Field. This provided a water supply to Eastbury and its cottages and also allowed the village to be connected to a sewage disposal system. This was a far-seeing act for very few rural labourers' cottages could boast such a luxury as a flushing water closet. The reservoir still exists and the remains of the sewage works can still be seen in Westbury Mead.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to identify who was living in the other half of the house in 1851 because the census enumerator did not follow a logical sequence around the village nor did he identify the individual houses. The same problem of identification exists with the 1861 returns although it is apparent that Mr & Mrs Chandler were still living in Westbury Road.

The returns of 1871 shows that there was only one household in “Westbury Cottage”, - indeed this may have been the case in the previous two census years. The occupier was James Cutlar who earned his living as a shepherd. James was in his fifties and lived there with his married daughter, Elizabeth Sprately, and her daughter Sarah. Curiously, neither James's or Elizabeth's spouses were in residence on census day.

After George Best's death, General Charles Hagart bought the estate in 1872 and soon rebuilt Eastbury House. Like Best, he and his successors followed a policy of purchasing village properties. The General was not

at Eastbury for many years for he died in 1879 when the estate passed to his brother, James McCaul Hagart. The evidence suggests that life for the estate tenants was good under the Hagart regime. There were tenants of long-standing in the village, new estate cottages were built and a domestic water supply was created that served not only Eastbury House but also each of the tenanted houses in the Street.



Westbury Manor House in the late nineteenth century.

By 1881, Westbury was the home to one of these long-term servants, the Eastbury Manor gardener, Noah Fullegar and his wife, Jane. They had no children and, after Jane died in 1899, Noah continued to live at Westbury with a housekeeper. He later remarried and, under the paternalistic eye of the Hagart regime, he and Anne were to remain at Westbury for all of his working life and after. Noah was in an enviable position compared to many of his contemporaries: he worked for a good employer doing a job where he would have been left very much to his own devices and he also had the good fortune to be able to remain in his home after his retirement. It was typical of the paternalistic attitude of the Eastbury estate owners that their old servant was allowed to continue living in his home long after he had ceased work. Noah was aged ninety when he died in 1942 having lived at Westbury for over sixty years. His widow, Anne, died the following year.

The twentieth century

The Hagart family continued to own and farm the Eastbury estate into the twentieth century. Colonel McCaul Hagart died in 1895 and his sister Eliza Stewart Ellice inherited the estate where she lived until her death in 1910. The Eastbury estate was all enveloping. A new farmstead had been built by the 1890s (this has now converted to houses and named Angel Court) and the Eastbury estate provided work for much of the village population. Further properties were bought as they became available and by the early 1960s, nearly all the houses in the Street were owned by Eastbury and lived in by estate workers. Many, like Noah Fullegar, were retired with a life tenancy. The rents were small: in 1963, North Cottage and South Cottage were each let for the sum of 7/6 per week and many villagers, such as Mrs Walker at White Hart Cottage, had a rent free tenancy for life. Until recently some of the houses, e.g. Wood's Cottage and Goddard's Cottage were still known by the names of the estate servants who lived in them.²⁶

This paternalistic, Victorian society survived until the Eastbury Manor estate was sold in 1963. It lasted longer than a great many similar estate villages and was an anachronism, a nineteenth century survival in a post-war world. After the sale, as those holding life tenancies died or left their houses, the buildings were improved and new occupiers moved in. The new owners and occupiers of the house were very different from the estate servants of the previous century or more. The estate cottages were now sought after by a new breed of countryman – the city commuter. Easy access to London by road and rail made Compton a very desirable place to live and, like George Best over 130 years before, city people sought to establish their home in the country. This major social change occurred in the village over a very short time. The metamorphosis from Victorian tied estate village to one that was almost entirely owner-occupied took place within about ten to fifteen years.

Westbury Manor was one of the principal lots in the 1963 sale and the house and garden sold for £10,250. The new owners of Westbury were Anthony and Peta Matthews who became the first ever owner-occupiers of Westbury Manor. He was a London stockbroker and together they set about renovating and extending the house. John Young of Godalming was one of the bricklayers employed by the building firm who built the new north wing, David Fry and Sons. He worked on the new extension in the mid 1960s and he remembers that Mr Matthews frequently worked from a small office in the garden near the swimming pool. Mrs Matthews was a

²⁶ Sale particulars for, Eastbury Manor Farm estate, 1963. Doc. no. 1354/2 GMR.

keen rider and kept horses in Brixbury Field opposite the house. It was about that time that Mr Matthews was killed in a car accident at Brook. Mrs Matthews subsequently married John Hancock, the owner of the antique shop in the old Compton stores, and they lived together at Westbury Manor until 1981 when they sold it to Nigel and Andrina Neal. Mr & Mrs Neal were to remain at Westbury for about a decade and they sold the house to the present owners and occupiers, John and Thea Adair.

The records of the manor of Westbury tell us of many changes that have affected the property since before the Norman Conquest. There have been changes in the ownership, occupation and status of the house but the basic structure of the medieval building itself has survived, even though it has been extended and adapted to the shifting economic circumstances and the needs of its various inhabitants. Despite these changes, there is a sense of permanence and stability about Westbury Manor that is, perhaps, represented most forcefully in the age-old use of the name itself. It has seen many changes and there will doubtless be more but let us hope that the house will continue to be a part of the Compton village scene for many generations to come.



Appendix 1a

Will of James Westbrook of Compton, yeoman, 1570,
Proved 23rd October 1574.²⁷

In the name of God Amen the xxiith of Aprill An(n)o D(o)m(ini) 1570 I James Westbrooke of Compton juxta Guilford in the County of Surry sick in body yet of good & p(er)fect memory thanks be to God do constitute ordaine & make this my last will and testament in maner & forme following ffirst I bequeth my Soule to allmightie God my creator to his sonn Jhesus Christ my redeemer & to the holy ghost my comforter my body to be buried in the churchyard of Compton above written.

Item I give to the pore mens box of the said parish iis

Item I give to William More esquire six wethers desiring him to be good to my children;

Item I give to my son William Westbrooke fower oxen two geldings, one mare colour grey, one wagon one plow, ii harrows w(i)th yokes, tyms and all other things belonging to the said wagons, plow & harrowes, xx wethers & xx ewes;

Item I give to John my sonn xx wethers, one white faced cow, ii acres of barly lying above the marlepitts, i acre of wheat in Crabtree Croft beneth the olde hedge the uppermost acre of pese upon the Downe;

Item I give & bequeth to George my sonn one black cow named Swallow, xii shepe, half of the age of two years & half of the age of i year, i acre of barly above the marlpitts next above his brother John's acre, i acre of wheat three landes of fetches in Fowlers Croft next the gate, i acre of otes in Shepelands next William Juwards gate;

Item I give to Thomas, my sonn, i black cow named Joye xii shepe halfe of the age of ii years, halfe of the age of i yere, i acre of barly next above his brother George's, i acre of wheat beneth his brother George's, I acre of otes in Shepelands being the middle acre;

Item I give to Agnes my daughter i red cow named _____, ten barron ewes, x lambes, i acre of barly next above her brother Thomas, i acre of whete next above the olde dich, i acre of otes in Shepeland, i flockbed whiche doth continuallie ly upon i payer of canvas sheets, i coverlet belonging to the saide bed, i cheste that was her mothers, iii of her mothers best kerchers, her mothers best hat, ii of her best neckerchers, my best pewter platter & my worste, my best candlestick, i little cauldron called a tinkers cawdron, my wifes wedding ring, her tach hokes & a silver pin;

Item I give to Thomas Westbroke my servant i black hecfer ii yeres of age, ii barren ewes, half a quarter of whete & half a quarter of barly the said whete & barly to be deliv(er)ed at the feaste of the purification of the Virgin Mary next ensuing the date thereof;

²⁷ Ref: 1574B180/1, Hants R.O.

Item I give to my servant William Wheler half a quarter of whete & half a quarter of barley to be deliv(er)ed the xiiith day of April next & immediately ensuing the date here;

Item I give to Florence Punter my servant xiii^s iiiii^d in money to be paid w(i)thin one month next after my decease or dep(ar)ture owte of this worlde, half a quarter of barley to be deliv(er)ed at the feast of the purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary next ensuing, i canvas saick, i Holland kercher, ii lockrum kerchers & a grey, russet peticote;

Item I give to the wife of John Wodier the elder i russet frock;

Item to the wife of Richard Juwarde my wifes best peticote except one colour red;

All the residew of my wifes raiment not above given & bequeathed I give to Agnes my daughter;

Item I give & beqeth to Ellen Weste widow iii^s iiiii^d;

Item I give to the wife of Thomas Turner iii^s iiiii^d;

Item I give to Peter Smith my brother in law my beste white russet cote;

Item I give to Edmund Smith my brother in law my best payer of hose, i paire excepted;

Item I give & bequeth to Henry Courtes my worste paier of hose;

Item I give to Edward Punter i olde dublet;

Item I give & bequeth to the wife of Thomas Westbroke my brother, i red heckfer of the age of ii yeres;

Item I give to ev(er)ie of my Godchildren vi^d moreover my will is that Thomas Westbroke my brother shall have custody & keeping of my sonn Thomas with all & singular goods cattells which I have given him in this my last will & testament And if my saide sonn Thomas dy before the age of xxi yeres, my will is that Thomas Westbrooke my brother shall have one halfe of his goods and the other halfe to remayne to the residew of my children then living;

All the residew of my goods and cattells not above given & bequeathed I give & bequeth to William Westbroke my sonn whom I make sole & full executor of this my last will & testament And he to see me honestlie buried And to see all my legacies & bequests p(re)s(er)ved and kept & all my debts discharged & paid And I make Thomas Westbroke my brother & Richard Juward sup(er)visors or ov(er)seers of this my last will and testament And I give to eithe of them for their paines therein to ___ sustained over & above there charges therein to be expended x^s;

These being witnesses Thomas Tavaner & Thomas Brodbridge w(i)th others & the Lord have mercy on me Amen.

Appendix 1b

Probate inventory of James Westbrook of Compton, yeoman, 1570.²⁸

The inventory of all the goods & chattels of James Westbroke of Compton juxta Guildford in the County of Surrey deceased priced or valued xxv day of April 1570 by William Cheloran gent Thomas Turner George Merlyne John Turner & Thomas Brodbridge.

Imprimis	in the hall	
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>table ii benches & a form</i>	<i>ii^s vi^d</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>ii coberds & ii chelves</i>	<i>xii^s</i>
	in the chambers	
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>iii flockbeds iii cov(er)lets ii blankets iii bedlestedells ii feather bolsters i flock bolster & ii pillowes</i>	<i>xx^s</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>ii cawdrons iii kettles & a pan</i>	<i>xvi^s</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>ii brasse pots & a chafer</i>	<i>x^s</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>i latten bason ii laten candlesticks & a brasse ladle</i>	<i>iii^s</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>v pewter platters iii pewter disshes ii sawsers iii salt sellers & iii dozen of tinnen spones</i>	<i>xvi^s iii^d</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>a paier of pothangers a paier of pothokes a broch an anndiern a dripping pan a chafing dish ii trivets a frieng pan & a gridiern</i>	<i>v^s</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>iii table clothes ii paier of locaram sheets ii payer of canvas sheets & ii table napkins</i>	<i>x^s</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>iiii chests</i>	<i>iiii^s</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>a quarter of whete</i>	<i>xx^s</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>ii quarters of barley</i>	<i>xviii^s viii^d</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>iii quarters malte</i>	<i>xxxⁱ^s</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>v bacon hoges in the rofe</i>	<i>xxv^s</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>in the barne by estimac(on) iii quarters of rye</i>	<i>lvi^s viii^d</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>iiii quarters of barley in the barne by estimacon</i>	<i>xxxvii^s iii^d</i>

²⁸ 1574B180/2, Hants R.O.

<i>It(em)</i>	<i>a wagon with iron bounde wheles a plow with yokes chaynes & all things thereto p(er)taining & i paire of whele bayls ii old dung potts w(i)thout wheles and ii harrowes</i>	<i>iii^l xiiii^s</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>iii axes ii bills ii shovels with certain other implaments & trifles belonging to husbandry</i>	<i>vi^s</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>all his apparel & his wifes</i>	<i>iii^l</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>his dagger & his girdle</i>	<i>xii^d</i>
	<i>money in his purse</i>	<i>x^s</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>certaine tubbs stobins & standes w(i)th certain other trumpery & lumber in the kitchin</i>	<i>x^s</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>iii stone potts iiiii dozen of trenchers</i>	<i>x^d</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>iiii oxen</i>	<i>vi^l xiii^s iiiii^d</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>v kyne</i>	<i>v^l</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>iiii heckfers i younger bull & a stere</i>	<i>iiii^l</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>ii gelding & iii mares</i>	<i>iiii^l</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>xvii ewes & xiiii lambes</i>	<i>iii^l</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>liii wethers</i>	<i>vii^l x^s</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>xxxii teggs</i>	<i>iii^l</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>all the swyne</i>	<i>x^ls</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>x acres of whete upon the grounde</i>	<i>vi^l xiii^s iiiii^d</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>v acres of rye</i>	<i>l^s</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>x acres of barley</i>	<i>iii^l</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>viii acres of smale oats</i>	<i>xxxii^s</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>iii acres of teares</i>	<i>viii^s</i>
<i>It(em)</i>	<i>a lease for terme of years of Westbury lordship xv yeares to come</i>	<i>[not priced]</i>
	<i>sum(ma) to(ta)lis</i>	<i>lxxii^l xii^s</i>

Glossary

Anndirons	Andirons or firedogs. Horizontal supported on three short feet with upright pillar in front. To support logs in an open fire.
Bedlestedell	Bedstead.
Broch	A broach or spit.
Buckeram	A fine linen or cotton fabric.
Canvasse	Canvas; a fine unbleached cloth made of flax or hemp.
Chafer	A small, enclosed brazier containing hot charcoals for heating food and drink.
Chelves	Probably shelves
Coberd	Cupboard.
Flock bed	Mattress stuffed with reused wool.
Heckfer	A heifer that has not had a calf.
Kerchers	A scarf.
Kyne	Usually the milking cows of the herd.
Landes	A cultivated strip of land.
Latten	An alloy of copper, lead, zinc and tin.
Oxen	Bulls rendered docile for farm service by castration.
Lockeram	A coarse loosely woven linen.
Quarter	A measure of grain (one quarter = eight bushels)
Rofe	Roof.
Sawcer	Circular, small shallow dish or deep plate in which salt or sauce were place on the table.
Spones	Spoons.
Stere	Young ox
Stobin	A small cask.
Tach hoke	A clothes clasp.
Teares	Tares, a cultivated vetch grown as fodder.
Tegge	Sheep in its second year.
Wether	A castrated sheep, usually in its second season.

