

C O W F O L D

The Historical Background

[Researched and written by David Pavitt c1970]

Foreword

1. The Contents List at the beginning of the document includes four chapters. Chapter IV, "A Time of Change", was not included in the document and it is assumed that this was not written.
2. There was also a separate unfinished manuscript with the heading "Cowfold Parish Council". It has been assumed that this formed part of Chapter 3, Section 5, "Village Life and Government" and has been added to the end of this section.
3. There were three additional manuscripts: "Glossary of Terms", "House Price Chart" and "Listed Buildings" in the archives. These have been added as appendices to the document.

C O W F O L D

The Historical Background

- I In the Beginning
- II The Village is Born
- III The Evolving Village: 15th to 19th Centuries
 - 4. Population, Housing and the Village
 - 5. The Manors and Land Holdings
 - 6. Agriculture, the Village Economy and the Labouring Poor
 - 7. Roads and Communities
 - 8. Village Life and Government
- IV A Time of Change

[Researched and written by David Pavitt c1970]

I. IN THE BEGINNING . . .

Cowfold in the 1970s is surely not remote from the developments which affect the quality of English life today. Placed in a pleasant countryside which now attracts commuters to London and the surrounding areas, it also lies at the junction of a major motor route from the Home Counties to the South Coast and of the A272 linking the South East with points further west. Hence the boom in motor traffic through the village especially in summer while industrial haulage swells its weight. The advent of air transport whose routes from Gatwick lie over the village adds to the villagers' awareness of being in a busy zone of movement. If the Age of Mobility brings its problems one is no less aware of being in a fast developing corner of England where population growth with its attendant anxieties is a frequent matter of debate. Again, though in an agricultural setting only a fraction of Cowfold's population is now engaged directly on the land and rather has its livelihood outside the parish boundaries. For many of her wants the housewife also goes to shopping centres miles away from the village.

These developments are perhaps the clichés of present day life in England but to have imagined the change they represent would have seemed to one viewing them from the Cowfold standpoint 150 years ago a far fetched dream. If one could go further back and have stood where the A281/272 crossroads are 1,500 years ago the change in pattern in the area would have been inconceivable; all around would have stretched mile upon mile of thickly wooded landscape, one's only company the occasional wild boar or deer rooting round under the trees. It is a telling thought that at the time of our imaginary stand under the forest boughs, say about AD450, peering through the undergrowth for some wider vista of the country around, the history of England as a whole had already passed through several momentous stages alive with human creativity and activity; Celtic civilisation had blossomed and waned to be followed by the development of Roman Britain. The events connected with these periods had become history and Britain now awaited the Saxon settlement, a settlement which would eventually put Cowfold on the map.

The reason for the long absence of human activity around Cowfold, and indeed in most of the Wealden area, lay in the characteristics of the forest itself. Between the lines of the North and South Downs stretched a wilderness of trees the very extent of which was forbidding. The forest was thickest on the lower clay lands where the oak abounded providing food for the wild boar lurking in the undergrowth and the ground itself was cold, heavy and often waterlogged. The streams and brooks threading the country were probably wider than now, bordered by bog and marshland making travel difficult for those who might venture in subduing fears of being eternally lost in the unknown. In several places within the parish the line dividing the flood plain of the streams from the rising slopes above is quite marked and time, drainage and the efforts of man have since contributed to confine the water channels to narrower limits. The undulating levels of the oak forest spread inwards from the Downs, perhaps thinner and less inhospitable along the line of the greensand ridges running east-west below the chalk slopes, until the landscape again opened up with its rise to

the High Wealden ridges of St Leonard's and Ashdown Forests some hundreds of feet above the clays. The High Weald with its drier geology presented a more heathy appearance, more in the character of Ashdown Forest today than of the thickly wooded areas now lying over parts of St Leonards. This drier countryside was more conducive to settlement by man who in prehistoric times made his home in various areas of the Wealden ridges. Such habitation was however sparse by comparison with settlement along the Downs where the requirements of an agricultural civilisation, such as natural drainage and an open cultivatable landscape, were well satisfied.

Some impression of the Weald as it must then have appeared can still be obtained looking over it from the Downs in summer. Beyond the foreground the trees seem to close in, concealing present open spaces and merging into a sea of greenery reaching away into the distance. Views within the Weald too are generally closed by trees whether lacing the thick hedges or in wood and copse. Nevertheless a great deal of imagination is still necessary to recreate the Wealden forest as the 'other world' and the barrier it was to people living to the north or south in early times.

Within this area the present parish of Cowfold lies mainly on the clay but the ridges of the High Weald encroach into its north-eastern parts down to Wallhurst. Below those steeper slopes the country rolls gently southwards forming the shallow basin of a stream flowing down from St Leonard's towards the Adur and to which, for convenience, we may give the name Whitingroll, by which it was called in a survey of the 17th century though it seems to be nameless now. Towards the boundaries of the parish on either side of this basin the land rises slightly. Low ridges project from east and from west towards the Whitingroll about midway in its course through the parish, pinching the lower levels into a narrow valley before they open out again to the south and it is on the western ridge that the village of Cowfold subsequently grew up. Over all this area apart possibly from the slopes north of Wallhurst would have spread the oak forest, perhaps with occasional clearings or lighter covering where higher or sloping ground was less damp.

Lack of sustenance within the forest together with Cowfold being far from its southern borders below the Downs no doubt discouraged much human penetration as far as the parish area in early times. There is however evidence that man was present in the Bronze Age, briefly at least, for early in the present century a hoard of flint implements was found in a field on the north-west side of Wallhurst. Significantly this location is on the slopes of the central Weald rather than in the denser woodland lower down. Whether these were settled people is probably open to doubt and it is more likely that they were semi-nomadic hunters where there was game to be found. After this we have no knowledge of human activity for many centuries and, though the Weald did not prove an absolute barrier to Roman determination, Cowfold seems to have lain in a wilderness between any scenes of Roman activity. To the west Stane Street was pioneered through the forest from London by Pulborough to Chichester and another Roman road was driven through from London by Ardingly to the Downs above Portslade. This period saw the

exploitation by the Romans of the Weald's potential as a supplier of iron, a potential which was later to be one of its chief assets to the nation, and recent discoveries at Crawley have revealed a substantial iron producing site there in the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD. Apart from the echoes of these developments and the possible passage of hunting parties Cowfold continued to lie at peace under its green boughs. Then the Romans departed and in the 470s Aelle and his Saxons landed at Selsey to begin their conquest of the Downland area of Sussex. Soon a new people had spread their villages and settlements along the length of the South Downs and looked northwards upon the forest, the Andredswald.

To the Saxons also the Weald was a daunting prospect and they were slow to take the measure of it. As with the Britons on the Downs, so to the Saxon settlers the vast green wilderness must have provoked something of the awe in which 'Darkest Africa' was held in the 19th century. Not only were the distances immeasurable and the hazards unknown but to superstitious minds the forest was the home of evil spirits. Those who ventured far into it were devil-may-care hunters, refugees from justice or the dispossessed fleeing from the new masters of their homelands. The possibility that some of the latter found a refuge within Cowfold is suggested by the derivation of the name, Wallhurst, which is a Saxon name meaning "Wood of the Britons".

As the years brought familiarisation, however, the Saxons began to exploit the forest in which one of the first assets was timber for their Downland villages. The manner in which present parishes along the Downs tend to be elongated on a north-south axis with the northern parts extending into the Wealden area suggest how the villages each claimed their share of the resources at their backs. The value of the forest for pasturing swine was also discovered and this led to deeper penetration of the Weald. At length new settlements were established in the Weald itself where conditions were favourable and the villages of the greensand belt, the soils of which were more easily turned to agriculture, resulted from these penetrations. Henfield is such a site and a manor there in its own right existed by 770.

The herdsmen may be seen as the pioneers in the opening up of the Weald. Following their droves of swine they were exploring new corners of the forest and, though slowly and by degrees, were delving ever deeper into its heart. Initially no doubt the swineherds roamed freely wherever conditions were favourable whether in accessibility or in availability of food for their animals. However, with pastures or 'dennes' being sought out by all the villages along the downs and within the fringes of the woodland the likelihood of contentious situations arising where herdsmen found themselves face to face in favoured spots with those from other communities can be imagined. The influence of the King's Law must at the same time have been following the pioneer development of the Weald so that it is reasonable to assume that in time the areas in which each village had its 'dennes' became more regulated. There began, in effect, a crystallisation of land holdings within the Weald and this manorial development brings us our first clues to the origins of Cowfold.

The manorial system with title to the community land resting in the local chief or lord under whom the lesser members held their portions and owed service seems to have grown up in the Saxon era. It was a natural development in the demarcation of territorial areas preceding the more artificial and ecclesiastical division of land into parishes. Of the manorial lands in the Weald some are related to Downland manors and thus seem to reflect the early exploitation of the region as swine pastures and colonies by the parent communities. Others are wholly Wealden and these are regarded as later foundations, most not appearing in history until the 18th century.

When Cowfold itself emerged into the light of history six manors had lands extending into the bounds of the parish. These were Beeding, Ewhurst, Shermanbury, Streatham, Wallhurst and High Hurst. The lands of Beeding Manor which lay to the north-east side of the parish from Parkgate and Hookland up to Drewitts were an appendage of Upper Beeding on the Downs. This part of Cowfold was thus probably pioneered by the herdsmen of the Downland village and their territorial claims to the area became formalised with its inclusion in Beeding Manor. If this is so, the general line of the road from Upper Beeding, through Henfield and continuing through Cowfold to Lower Beeding must have been the line of communication between the newly established 'dennes' and their parent village, making the route one of considerable antiquity.

Other trail blazers also followed the same route, at least from Henfield. Henfield is derived from Hamfelde which was the original name of the Manor of Streatham. As previously mentioned, Henfield must have been colonised fairly early and in the year 770 the manor was held by Earl Warbold and his wife Tidburga. In 770 the West Saxon King, Osmund, gave Earl Warbold sanction to grant the manor to the church and in its recorded history the lord of Streatham Manor was the Bishop of Chichester. The lands belonging to the manor in Cowfold were separated from the Henfield lands by several miles and lay in a swathe across the parish northwards from Mockford. It is a reasonable assumption therefore that the Cowfold holdings were also a pasture offshoot developed by the manor at Henfield.

With the regularisation of their 'dennes' in the forest spreading over the Cowfold area we can imagine the herdsmen erecting shelters with timber, wattle and mud to protect themselves from the elements. Individual herdsmen would choose their own places in the district to run their animals and with increasing permanence built better huts for themselves, felling the abundant timber and extending the clearings around them. Thus with the passage of time and the augmentation of the numbers subsisting on pasturage and hunting in the new areas the newcomers changed their status. Instead of wandering nomads they were becoming settlers and colonists and Cowfold had its first permanent inhabitants.

This evolution prompts the difficult question: when did it all happen? The usually accepted view is that while settlement around the fringes of the Weald including the greensand belt had made a considerable progress by late Saxon times, the colonisation of the more central parts, at least in West Sussex, was much slower and

hardly out of the swine pasture stage by the time of the Norman conquest. It was after the conquest that settlement of these deeper regions of the forest received added impetus and proceeded rapidly to produce the scatter of farmsteads such as we find around Cowfold from the 18th century. This view seems confirmed in so far as Streatham Manor is concerned for it is recorded in Domesday Book (in the Victoria County History translation) as follows:

The Bishop himself (ie of Chichester) holds in desmesne Hamfelde. In the time of King Edward it was assessed for 15 hides and now for 11 hides and one virgate. There is land for 20 ploughs. On the desmesne are 2 ploughs, and 23 villeins with 15 bordars have 10 ploughs. There is a church and 40 acres of meadow(land). A mill and a fishery are wanting because they have been made over to William de Braiose.

Of these hides William holds of the Bishop 3 hides and there he has on his desmesne 1 hide, and one villain with 10 bordars have half a plough. Woodland yielding 3 swine. The whole manor in the time of King Edward was worth £10 and afterwards £7. Now what the Bishop holds (is worth) £10; what the knight holds 40 shillings and yet it was let to farm for £18.

The lands held by the manor in 1086 seem hardly sufficient to include also the full extent of its later holdings in the Cowfold area which stretched from Mockford northwards to the village with further lands beyond even as far as Warninglid. The church mentioned in Domesday must be that of Henfield though Cowfold church subsequently stood within the territorial limits of Streatham Manor. Shermanbury Manor was also recorded in Domesday but with a small holding, the entry reading as follows:

The same Ralph (Ralph de Buci) holds of William Salmonesberie (ie Shermanbury). Azor held it of Harold. Then it was assessed for two hides; now for nothing. There is land for 2 ploughs. On the desmesne is 1 plough and (there is) 1 villein and 3 bordars with 1 plough. There (is) a chapel (ecclesiola) and 4 serfs. In the time of King Edward and afterwards, as (et) now, it was worth 24 shillings.

The first named reference to Cowfold is in 1232 and other villages in the area seem to achieve their first written record in the 13th century; for instance, Bolney, West Grinstead and Nuthurst. Ashurst comes in the 12th century but the earliest mention of Horsham appears to be in 947. Even if early written records were more frequent we would hardly expect to find such a record of a newly formed settlement until the passing of a few generations had put a degree of permanence and cohesion into the community. The 1232 reference just mentioned occurs in an agreement between the Priory of Sele at Upper Beeding and the Nunnery of Rusper which was witnessed among others by "William, chaplain of Coufaud" and this office suggests

an established community by that date. By the end of that century we shall find a plentiful distribution of farmsteads round about. If therefore this stage was the culmination of a period of human activity of a more nebulous kind it is perhaps not improbable that by the 11th century, if not earlier, Cowfold had droves of swine fattening under the oaks, its nascent trackways and scattered herdsmen's huts in grassy clearings through the forest. Seen against the national time scale these developments had occupied a period which had witnessed the fading of the British kingdoms of the post-Roman era and the evolution of their Saxon successors into a united England.

II. THE VILLAGE IS BORN

During their journeying the pioneers of the forest followed the track way their footsteps and those of their fathers had stamped out climbing the slope of the Cowfold ridge to descend again on the other side. At the top some paused and in due time some individual or group found the level summit congenial and settled there. Field names are reputed often to go back far into the past and to be a reflection of a physical fact which led to a particular field being named as it was. If this is so we may have a clue to the site opened up by the first community in the village area for two fields, now united, on the east side of the Recreation Ground were recorded on the Tithe Map of 1840 as Great Cowfold and Little Cowfold. The application of the village name to these fields exclusively among the many contiguous to the village seems pointed. Perhaps here we see the original 'open space in the woods', the Old English meaning of '-field' with which '-fold' is synonymous, where the first settlers' animals were pastured.

In its beginnings the colony on the ridge was probably little different from the other settlements springing up in the surrounding area. The establishment of a church close by, however, added another dimension to this part of what was to become the parish and made it a centre around which further settlement would gradually coalesce. When a church was first built in Cowfold is uncertain. The earliest part of the present church, the chancel, is ascribed to the period c 1270 – 1307 and a church was included in the ecclesiastical valuation of 1291 known as the Taxation of Pope Nicholas. However, a building of lighter timber construction could have preceded the later stone built structure. The coming of the church would have brought the demarcation of the churchyard for the Christian burial of the new inhabitants of the district and around this in time gathered other buildings, including probably a priest's house: the Subsidy Rolls mention the Vicar of Cowfold in 1327 and there is also the earlier reference to a chaplain in 1232. The old timbered building, now St Peter's Cafe, though of course of later period, has been suggested as once being the priest's house but there seems to be no positive evidence for this proposition. At a later time the vicarage stood across the street to the north of the church, by which time the block of land including the Thornden estate and stretching over the northern slope of the hill had accrued to the living of the parish.

These developments of the village cannot be dated with any precision and this applies also to the establishment of the parish boundaries. Colonisation of the Weald was, however, hastened after the Norman Conquest when the lands which later formed the Rape of Bramber were awarded by the Conqueror to William de Braose who built his castle at Bramber. The supply of colonists willing to take up tenancies in the new lands was plentiful and manorial lords were themselves often prepared to grant more favourable terms to tenants undertaking the toils entailed in the transformation of the virgin forest. If we could have looked upon Cowfold from the air in the two centuries following the conquest we should probably have seen the rolling sea of green woodland spotted, as with a rash, by many scattered clearings, clearings which as decade followed decade spread outwards from each nucleus and

steadily encroached further into the surrounding trees. Though often obscured by modern hedge clearance, Wealden fields have a variety in shape which, it has been suggested, represents in each field an ancient clearance of a forest patch, pushing back the trees until only a thick bushy shaw divided it from the next piece of assart land. And as with individual fields, so with the farmsteads, expansion reducing the forest in the course of centuries to belts of dense woodland separating one settlement from another. If all this was effected solely with axe and saw, the resulting timber being used for building or for fuel, the process must have been slow and laborious. Perhaps, however, fire was also employed, at least in the removal of unprofitable timber and undergrowth for the ash would have been a beneficial fertiliser. Charcoal burning would have made its contribution to the opening up of the landscape.

From the 13th century we have positive evidence of this developing settlement and now familiar landmarks in Cowfold make their appearance. The farms acquired the names they have often held for centuries from the personal names of early occupants of the land or the descriptive suffixes by which they were identified. The Subsidy Rolls listing taxpayers provide a string of these names which can be linked to present properties. Thus we find under Wineham Hundred the following:

Philip Arnald in 1296 (Capons was formerly 'Arnolds')

Rado de Waylse or Walsh in 1296, 1327 and 1332 (Welches?, now Longhouse)

William de Gosedenn in 1296

Rado de Gosedenne in 1332

Gilbert de Pettesgat in 1296 (Peppersgate?)

William de Hoggynden or Okindenne in 1296, 1327 and 1332

John de Hoggingeden or Okindenne in 1296 and 1327

John Godhyer in 1296

William Gudzer in 1327 (Goodgers?)

John de Walehurst or Walhurst in 1296, 1327 and 1332

Alice de Walehurst in 1327

Henry Pyteknolle in 1296 (Picknowle, now Parkminster)

Stephen le Kyng in 1296

John le Kyng in 1332.

Also from the Subsidy Rolls under Villat' de lwhurst come the following names:

Thomas Grauetwyk in 1327

John de Grautewyk in 1332

William atte Frith in 1327 and 1332 (Frithknowle?)

Rado Warde in 1327 and 1332

John Geruais in 1327 (Gervaise)

William Geruais in 1327 and 1332

John Brunyng or Brounyng in 1327 and 1332

Matilda Croftman in 1327 (Croftmans is now Cratemans)

William Piteknolle in 1327 and 1332

Philip Arnold in 1327 and 1332

Rado Wolfringfold or de Wolfryngfold in 1327 and 1332

Richard Godeshull or de Godeshulle in 1327 and 1332

John le Bule in 1332

The Manor Rolls of Shermanbury in the 14th century produce some names associated with property in Cowfold; Richard Trenchmore in 1365 and 1370, Robert Drewitt in 1376 and Thomas de Thorneden in 1365.

These medieval inhabitants of Cowfold lived in the context of a feudal society. While the church claimed their spiritual allegiance – and of course their tithes – their temporal lives were probably orientated more to the manors from which they held their land and to which they owed their service. The Manor of Streatham provides a glimpse of some of these tenants in their relationship to the lord, in this case the Bishop, in the customnals of 1373-74. In setting out the duties of the tenants they show something of their lives as well as linking them with more place names which have become part of the topography of the parish.

Robert Hayne was one of the manorial tenants whose holding was probably north of Brook Hill for the name appears in the 17th century in Southhaines, later known as Hill Farm, and in Northhaines close by. Robert Hayne, the customnal tells us,

holds a house and a yardland, customary land, in Coufolde, lately of Richard Hayne and formerly of the widow of Robert of the parish church of Coufold, rendering 20d at St Thomas' Day, 20d at Lady Day and 2d at Midsummer. He shall harrow with a man and his horse for two full days for lent seed and shall reap in harvest 2 acres of wheat, 1 acre of barley, 1 acre of peas or vetches and

4 acres of oats. He shall find two men at one harvest boon work for a whole day, having food as the other customers. When the Lord comes to Streatham in summer he shall cart two wain loads of sticks to make bowers (ie of leaves). He shall render 3 hens at Christmas and 4 hens and 37 eggs at Whitsun. He shall find a man for two half days, raking dung with a riddle within the gates of the Manor when the customers cart the Lord's dung. He shall fence Aldyngbourne Park with the other customers of Coufold according to the share of his land. If he dies, the Lord shall have his best beast as a heriot.

It was presumably the same Robert Hayne who held also.

A house and half a yardland, customary land, in Coufold, lately of Richard Hayne and formerly of William Praton (the name Praton appears among the subsidy payers at the beginning of the century) and renders 20d at St Thomas' Day, 20½d at Lady Day and ½d at Midsummer. He shall reap two acres of oats in harvest; and he shall summon the Lord's tenants at Coufold whenever Hallmote is held, after being himself summoned by John Flaxlond or Gilbert Herri. He shall collect the tenants' rents and shall distrain with the Lord's hayward.

Other persons from the Subsidy Rolls, or at least their descendants, appear in the following records.

William Gratewyk holds a house and a yardland, lately of Simon Clerc and formerly of John Clerc, rendering and doing in all things as Robert Hayne.

John Geruays, the Lord's neif, holds a house and half a yardland, customary land, in Coufolde, lately of John Geruays his father and formerly of Ralph Church (ie de ecclesia) and renders and does in all things half the works, rents and services of Robert Hayne.

Stephen Godeshulle holds a cottage and six acres, lately of Richard Godeshulle and formerly of Ralph Godeshulle and renders 12d a year.

Another tenant was Richard atte Gruoe who could be equated with Groveland. He,

the Lord's nief, holds a house and a ferlyng, customary land, lately of Laurence atte Groue and formerly of William atte Groue, and renders 12d at St Thomas' Day, 12d at Lady Day and 1d at Midsummer.

Finally comes this entry which may relate to the present day Mockford.

William Colom holds a house and a herlyng, customary land lately of Richard Mokeford and formerly of William Mokeford, and renders 12d at St Thomas' Day, 12d at Lady Day, 1d at Midsummer and 12d at Michaelmas.

This manorial tenant might find himself in contact with his Lord or his steward and officials not only in the performance of feudal service but also in the course of the hunt. The same customnal of 1373-74 refers to the Bishop's "deer chace, commonly called Goseden Chace (Warthynglith to Wyndeham)." This extended "over the whole desmesne there and thence to Mokeford as far as the holding of Richard at Groue, the Lord's nief, in the parish of Coufold and over all parts of the said holding and thence to Pacchesgate." Clearly the district was still well stocked with game and when the quarry broke from the cover of the woods the hunt was unlikely to have recognised any difference between common land and the tenanted holdings.

The military character of feudalism should also not be overlooked though how closely in practice it affected the copyhold tenant we have no evidence. Nevertheless when the Manor of Shermanbury was leased by Lord Thomas Sandys to William Comber in the 16th century the obligation was placed upon the latter "to fynd one abull man with horse and harness wear for Lord Sands in the Kynges Warres when commanded."

The foregoing customnals indicate mixed farming over a wide range of arable crops in Streatham Manor. Many of the tenants services may have been due on the Bishop's desesne lands which presumably centred on the manor house at Henfield and hence the crops mentioned were not necessarily in Cowfold. However the range of farming in Cowfold is attested by the record of the Nona Inquisition, an account of the tithe of one ninth of the produce of the parish taken in 1341. Four worthies of the parish then testified that

the ninth part of the sheaves of the aforesaid parish is valued this year at nine marks 11s 4d, the ninth of the wool at 12d and the ninth of the lambs at 12d, total amount ten marks (or £6. 13. 4d) and that it is of no greater value because the vicar of the aforesaid church has fifteen acres of arable land, with which his church is endowed, and which are valued at 3sh per acre; the tythe of hay valued at 3sh 4d, the obligations of the aforesaid church at 9sh per annum, the tythe of vetches at 3sh 4d, the tythe of milk, flax and hemp at 3sh, the tythe of a mill at 2sh, and the tythe of calves, pigs and geese, with all other small tithes appertaining to the church at 2sh per annum; total amount £1. 5. 8. And (the parishioners) further say, that there are no ecclesiastical lands in the aforesaid parish nor any merchants, but such persons as live by tillage and the produce of their labours.

The diversity of the crops and products listed in this account shows that a considerable transformation had taken place in the forest lands of Cowfold. The first stage in this process required the clearance of trees and the bushy undergrowth beneath. The difficulty of this with the tools available in early times had been one of the hindrances to the agricultural development of heavily wooded areas but even with the more adequate tools coming into use from the late Saxon period clearance can not have made the new open spaces immediately suitable for cultivation. Another long standing deterrent had been the heavy consistency of the Wealden clay, defying primitive implements. The late introduction of a heavier type of plough was one part of the answer but the clay also needed generous fertilisation to make it fruitful. Good supplies of marl, lime and manure were a prime necessity before its cultivation could become profitable. With these difficulties to be overcome the newly cleared woodland probably remained rough pasture around the farmsteads for some time. A wider variety of livestock no doubt browsed over this pasture, adding its contribution to the improvement of the land, until eventually cultivation was undertaken bit by bit with full use of the resources of manure, of marl and lime which had in the meantime become available. Preparing the virgin land for crops was laborious and the procedure was known as 'denshiring'. The turf was pared off with a breast plough, burnt, and the ashes, having been scattered, were ploughed in. Then a quantity of quicklime was spread over the ground and this again was ploughed in. As a preliminary marl could be put down in quantities of 40 bushels to the acre and left through the winter before 'denshiring' in the following spring. The ploughing was done with oxen which continued to be used for this purpose right up to the 19th century.

Even then the clay required continual attention. It could provide, according to one 17th century observer, "no convenient substance to nourishe corne any long time but will faint and give over after a crop or two". The Wealden soil was nevertheless potentially fertile though this potential, depending on much ploughing and the liberal addition of marl or lime and farm manures, was demanding in labour. Even in the 19th century when yields were greatly improved, the Rev Arthur Young reported that "many farmers look upon wheat as a losing crop" for these reasons. The extent of cultivation around the infant farmsteads of the 14th century may therefore have been limited; farming at this time was on a subsistence basis and a larger area of poor pasture probably lay between the few arable fields and the forest beyond. If this is the correct view of the agricultural scene, a reconciliation may be easier between the state of arable farming at Cowfold evident from the Nona Inquisition in 1341 and the usually accepted view that the Weald was until the latter part of the 16th century still largely a wooded waste inhabited by wild deer and droves of hogs. Overall generalisations can be misleading in regard to particular localities and if John Norden, writing at the beginning of the 17th century, could remember farms in the Weald which in his earlier days had stood "wholly upon these unprofitable bushy and wooded grounds, having only some small ragged pasture", Cowfold no doubt had its exceptions as well perhaps as parallels to this standard.

Though it may be impossible to judge the progress made in the agricultural development of individual holdings during the period, it remains evident that by the 14th century settlers in the Weald were achieving a measure of prosperity and the descendants of the colonising villeins and serfs had become well established as husbandmen in the new country. In consequence the hundred years from around 1300 saw the first Rebuilding of the Wealden homes. Substantial timber framed houses took the place of earlier more rudimentary homes and the principal feature of these new houses was the open hall reaching up into the roof. The hall with its fire burning on the central hearth was the focus of family life while, beyond, one of the end bays of the house often consisted of a two storeyed section with a solar or upper room above and service quarters beneath. Cowfold still has an example of one of these houses though it has been altered and elaborated by later ages. This is Capons where part of the present building started life as and conceals an aisled hall built between c 1300 and 1330. Another, until it was burned down in 1966, was Godshill, the earliest part of which originated in the 14th century as a single aisled hall with combined solar/service at one end.

The recollection of Philip Arnald in the 1296 Subsidy Rolls brings Capons into personal touch with that period for Arnolds was an earlier alias of that property. Likewise the 14th century dwelling at Godshill reminds us of Stephen Godeshulle of the Streatham Manor customnal with his “cottage and six acres”. Throughout the medieval period these men and their sons after them with the other copyholders around the parish continued to “live by tillage and the produce of their labours”, pushing back bit by bit the woodland enclosing their farms on every side. It was still a pioneering existence though a settled one with each generation building a little onto the achievements of its predecessors. The world for most people was limited to their farms and the countryside in the vicinity while of administration their experience was for the most part only that of the stewards of the manors in secular matters and of the priest in the village in spiritual concerns or when their tithes were due in the autumn of the year. For the roof over the heads of his family the husbandman relied on his own efforts supported by those of his neighbours but he was a freeman on his holding and as success marked his endeavours, so were the yeomen families of Cowfold coming into being. The sum of their daily toils, generation by generation, was a profound change in the topography of the parish after thousands of years marked only by the wind in the trees.

III. THE EVOLVING VILLAGE

15th to 19th Centuries

1. Population, Housing and the Village

While the aspect of the countryside and of the farms developed steadily with the continuous cutting back of the forest limits to produce something like the present day topography of the parish by, perhaps, the 18th century, the growth of the village itself was much slower. Medieval Cowfold had been concentrated closely around the bounds of the churchyard and the extension of the village further from this centre only began, hesitatingly, towards 1800. It was another hundred years before building development began to thicken up along the roads leading east, north and south.

In marked contrast to the lack of growth of the village was the steady enlargement from an early date of the fine church in its midst. The chancel, it will be recalled, dates from the 13th century and the 15th century saw the addition of the nave and tower. The south aisle was added during the reign of Henry VIII so that by the mid-16th century the church stood in more or less its present outward form. The construction of so substantial an edifice, “an anthology of sturdy Wealden details” as it is described in Pevsner’s *Buildings of England*, must indicate that the prosperity of the parish had advanced quickly even if the size of the village had not. The wealth on which the church was founded lay in the progress being made on the surrounding farms and their involvement in the upkeep of this focus of Cowfold life is illustrated in the churchyard to this day. The churchyard was surrounded by a fence of which each farm and property in the parish was responsible for a section. The Church Register for 1735 – 1801 starts with “a particular of ye Church Pannells of Cowfold according to ye present owners, being extracted out of ye old books, October 1682” in which are set out in succession the landowners and the properties by virtue of which they were bound to maintain the fence. The fence was renewed in 1913 and, though much overgrown, on each of the present posts can still be read the incised name of the property responsible for the upkeep of that particular part of it.

The vicarage on the north side of what is now the West Grinstead road had around it an increased area of glebe, land belonging to the living of the church. At the time of the Nona Inquisition in 1341 the glebe was stated to be 15 acres but in a Terrier of 1635 it had increased to 30 acres or approximately its ultimate extent. The vicarage lay towards the western end of the present Thornden estate with barns and farm buildings nearby. A meadow stretched eastwards to the Horsham road while the rest of the glebeland comprised the fields to the north of Thornden, extending over the hill and down to the east-west hedge boundary almost opposite Brook Farm house.

The Terrier of 1635 describes in more detail the bounds of the church and glebe and in so doing gives us a glimpse of, perhaps, the major part of the village at this period.

A just and true terrier of all the glebe land, houses, barns, outhouses and portions of the tythe appropriate and belonging to the vicary of Cowfold in the county of Sussex, seised and taken by Thomas Hudson, Vicar and incumbent there, and by Thomas Bartlet and Thomas Crips, Churchwardens of the said parish, and Charles Mutton and William Awood, sydemen there, the thirteenth day of July Anno Dom 1635, the lands being measured by Richard Crips, an inhabitant of the said parish with a pole of eighteen feet and six inches long.

Imprimis, the churchyard of Cowfold containeth by measure one acre and thirty rods of land and is bounded upon the Kings Highway leading from Mockbridge towards the Forest of St Leonards and upon the orchard, house and garden of Henry Lintott, mercer, towards the east, to the copyhold lands of Mary Vincent, widow, to the south, to the copyhold lands of William Gratwicke called Potters orchard to the west and also to the bowling alley to the west and to the house and garden of Richard Bennet and to the house of William Awood and to the house or shop and garden of Ockenden Cowper and to the parish house wherein Thomas Ellis now dwelleth and to the Kings Highway leading from the aforesaid highway to the Vicaridge house northward.

Item, the glebe of the said vicary lies altogether from the said churchyard northward in sixe parcells called and known at this present by the several names of theTainterfield, the Stonefield, the two Northfields and the Culverfield and the barn and close, one hemp plot and two gardens, the Vicaridge House, one great barn, one stable and close adjoining, all which contains in the whole, thirty acres and XXthree rods and are bounded together upon the Whapple Way leading from Cowfold church towards the Forest of St Leonard and upon the copyhold land of William Gratwicke of Jervis toward the west, to the two fields which Mr Withers holdeth in the right of his wife called the halfsyard to the north, to the Kings Highway which leadeth from Mockbridge towards Horsham on the east and to a cross lane which cometh from the said Kings Highway and lyeth between the aforesaid churchyard and the rest of the said glebe on the south.

Item, the appropriation of all the tythes belonging to the Rectory of the said parish for which and in lieu whereof £4. 6sh and 8 pence is to be paid every (year?) to the Lord Bishop of Chichester by the Vicar of Cowfold at (..?..) severall feasts of the year, viz at the feasts of St Michael the Archangel and of the Annunciation to the Blessed Virgin Mary by even and equall portions.

And to the truth hereof we, the said Vicar, churchwardens and sydemen have subscribed our names and set our seals the year and day first above written.

“The orchard, house and garden of Henry Lintott” on the east side mentioned also in the later statement of the Church Pannells which refers, evidently in this quarter, to “all ye rest (of the churchyard boundary) against Mr Lintot’s house.” The last remark would seem to fit St Peter’s Cafe better than the old building to the north of it containing the ‘Olde Shoppe’ for the cafe abuts onto the churchyard boundary whereas it is mostly later accretions to the other building which fill the space between it and the churchyard. Nevertheless it seems probable that the ‘Olde Shoppe’ block existed at the time of the Terrier. There would have been little space remaining for the orchard on this side of the churchyard, if indeed it was located precisely there. At a later date there was an orchard against the eastern end of the southern boundary which belonged to another early house now buried deep in the misleading exterior of Bacon’s Stores. This property was described in 1765 as the “messuage, tenement or shophouse, stables, outhouses and buildings thereunto belonging and also the garden, orchard,, plantation, field or plot of ground” and its extent can be seen on the Tithe Map of 1840. This ‘shophouse’ is believed to originate from the 16th century and, if so, antedates the Terrier. Being a mercer, Mr Lintott’s premises probably included a shop. However, having noted these facts it remains that the most likely situation for his house was St Peter’s Cafe.

Further to the west along the southern fence Mary Vincent’s copyhold land is represented by Church Field which, before the enclosure of the comparatively recent graveyard, abutted up to the south west corner of the churchyard. The playing field of St Peter’s School and the swimming pool correspond to Potters orchard, Potters farmhouse having stood on the approximate site of the school itself.

Four houses stood on the northern boundary in 1635 of which one, or the site of it, is identifiable. This is “the parish house wherein Thomas Ellis now dwelleth”. The ‘parish house’ was the ‘poor house’ or ‘work house’, that symbol of the old poor law system which came to notoriety in the late 18th or early 19th centuries. Margaret Cottages were originally the ‘Old Workhouse’ but are probably a successor to the building which stood there in 1635 bearing in mind their wholly brick construction. A date around 1753 has been offered for the origin of the present building. The ‘particular’ of the church fence also mentions in 1682 the South Stone “against Edward Ellies’ house” which, facing south, itself formed part of the boundary in this corner of the churchyard.

What other buildings went to make up the village of Cowfold at this time? The vicarage in its grounds to the north is documented and even if it is not actually mentioned in the Terrier the house submerged in Bacon’s Stores was probably standing, no doubt as a timber framed building. The house now named Church Farm House is an early building which probably existed in simplified form. Across the road from the ‘Olde Shoppe’ the building later known as Huntscroft and now Fowler Brothers offices may have been standing in the 17th century. And we may also envisage the existence of a Red Lion Inn close by. Prior to the erection of the present Red Lion in the 1880’s a very much older inn stood on the site, impressions of which have been preserved in a few 19th century paintings and photographs.

Apart from these buildings, however, the 17th century traveller passing through Cowfold is unlikely to have seen on either hand more than thick wooded hedges with tall trees arching over the highway or some open field or meadow glimpsed through the occasional gateway.

About this time changes appeared in the houses themselves. The Wealden farmers had continued to prosper and John Norden, whose memory of poor farms we have noted, went on to say how they were being “converted to beneficial tillage, in so much that the people lack not but can to their great benefit yearly afford to others both butter, cheese and corn, even where there was little or none.” As these yeomen became more affluent so they improved their houses and the hundred years or so from around 1570 saw the second Great Rebuilding of many Wealden homes. The old open halls were floored over to provide two storeyed accommodation throughout the house and much craftsman’s skill was applied to the mouldings of the timber framing. At this time also bricks were coming into more general use and they made possible the enclosing of fireplaces and the provision of chimneys where previously the smoke from the hearth had found its own way out through the roof ends. Sometimes the big fireplace was erected over the old hearth in the centre of the building but later and particularly in the smaller houses the tendency was for the chimney to be constructed at the gable end. Capons and Godshill again provide examples in Cowfold of these alternations and enlargements. Capons had been extended by the addition, probably in the first half of the 16th century, of a cross-wing at right angles to the original hall while a somewhat later extension was made on the eastern side using brick for its facade. In the case of Capons the chimney was built on the side of the old hall, probably before it was floored over. Godshill was also enlarged, firstly in the 15th century by a crown posted hall and then by a 16th century addition.

With the continuing enhancement of the farmer’s position a consciousness among some Cowfold families of their improving status in society is detectable in Sussex genealogies made up, no doubt, from documents bearing the mark of the persons concerned. Some of these families such as the Gratwicks had, as we have seen, been in Cowfold from a very early time, if not from its first settlement. Their origins in those days must have been quite humble but as generation passed to generation they prospered on the Wealden soil and their wellbeing justified the term ‘yeoman’ which was applied to them and the other sturdy independent farmers whose roots were firmly established in the countryside. John Gratwicke of Jervis (Gervaise) who died in 1642 was, like his ancestors, so described. William Gratwicke, his son, however, was styled ‘Gentleman’ while two generations later in the same family, John Gratwicke who died in 1720 merited an ‘Esquire’. Similarly, in the branch of the same family at Eastlands in the early 17th century Thomas was a yeoman and his son, Richard, a gentleman. Thomas Vincent also, who inherited Eastlands in 1680, was described as a gentleman while his father and grandfather had been yeomen. While there may have been an element of self congratulation in the assumption of these dignities, the changes do suggest that during the 17th century the accumulation of wealth and success was raising some Cowfold farmers to a position in which

being sons of the soil might not be the quality they most favoured in their social lives. The same John Gratwicke who died in 1720 had the dual description 'of Jervis and Chichester'. It was about this time that the Gratwicke family faded from the Cowfold scene which may imply that for him and others of the rising rural upper class the more sophisticated life of a city gentleman held out an attraction stronger than their bonds with their farming origins.

The 18th century was, however, a period in which the gentry discovered increasing interest in the rural scene and the possession of an imposing country seat was becoming one of the passports into good society. A more positive contribution was at the same time being made by many gentleman farmers whose interest in farming methods and efficiency made them catalysts of agricultural improvement. The countryside was going through a period of change of which a more ominous aspect was the widening gulf opening between the rich and the poor, between the landowners and the wealthy farmers on the one hand and the labouring classes on the other.

In the years leading up to 1800 Cowfold was showing signs of growth. The population had begun to increase rapidly in the second half of the 18th century with more housing being required for labourers' families, a need accentuated by the loosening of the old habits of farm workers 'living in' on the farms where they were employed. Houses and cottages began to appear on the wide strips of roadside 'waste' in village and parish. Several of these enclosures for building can be traced. Frithlands cottage (now the site of Brooklands in Picts Lane) on half an acre "part of the waste", appeared by 1743 and in 1771 Stephen Wood enclosed a "parcel of the waste" to build the house later known as Chates. In the same year Elizabeth Weekes enclosed the ground now occupied by Wood Grange and the Malaya Garage forecourt. A year later Stephen Wood built a house on the roadside strip where Knights bakery stands and further up the street the Vincents built the cottage, Old Steyne House, on their land sometime after. The date of this building, recently pulled down after a long drawn out deacease, is not known but it was there by 1840. By 1840 also New Steyne existed and a continuous row of buildings had filled the gaps along Church Path bordering the churchyard. Houses now extended up the east side of the Horsham road to the top of Brook Hill. Elsewhere in the parish houses set in elongated narrow plots beside the road betray enclosures of the waste though their dates are not known; for instance, Burnt House and Hillsfoot in Burnt House Lane and two buildings on the east side of the road near Parkminster. A group of houses formed a small community on the Horsham road below the Crabtree by the early 19th century.

In the village, however, the new buildings served to emphasise the open spaces that still remained along the roadside. Old Steyne House was out on its own while on the other side of the road the only buildings were a small group of cottages at the Hare and Hounds; the second pair of these was pulled down about the early 1950's to make way for the pub car park. No houses existed along the Bolney road and the

open meadow belonging to the vicarage still faced the Church Path cottages across the street.

The first indication we have of the size of Cowfold's population comes in 1724. In that year there were apparently 60 families, a figure which doubtless refers to the parish as a whole. If the average size of each family was six persons – the average household at the time of the mid-19th century censuses was between five and six – the total population would have been less than 400. Discounting the outlying farms and houses the number of people in and around the village probably did not exceed 150. The increase in the parish population is shown by the figures from the 19th century censuses which, for convenience, we may at this point follow through into the present century.

1801	601
1811	614
1821	822
1841	943
1851	975
1861	946
1871	993
1881	1,042
1891	944
1901	968
1911	1,152

With the increasing number of inhabitants went, naturally enough, a rise in the number of houses, some examples of which have already been noted. If the 60 families of 1724 represented 60 houses the number of the latter in the parish had risen to 100 by 1811. Between 1841 and 1871 the total of households ranged from about 170 to 190, though this no doubt exceeded the number of houses as many were shared by more than one family. Nevertheless it is clear that between the mid-18th and the mid-19th centuries people living in Cowfold and their homes had more than doubled in number. From around 1841 the level of population became fairly steady for some decades which can be attributed to the agricultural depression of the mid-century; there was just not the work available in the parish as farmers cut back more and more. When the population started to rise again after 1900 Cowfold was on the threshold of a new world in which mobility was easier and one's work was not of necessity on one's doorstep.

Until this last development got under way Cowfold remained self-sufficient for far more of its daily needs than at the present day; indeed, before the advent of mass production in the 19th century this self-dependence would have been almost complete except at the top of the social ladder. Building and household joinery, clothes and shoes for the family, food, harness and wagons, all these were the product of the locality, if not of the village itself, until manufactured goods began to

filter through the market and bulk transport of such commodities became easier. This situation is reflected in the information provided by the censuses of the mid-19th century concerning the trades and occupations followed by Cowfold people. The table overleaf shows the fields in which their labours were expended and in which they sought their livelihood. Some trends during the period from 1841 to 1871 are also apparent.

Agricultural work shows as the dominant sector of human activity, and naturally enough for agriculture was the *raison d'être* of the community. The connected occupations covered shepherds, sheepshearers or gamekeepers. Agriculture will, however, be discussed separately in view of its importance in conditioning the everyday lives of the villagers.

PRINCIPAL MEANS OF SUPPORT of Cowfold families

(Based on the head/senior breadwinner of the family expressed as a percentage of the total)

	Year	1841	1851	1871
1.	Propertied and Professional classes:			
	Households of independent means	8%	7%	7%
	Households in professional class	2%	1%	2%
	Farmers	14%	17%	12%
2.	Non-Agricultural Occupations:			
	Households in 'retail' trades	7%	7%	9%
	Households in 'craft' trades	11%	9%	13%
	Non-manual occupations	2%	3%	2%
3.	Agricultural Occupations:			
	Agricultural labouring households	49%	44%	39%
	Occupations connected with agriculture	1%	1%	1%
4.	Other Labouring Classes and the Poor:			
	Other labouring households	1%	4%	3%
	Households depending on menial labour	2%	6%	10%
	The poor (non-self-supporting)	6%	1%	2%

A common element in the 'other labouring' category were timber trades and those working on the roads. The latter were fairly constant in numbers, only one family, later two, professing a permanent livelihood from this work. At times many more might be employed on the roads but there was ample casual labour from among the farm labourers who were frequently short of work. The numbers subsisting as sawyers and in allied trades such as hoopmakers and cleavers were more variable and rose from one in 1841 to five in 1851 but had shrunk again twenty years later. In 1871 one family's livelihood came from work as a carrier, a new element in the

village occupations; though doubtless local in range this occupation is significant of increasing movement and carriage by road.

Almost a quarter of Cowfold's population were tradesmen, whether in retail trades or in the crafts. In the former category were bakers, butchers, millers, innkeepers, grocers (sometimes combining drapery), tailors and confectioners. There were also one or two hucksters, pedlars or hawkers dealing in small wares. While the quantitative position of these trades shows little variation, some increase does appear by 1871 when the numbers in bakery, butchery, milling and innkeeping had doubled. This increase results partly from the establishment of retail outlets to serve the community below the Crabtree in the north of the parish. Though the settlement around the Crabtree had existed at least from the first half of the 19th century the lack of shops to serve it earlier suggests its comparatively recent growth.

The craft trades show a more changing pattern between 1841 and 1871. Households living by shoemaking, for instance, in 1841 numbered eight but by 1851 this number had dropped to three, a figure maintained in 1871. This may be indicative of the increased availability of manufactured shoes as the 19th century proceeded though it may be noted that there were still eight individuals, as opposed to households, involved in the trade. For locally made shoes the leather no doubt came from tanyards in Horsham. Building crafts, on the other hand, show an increase in the period, much of which can be attributed to the expansion of Stephen Fowler's business established in the village in 1853. The number of bricklayers' households rose from two in 1841 to seven in 1871. Allied to the building trade were carpenters whose tally at six households remained about steady throughout the period. Other crafts were blacksmiths, wheelwrights and saddlers whose numbers also varied little, while in 1851 Cowfold had a painter and plumber and in this year and in 1871 one family lived by broom making. Finally the brickfield north of Picts Lane was in operation by the end of the period adding a brickmaker to the catalogue of village crafts.

Non-manual occupations included up to three school teachers households with some miscellaneous additions from time to time; a tollgate keeper at Picts Lane in 1841 and two clerks, parish and vestry, ten years later. Whether these clerks lived on this type of work seems doubtful; some other gainful occupation is likely and as the parish clerk lived opposite the tollgate he could have had employment there.

By 1841 Cowfold had among its population some elements which perhaps we associate more with later times, retired persons and those living on investments or the income from land. The parish had, of course, had its wealthier inhabitants but if they were numbered among the gentry, they were also farmers with a direct interest in the working of their lands and generally they were of local origin. The 19th century, however, saw the addition to Cowfold society of a new class lacking these local associations and antecedents. Besides these there was a very limited number of professional people whose work was in the immediate district. (The farmers who

also fall within the group of those who by village standards at any rate were better off are deferred for later consideration).

The professional people comprised the vicar and the surgeon or doctor with one or two additions at various times, a surveyor in 1841 for instance and by 1871 Cowfold also had a non-conformist church minister. Retired persons included such people as a former Port of London Customs Officer of Hanoverian origins and a London silk mercer in 1851 and twenty years later an actuary, a major general and a colliery proprietor. Others living on income from 'the funds' or as 'annuitants' resided in fairly modest village houses and among them were some maiden ladies or widows. There were, however, also the 'big houses' which perhaps inspired some awe when a visit to them was necessary. At Brook Hill from 1851 was William Borrer, a county magistrate, and William Boxall's mansion at Parkminster in 1871 was staffed by six resident servants. Cowfold Lodge in 1851 had a resident coachman and groom and a footman besides three other servants while there was a staff of six to run James White's "convenient and pleasantly situated mansion" at Woldringfold. The number of families in the professional and 'independent' category shows little variation standing at around a figure of 16 or 17 throughout the period.

The mention of houses amply staffed with domestic labour reminds us of the abundant supply available in the 19th century; it was indeed one of the main markets for young girls whose families needed to lighten the financial burden of their children as early as possible. Apart from the labouring households most houses had one or more domestic servants. In fact there were some 85 resident domestic servants and farm servants in 1871 representing about 20% of the working population of Cowfold.

But there were also the non-resident servants with families and dwellings around the parish. This category shows a steady increase between 1841 and 1871 when the figure reached 10%. Included among these were coachmen and grooms, charwomen and domestic servants and, most prominent in this progressive increase, gardeners. There was one gardeners household in 1841, seven by 1851 and eleven in 1871. How far these were employed at the big houses and how far they relied on casual work at other homes around the parish we cannot tell but rustic disorder was evidently at a discount as the century drew on and people were more conscious of the appearance of their properties.

Finally those who were unable to support themselves and who relied on parish and other support may be mentioned. By 1871 the very poor – the pauper households – had decreased in numbers to a couple of families.

The foregoing table of the means by which Cowfold families maintained themselves is based on the husband or equivalent breadwinner for he was the principal support of the household and the reason for its presence in the parish. But he was not the only person seeking employment. The times were hard ones for the rural community and other members of the family generally had to earn what they could to supplement the family income. Wives went out in domestic service or took in washing and children from the age of 12 years were often sent to work as well.

Furthermore many families had lodgers with work in the neighbourhood. A fuller and slightly different picture of employment (or other means of support) in the parish is, therefore, given by an analysis of the whole working population in 1871. The table on the next page covers 414 men, women and children, or 42% of Cowfold's population of 993, the remainder not professing any gainful occupation or support and consisting of wives, school children, young children and other dependants.

Another aspect on which the censuses add to our view of 19th century Cowfold is that of population movement. For the average countryman the world with which he was familiar had always been small, stretching most likely over the neighbouring district. Even for the wealthy members of the community 17th and early 18th century travel had been so arduous with wheeled transport frequently liable to get bogged down on the appalling roads that to 'go away' was far from the casual decision it is today. Transport was improved by the coming of toll roads in the 18th century but for the village labourer a visit to the next village or town, whether for recreational purpose or for work, probably meant a long walk.

EMPLOYMENT AND OCCUPATIONS IN COWFOLD, 1871

(Percentages as of total 'working population')

1.	17	Upper levels of society: Persons of independent means:	(4.1%)
	5	Landowners (including 2 magistrates)	
	12	Retired persons and annuitants	
	6	Persons of professional standing (including students in higher education)	(1.4%)
	1	Doctor	
	2	Ministers of Religion	
	1	Law Clerk	
	2	Undergraduates	
	28	Farmers (inclusive of 4 'farmer's sons)	(6.8%)
2.	36	Non-Agricultural Occupations: Persons in 'retail' trades	(8.7%)
	5	In Butchery	
	10	In Grocery/Drapery and Confectionary	
	8	In Tailoring, Dressmaking and Millinery	
	2	Innkeepers	
	4	Hucksters or Higglers	
	48	Persons in 'craft' trades	(11.6%)
	8	In Boot/Shoe trades	
	13	In building and Bricklaying trades	
	12	In Carpentry and Painters trades	
	8	In Blacksmiths and Wheelwrights trades	
	2	Saddlers	
	3	Basket or brush makers	
	2	Brick makers	
	6	Persons in non-manual occupations:	(1.4%)
	6	Persons engaged in teaching	
3.	132	Agricultural Occupations: Agricultural labourers	(31.9%)
	6	In occupations connected with agriculture	(1.4%)
	3	Shepherds	
	2	Dairy women	
	1	Gamekeeper	
4.	6	Other labouring classes and the poor Persons in labouring occupations:	(1.4%)
	3	Road labourers	
	2	Persons in timber trades (sawyers, hoopmakers/cleavers)	
	1	Person in Carriers trade	
	123	Persons in occupations concerned with menial labour:	(29.9%)
	85	Resident domestic and farm servants (including governesses)	
	14	Gardeners	
	9	Coachmen, grooms and the like	
	6	Women engaged in laundering	
	7	Charwomen and non-resident domestic servants	
	2	Nurses	
	6	Poor persons not in gainful employment:	(1.4%)
	5	Paupers	
	1	Vagrant	

Another restricting factor was the operation of the Poor Law. This system, originating in the Tudor period, had been intended to provide relief on the premises of a workhouse or poorhouse to those who were unable to maintain themselves by their work. It was, in effect, a rudimentary social security system financed by a rate levied on local rental values in the parishes which were responsible for its operation. Under the Act of Settlement of 1662, however, the giving of poor relief was limited to natives of the parish, that is to say, persons whose legal settlement was in the parish. What constituted 'legal settlement' was defined in the act. Since the parish bore the burden of maintaining the poor within its bounds and the arrival of immigrants who might at some time fall in need of relief could add to that burden, parish officers became diligent in preventing new settlements being acquired within their area by those with slender resources. An early record in the church books may show that the parishioners of Cowfold realised even before the Act of Settlement the latent burden placed upon them by strangers in their midst. In 1588 a minute was signed by John Dunstall, Thomas Agate, Rychard Awood, Rychard Barthely, Thomas Roberts, Richard Scrase, John Chapman, Thomas Gratwyck, Robert Vincent, Thomas Okes, Thomas Whyting and James Grover, by which

it was agreed by the assent of the whole parish that whosoever after this last day of March 1588 shall bring into any of his land or tenet . . . (part of this passage is illegible) . . . shall discharge the parish of the said tenant except he have ye assent of XII of the best of the parish at least, whereof we here present set our hands.

The diligence of parishes in curbing settlement increased towards the end of the 18th century with the rise in poverty and of the cost of its relief at local expense. The aggravation of the problem by inflation during the Napoleonic Wars coupled with the decision of the Speenhamland magistrates that wages should be held down and supplemented by relief out of Poor Law funds will be mentioned later in connection with the plight of the agricultural labourer at this time. Here we may note its effect on the free movement of people. If a man went to another village to seek a job the officers there were likely, if they were lenient, to secure their position by requiring a certificate of his legal settlement in his former parish or, if harsh, they might seek an order sending him back there immediately without waiting for the immigrant to become destitute. In any case as soon as signs showed of his being unable to support himself or his family steps would be taken before the magistrates for his removal to be effected.

With what frequency Cowfold expelled its immigrants we do not know as the removal orders would be among the papers of the parishes of settlement. There are, however, a number of removal orders of persons sent back to Cowfold from elsewhere.

James Attree, his wife and family, from Cobham to Cowfold in December 1789.

Mary, wife of Richard Attree, from West Hoathly to Cowfold in September 1792.

Thomas Pierce and his wife from Ashurst to Cowfold in January 1795.

John Bonniface, his wife and family, from Nuthurst to Cowfold in January 1801.

William Dewdney, his wife and family, from Shermanbury to Cowfold, in November 1806.

Henry Bonniface from Nuthurst to Cowfold in June 1815.

John Tidey, his wife and family, from Isfield to Cowfold, in December 1816.

Thomas Mitchell, his wife and family, from Berwick, Sussex to Cowfold in September 1818.

Sarah, wife of John Stoner, from Nuthurst to Cowfold in April 1820.

Elizabeth Woolven from Horsham to Cowfold in March 1825.

In the two latter examples Sarah Stoner's husband "hath deserted her" which doubtless left her without support while the fact that Elizabeth Woolven was an "unmarried woman with child" shows clearly enough why Horsham ordered her removal.

One impediment to the mobility of the labourer and his family seems to have been removed following the radical changes which affected the Poor Law system in the 1830s and indeed scarcity of local employment with the threat of the Union Workhouse as an alternative might then be thought an incentive to movement. The depression in agriculture was, however, fairly general through the middle years of the 19th century so that to go elsewhere in search of work remained a risk for labourers with families to support and little in the way of resources. For the younger unattached men leaving their native village did not have the so great objection. That mobility among the rural working class was becoming more common is shown by the table overleaf comparing the origins of Cowfold inhabitants in 1851 and 1871 but the high proportion of local men, especially among the labourers, is still very apparent. Among those less inhibited by poverty a greater mobility was to be expected but the majority of traders and craftsmen were still natives of the county. The natural conservatism of the countryman, the inadequacies of communications and particularly the lack, as yet, of the habit of distant removal tended to keep the population fairly local in character.

A tabulation based on the birthplaces of the people is nevertheless liable to conceal the frequency of migration in individual cases since it is concerned only with their origins in relation to their final settlement. This inadequacy can to some extent be overcome by considering the birth places of the children of the family in relation to its head. In 1871 21% of the labouring families (or 22 in number) had had one

intermediate residence elsewhere before settling in Cowfold and two-thirds of these were the families of men born in the parish. A few had travelled even more widely, seven labourers born elsewhere having lived with their families in two or more intermediate places before coming to Cowfold. An extreme example was Henry Meeton who had originated from Thakeham and around 1850, having married, was in Horsham where his eldest daughter was born. Six years later another daughter was born at Shipley, his wife's birthplace, and subsequent children were added to the family at West Chiltington, Sutton (Sussex), Ringmer and Twineham. He had arrived in Cowfold towards 1870. James Johnson, also, another labourer, and his wife, both of Shipley, had children born successively in their native village and in Warnham, Ashington and again in Shipley before coming to Cowfold. That these were exceptions is, however, evident from the fact that 72% of the labouring class appear to have known no home but Cowfold (apart in appropriate cases from the village of their birth). Even among those parishioners less tied to the land than the labourers 58% had families wholly brought up in Cowfold. (For the overall population the figure of those without any intermediate residence before Cowfold was 66% or 121 families).

Up to the latter part of the 19th century the people of Cowfold thus had their roots in the district around them and their lives were centred on local activities and events. The village itself remained small and compact but it had become recognisable with the core of the present day village. The Stores opposite the Bolney road junction, for instance, bore an external resemblance to Bacon Stores such as the likeness of features one might recognise carried forward from a Victorian grandfather to his 20th century grandson while the detail retains the air of a bygone age. The dim interior of the shop, stocked with practically everything the village home might need from bedsteads to brushes and from pinafores to potatoes, was very different from the modern supermarket. The yew trees have grown up in the churchyard since then but otherwise its aspect with the old houses fronting towards the church were much as they are now. The atmosphere of Cowfold, however, still remained in its past, a quiet undisturbed country backwater in which a flock of sheep might be seen drifting down the street and where a stranger passing down the road attracted the curious gaze of any idling native.

ORIGINS OF COWFOLD POPULATION

(Based on birthplaces of heads of families)

	All Families		Labourer's Families		Other Families	
	<u>1851</u>	<u>1871</u>	<u>1851</u>	<u>1871</u>	<u>1851</u>	<u>1871</u>
Born Cowfold	46%	34%	59%	49%	34%	22%
Born Cowfold and adjacent parishes	71%	57%	84%	74%	59%	43%
Born Cowfold or within 5 miles	81%	67%	98%	88%	65%	50%
Born Cowfold or within 8 miles	88%	78%	100%	94%	77%	64%
Born Cowfold or within 10 miles	92%	82%	100%	97%	83%	70%
Born Cowfold or elsewhere in Sussex	94%	90%	100%	99%	88%	83%
Born Cowfold or elsewhere	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

‘Adjacent Parishes’ include: Lower Beeding, Slaugham, Bolney, Twineham, Shermanbury, West Grinstead, Nuthurst.

‘Within 5 miles’ includes Ashurst, Henfield, Woodmancote, Shipley, Southwater.

‘Within 8 miles’ includes Rusper, Horsham, Itchingfield, Bramber, Billingshurst, Fulking, Edburton, Steyning, Ashington, Cuckfield, Hurstpierpoint, Lindfield, Handcross

‘Within 10 miles’ includes Ditchling, Thakeham, Ardingly, Storrington, Washington, Upper Beeding, Wiston, Worth, Balcombe, Wivelsfield.

MOVEMENT OF FAMILIES BEFORE SETTLEMENT IN COWFOLD

Population in 1871

(based on birthplaces of children)

	Labouring Families	Other Families (Professional, Independent, Tradesmen & Farmers)	All Families
	Numbers (& %)	Numbers (& %)	Numbers (& %)
1 Residence confined to Cowfold:			
Head of family born Cowfold	34 (32%)	12 (16%)	46 (25%)
Head of family born elsewhere	<u>42</u> (40%)	<u>33</u> (42%)	<u>75</u> (41%)
	76 (72%)	45 (58%)	121 (66%)
2 Residence in one other place before Cowfold:			
Head of family born Cowfold	15 (14%)	1 (1%)	16 (9%)
Head of family born elsewhere	<u>7</u> (7%)	<u>21</u> (27%)	<u>28</u> (15%)
	22 (21%)	22 (28%)	44 (24%)
3 Residence in two other places before Cowfold:			
Head of family born Cowfold	-	2 (3%)	2 (1%)
Head of family born elsewhere	<u>3</u> (3%)	<u>7</u> (9%)	<u>10</u> (6%)
	3 (3%)	9 (12%)	12 (7%)
4. Residence in more than two places before Cowfold:			
Head of family born Cowfold	-	-	-
Head of family born elsewhere	<u>4</u> (4%)	<u>1</u> (2%)	<u>5</u> (3%)
	4 (4%)	1 (2%)	5 (3%)
	105(100%)	77 (100%)	182 (100%)

2. The Manors and Land Holdings

1.5.1771 . . . presented by the homage that Richard Weeks, late one of the customary tenants of the said Manor, who held to him and his heirs of the Lord of the said Manor by Copy of the Rolls of the Court according to the custom of the said Manor one messuage and sixty acres of land in Cowfold called Clarkes, otherwise Eastlands, held by the yearly rent of. . . (blank) . . ., heriot the best claw (or cloven?) foot beast or for want thereof v sh., And also one customary tenement called Little Jervas containing forty acres of land in Cowfold held by the yearly rent of iiij sh. vj d., heriot the best claw (or cloven?) foot beast or for want thereof, comes Elizabeth Weeks of the parish of Cowfold in the County of Sussex, spinster, and humbly prays as youngest sister of the said Richard to be admitted tenant of the said premises with the appurtenances, To whom the Lord by his said steward granted seizing thereof by the rod to have and to hold all and singular the said premises with the appurtenances to the said Elizabeth Weeks, the said Manor by the yearly rents, heriots, suits of court, customs and services therefor due and of right accustomed and she gave to the Lord for a fine for such her admission as appears in the margin, was admitted tenant but her fealty is respited.

To this Court comes Elizabeth Weeks of the parish of Cowfold in the County of Sussex, spinster and as youngest sister of Richard Weeks, deceased, late one of the customary tenants of the said Manor, who held to him and his heirs according to the custom of the said Manor (among other lands and hereditaments) one messuage or tenement, garden and premises with the appurtenances within and held of the Manor aforesaid by the yearly rent of xij d. by apportionment, heriot the best claw (or cloven?) foot beast or for want thereof etc, and humbly prays to be admitted tenant to the said messuage or tenement and premises with the appurtenances as her right and inheritance in reversion immediately after the death, surrender or forfeiture of Sarah Weeks who now holds the said premises for her life, To whom the Lord by his steward aforesaid granted seizing thereof by the rod to have and to hold the said messuage or tenement and premises with the appurtenances unto the said Elizabeth Weeks and her heirs forever of the Lord by the rod at the will of the Lord according to the custom of the said Manor by the yearly rent, heriot, suit of court, customs and services therefor due and of right accustomed and she gave to the Lord for a fine for such her admission as appears in the margin, was admitted tenant but her fealty is respited.

The manors continued to play an important, if mainly legal, role in Cowfold life right down to the 19th century. The majority of the land was held under copyhold title from the manors and, as the above extract from the court books of Streatham Manor illustrates, transfers of title from one holder to another were effected through an act of their Courts baron. When a copyhold tenant died or left land by his will or when

he sold it to another person the matter was brought before the manorial court for legal endorsement and a copy of the entry, such as the one above, constituted the document of title of the new 'owner'. Strictly, of course, the owner was the lord of the manor who was entitled to a rent and other dues from the tenant though the rent might be fairly nominal. For instance the yearly manorial rent for Brownings with Bullocksland (54 acres) in 1636 was 10/9½ and for Little Jervis (40 acres) in 1771, 4/6d. Indeed, the rent for a given piece of land may well have remained constant from the medieval period. It will be recalled that John Gervais in the 1373-74 customnal paid 1/9d yearly for his 'half a yardland'. If his property can be equated with a part of the farm comprising Jervis, Julians garden and Searches – and if so, it had in the meantime passed from Streatham manor to Shermanbury – the rent in 1659 for 100 acres was only 2/7d, an increase which could be due to the subsequent accessions to the property. It was, in short, a customary rent rather than an economic one.

That this system had its archaic aspect is illustrated by the heriot. By this custom the lord of the manor was entitled on the death of a tenant (and, it would seem, on the sale and conveyance of a property) to seize his best beast or other chattel: it was a badge of the ancient servility of copyhold tenure which lasted through to the 19th century. Thus, when Richard Weekes Vincent of Eastlands who also held Little Jervis and other property died in 1860 "there happened to the Lord for heriots three of the best clove foot beasts". Other examples of heriots were "one blackish cow and a pig" for Northfields in 1678, "a brown mare and a pig" for Capons and Great Picknowle in 1778 and a "brown horse" for Gratwicke in 1831. The antiquity of copyhold also speaks through the forms adopted by the courts. Though the court was merely endorsing the status quo of a sale, an inheritance or a devise the holding was first returned to the possession of the lord of the manor and, secondly, granted by him to the new copyholder. In the case of a sale the interest of the purchaser was recorded in the surrender by the vendor and later the price paid might also be noted in the recital of the conveyance. When in 1793 Henry Ellis parted with the building of Bacons Stores to William Marshall he first "surrendered into the hands of the Lord ... (the) messuage tenement or shophouse with stable outhouses and buildings thereunto belonging and the garden orchard plantation field or plot of ground thereunto belonging ... to and for the use and behoof of William Marshall . . ." The latter then "prayed to be admitted to the said messuage ..., to whom the Lord by his steward aforesaid granted seizing thereof . . ."

But the manors were not merely an antique rubber stamp on the current interests in their properties. They retained some powers to regulate the exploitation of the holdings and defined the freedom of use that the tenant had of his land. In 1734 Little Jervis was held by Richard Vincent of Hurstpierpoint and when he wished to let the farm to a tenant (or, more correctly, sub-tenant) a licence was granted by the Court Baron of Streatham "to lett to farm to any fit and honest person all that customary tenement called Little Jervis . ." but it was on "this condition that no waste be done to the said premises and saving to the Lord all his just rights and services . . ." In 1859 Lucretia Wood who held Hookland and evidently exceeded her rights

and felled timber trees, 44 oak and 3 ash. The following year at Beeding Manor court she “forfeits Hooklands for timber cutting and pays the full amount demanded (whereupon) Hooklands regranted to her and she is readmitted”. Keeping on the right side of copyhold law Mrs White obtained a licence in 1860 to cut and take trees for the repair of Mockford and Groveland. The court books of Streatham Manor specify that “the customary tenants of this Manor have a right to plow boot, cart boot, wain boot and all other manner of boot (save and except building boot) without assignment”. How ‘boot’ is to be interpreted in the first three instances is not entirely clear – did it mean the right to take timber for the making or repairing of ploughs, carts and wains just as timber was not to be cut for building purposes? That the most obvious meaning may not be the right one is suggested by two other types, house boot which was permission to take fuel for firing, and hay boot, to take thorns for hedge mending. As regards inheritance of property the customs of some manors provided for a different mode of descent than that commonly applying in English law, that is, to the eldest son. Descent in Streatham Manor seems to have been to the youngest son or, failing sons, to the youngest daughter and this was also the custom in Wallhurst Manor.

The manorial grants were, as we have noticed, also “according to . . . the customs and services” of the manor. Whether the reference to services had any real significance in these later times is probably doubtful. The old services of feudal days such as were noted in the 14th century customnals had practically fallen into obsolescence by the following century, helped into the limbo of disused feudal practices by the labour shortage in England which followed the Black Death of 1348-49. (Whether this plague ever reached remote and budding communities like Cowfold, we cannot tell). It is nevertheless unlikely that the sale of copyholds was very frequent in the early days; the tenants had little opportunity nor the resources for the purchase of property held from the manor. The church books do however record in 1325 that John at Crone sold to John de Holmwood and Alicia, his wife, one messuage and one virgate of land in Cowfold. Later with the dissolving of the feudal relationship between tenant and lord of the manor and the disappearance of the concept of villeinage as well as the rising prosperity of manorial tenants, land and houses became saleable commodities and the Courts Baron were frequently recording transfers by sale. In practice copyhold tenure became a form of ‘ownership’ though limited by the customs and residual rights of the manors.

Another evolving aspect of land holdings was the realisation of their value as financial assets. Originally the copyholder would have viewed his property as a livelihood, his portion of God’s earth from the fruits of which, for subsistence or later for marketing, he could sustain himself. Once saleable it provided a secondary means of raising money and many a mortgage is to be found among the transactions of the courts from the mid-18th century. An extreme example of this is Marles water mill and land on Mill Lane below the present Gorsedean. Used several times as security by Joseph Terrell before he finally surrendered it to James Souch, a miller of Poynings and also his mortgagee, in 1779, the property was let and again used to raise loans for the new owner. In 1816 Thomas Souch, a labourer of Henfield,

inherited Marles Mill. Once again licence to let was granted and on the security of the property Thomas Souch borrowed £270 in 1825, £100 in 1827, £230 and £100 in 1831. All these loans were at 5% interest to John Pollard of Brighton to whom the mill was finally surrendered in 1838 in settlement of the debts. Thomas Souch doubtless had little concern for the property represented by the mill and its lands but his copyhold gave him access to a fund of ready cash with which perhaps he eased his conditions of life during a difficult period for the average labourer.

The farms and properties around the parish of Cowfold and the manors within whose jurisdiction they lay may be noted from the various court books though the resulting lists are not always free from some uncertainty. This is because lands worked as one farm seem sometimes to have been divided by manorial boundaries and the old names for parcels of land, perhaps originally individual forest clearances, have since faded with their merger into more familiar farms. Another peculiarity is the scattered nature of the lands belonging to certain manors and it may be significant that the holdings of probably the oldest manors are more compact. Some idea of the manors predominating in different parts of the parish can be gained from the following allocation of farms among them.

Ewhurst Manor

Baldwins
Browings (with Bullocksland)
Capons
Cratemans
Gratwicke (with Milhams)
Little Picknowle
Northfields
Picknowle (now Parkminster)
Woldringfold (but much of estate including Grubbs and Massets was in Streatham)

Shermanbury Manor

Bulls (part of old 'Homelands')
Eastridge
Gervaise (with Julians Garden and Searches)
Gosden (but Gosden Mill and also Marles Mill appear under Beeding)
Homefields (part of old 'Homelands')
Homelands
Kings (with Hedgelands): from the 1840s it fell within Ewhurst
Lidford
Wilcocks (with Buckhatch)

Streatham Manor

Chates (by grant but later recorded under Beeding)
Cotlands
Eastlands
Godshill
Groveland
Little Jervis
Mockford
Noahs Ark (now Wood grange)
Potters
Swains
Most of village and churchyard environs

Beeding Manor

Denwood
Drewitts
Drodges (ie cottages below Crabtree)
Goodgers (with Woodlands)
Graffield
Hooklands
Frithland (or Frithknowle)
Marles Mill
Patchgate (now Parkgate)
Ridgeland
Singers
Welches (now Longhouse)

Besides these manors there was Wallhurst but this was small compared to the others and seems to have been limited to little more than its own estate. High Hurst Manor is also omitted. Now included in Nuthurst it lay to the north west on the further side of Burnt House Lane.

There are some notable absentees from the properties listed above, for instance, Dragons, Oakendean, Hill Farm (now Homelands Nursing Home) and Averys, among others. These have not been picked up in the court book entries. Owing to the scattered nature of some of the holdings belonging to the same manor it is clearly unsafe to judge the manorial associations of the missing properties from those of their neighbours. Even the exact boundaries of Streatham can be elusive despite the information given in a survey of the manor for the Long Parliament in 1641 and described in Sussex Archaeological Collections (Vol LXII). Averys and Alfreys appear to have been in the manor, the line following the brook, there described as the “swiftly running waters of the Whitingroll stream”, a little to the east and of the tributary joining it from Bulls Bridge. While the next stretch is undefined the court books place Gervaise outside the manor, the boundaries of which continued down the east side of Godshill, along the south side of Mockford and then westwards to pursue a course up Littleworth Lane to Danefold Corner. Turning east through Groveland Wood the boundary left Gervaise Wood in Streatham but then it disappeared. Part of Capons farm land seems to have been within the manor and, as we have seen, Grubbs was also included but the line followed between them is unknown. The survey then mistakes the bounds as taking in Patchgate (contrary to its true placing in Beeding Manor).

Pursuing a course up the main road and then eastwards through Peppersgate the boundary gets quite lost but is said to include Bishops Wood in Slaugham and to reach Warninglid. After more missing stretches it is believed to emerge once again at the cross-roads east of Oakendean and then to return to the vicinity of Alfreys. The fact that much of Beeding Manor lay within the points apparently mentioned in the survey only goes to show how difficult it is in these days to plot any firm and logical limits to the lands of these ancient manors. It is better to rely only on the claims made for jurisdiction in the records of the Courts Baron where these can be found.

For the farmers and holders of land in the parish the manors retained a legal importance in providing them with title to their properties and in the regulation of their use of it. For the holders of the manors themselves their jurisdiction was a source of revenue from the heriots, rents and fines levied by the Courts Baron. In earlier times the manorial dues may have been a valuable asset but with the gradual depreciation of money values, the expenses of administration by paid stewards and the unchanging level of rents, their financial benefit to the lords of the manor must have shrunk considerably. As a social asset, however, the lordship was no doubt still a coveted possession. At the same time, though the rents were small the ‘fines’ taken by the courts when larger transactions came before them could be substantial: a

transfer of Eastlands in 1739 was accompanied by a fine of £24 and another in 1772 which affected also Little Jervis brought in £60.

For Streatham the lord of the manor was, as we have seen, the Bishop of Chichester. The other manors were vested from time to time in the following persons (the mode of descent being shown where known).

Shermanbury Manor

Descent:

William Comber	1542	
John Comber	Died 1593	Inheritance
William Comber	d. 1627	Inheritance
Thomas Gratwicke	To 1664	Marriage
Thomas Lintott	1718	Marriage
Henry Farncombe		Marriage
John Challen	To 1794	Marriage
Stephen Hasler Challen		Inheritance
Henry Hunt		Marriage
Sampson Copestake		Purchase

Ewhurst Manor

William Heath	1631 – 1642
Robert Heath	To 1678
Henry Pelham	1700 – 1731
Thomas Pelham	1736 – 1757
Rt Hon Thos Lord Pelham	1773 – 1780
John Challen	1787
Rev John Gratwicke Challen	1803 – 1831
Stephen Hasler Challen	1837
Rev Charles Webber	1839
H W Freeland & E Johnson	1854 – 1858
Rev C H Hutchinson & Houldsworth Hunt	1863 – 1872
Houldsworth Hunt	1874
Sampson Copestake	1880

Beeding Manor

Descent:

Thomas, Earl of Arundel		
Piers Edgecombe	1642	Purchase
Richard Edgecombe		Inheritance
Colvill Bridger	1764	Purchase
Harry Bridger	1765	Inheritance
Colvill Bridger	1767	Inheritance
Harry Bridger	1800	Inheritance
Harry Colvill Bridger	1832	Inheritance
Harry Bridger	1874	Inheritance
Harry Colvill Bridger	1910	Inheritance

Wallhurst Manor

John Lintott	1723
Henry Farncombe	
John Challen	
Henry Hunt	
Henry Wood	

The Copyhold Act 1852 brought the manors within sight of the end of the practical contribution to country life. The Act allowed for the enfranchisement of copyhold property by agreement between the copyholder and the lord of the manor with the payment by the former to the latter of compensation for “the value of all the manorial rights and incidents of tenure” from which the property was freed. Upon enfranchisement the property acquired the normal freehold character. One of the first copyholds to cast off its manorial allegiance in Streatham was Cotlands, enfranchised in 1858, and the ‘Shop house’, now Bacon’s Stores, followed in 1859. In 1866 Stephen Fowler enfranchised his part of the property on the Church Path long defined as “that messuage in two tenements and shop with backside gardens”; in this year also Mrs Sarah Roper did the same for Potters. But the process was a piecemeal one lasting over many years and Little Jervis, for instance, had to wait until 1908 before ‘going freehold’. We do not know when the last Cowfold farms and properties ceased to be subject to their former manors but copyhold tenure was finally abolished by the Law of Property Act 1922. With the fading of the jurisdiction of the Courts Baron ended their court books which are such a mine of information on the histories of the houses and farms around Cowfold.

In discussing, so far, the manorial tenants we have been referring in practical terms to the land ‘owners’, the landlords of Cowfold who probably in day-to-day affairs had

a more immediate impact on the life of the parish. At this stage it will be convenient to continue to consider them in this light for where the farmer did not himself have the copyhold of the land he worked it was the rents due to his landlord which were a big factor in determining whether and how he could make his farm pay. The rent factor will, however, be more particularly relevant when the agricultural scene is considered.

Cowfold was always an 'open parish', that is, one in which the land ownership was vested in many different people rather than being concentrated in one or two who could thereby exercise a dominating influence in local affairs. However, a number of families from time to time acquired quite extensive interests in Cowfold and the waxing and waning of some of these can be followed through the pages of its history.

Wallhurst and Oakendean belonged to the Lintott family during the 1600s. Among the children of Henry Lintott, a mercer of Cowfold in the earlier years of that century, were two sons, Thomas and Henry. Thomas held Wallhurst as did his son after him, at least until the latter's marriage to the co-heiress of Shermanbury Place at the end of the century. The other son, Henry, had Oakendean which descended through three further generations to John Lintott who by 1780 held Brook, Coopers and Cotlands also. However, he died in the following year and all these properties passed into other hands except Cotlands, the residue of over a century of land holdings in the parish. His son, John Henry Lintott, continued to hold Cotlands until he sold this also in the early 1800s.

Earlier Brook seems to have been associated with the Mitchell family from the 16th century until at least the late 17th century. (The property is described in a genealogy as 'Brooks alias Bulls' but as Bulls in Bulls Lane was held by the Bull family when 'Brooks' belonged to the Mitchells the alias can probably be disregarded). Brook descended from John Mitchell, a draper of Cowfold who died in 1565, through the line of one of his sons while the descendants of another son had interests in holdings to the west near Brownings, namely Bullocksland and Wistons Garden. A further step down this line Thomas Mitchell, then a gentleman of Cuckfield, owned Wilcocks and Buckhatch in the mid-1600s but this property passed to the Roberts family later in the century. Five generations of Mitchells had been among the landowners of Cowfold but by the middle years of the 18th century when Brook had passed to the Lintotts, they had disappeared from this stratum of society in the parish.

John Dunstall was a yeoman of Cowfold in the first half of the 16th century and, while one daughter married John Awood of Brownings and Patches and another daughter married Richard, heir of John Gratwicke of Jervis (Gervaise), his namesake son held Picknowle. This property was still in the family when his great-great-grandson had it a century later. His great-grandson, Thomas Dunstall, had come into Brownings in the 1630s at which time his cousin, John Dunstall, was holding Goodgers and Baldwins. A little earlier another Thomas Dunstall had acquired Eastridge which remained in the family for a further two generations. Before the 17th century

terminated, however, all these Dunstall interests, Brownings, Baldwins, Picknowle, Eastridge and Goodgers, had come to an end and subsequently the family name seems to have dropped out of Cowfold altogether. Before the decline of these estates Thomas Dunstall of Eastridge and Picknowle (1617 – before 1659) had married Anne, daughter of John Gratwicke of Jervis and Shermanbury.

The Bull family is another that disappeared from Cowfold annals after a long sojourn. According to notes written for the parish magazine in the 1920s by Sir William Bull, his family had come to the parish by the 14th century and their holdings at various times included Bulls, Homelands, Eastridge, Kings, Little Picknowle and Bulls Bridge. One branch of the family held Kings until at least the mid-1600s while another had Homelands until the end of that century. For a while in the middle of the following century Henry Bull held Little Picknowle but after this the Bulls passed out of Cowfold.

Extensive interests were held by the Roberts family in the 1600s and 1700s. John Roberts had Wilcocks until about 1698 when it was alienated and his other interests included Denwood, Welches, Hookland and Goodgers as well as other names less familiar and now doubtless merged in other properties. He had inherited Homelands about 1659. His son held all these properties except Goodgers and Wilcocks in the 1730s but in the next generation John Roberts, gentleman of Cowfold, disposed of Homelands, Welches, Denwood and Hookland in or before 1746. With the end of these interests the Roberts evidently ceased to be landowners in Cowfold. Their name still remained in the parish in the 19th century but whether as descendants of the same family is uncertain. At the latter time they were to be found among the labouring population.

The Gratwicks appeared consistently, as we have seen, through most of Cowfold's history. There were two branches in Cowfold, one holding Mockford and Little Picknowle in the 17th century if not earlier. This branch disappeared, possibly at the time Little Picknowle passed out of the family with the death of John Gratwicke about 1730. The main branch, however, was at Jervis and from them sprouted the branch that held Eastlands. The latter passed to Thomas Vincent following his marriage in 1670 to Mary, the daughter and heiress of Richard Gratwicke; Jervis itself ceased to be Gratwicke property following the death of John in 1720 and of his sister, Mary, a spinster, six years later.

These family associations with Cowfold had continued over generations and even over centuries. What factors, then, contributed to their apparent fading in the 17th and 18th centuries? The available information does not permit any positive answer but it leaves some impressions which may be valid. First, with the growth of these yeoman families and their prospering fortunes their tentacles had spread out into to other parts of the county. Among the later generations of Mitchells who held Bullocksland and Wistons Garden Richard was a yeoman of Henfield and Thomas, his son, a gentleman of Cuckfield. One of the sons of Thomas Lintott of Wallhurst became established in Henfield and in Hurstpierpoint at the end of the 17th century.

The Gratwicke family in particular had wide connections and as the centuries passed its branches extended at various times to Ringmer, Albourne, Tortington, Shermanbury and Horsham. The shrinking of their estates held in Cowfold may, therefore, owe something to progressively wider diffusion of the once local families, and in particular to their marriages. Most of these landowners counted themselves among the gentry by the end of the 17th century by which time a good marriage was an acquisitive one, to an heiress, for instance, as in the case of Thomas Lintott who married Anne Gratwicke thereby setting himself on a course to acquire Shermanbury Place. In another family, Thomas Vincent who held Little Jervis married, as has been mentioned, the heiress of Richard Gratwicke of Eastlands in 1670 and thus succeeded to Eastlands in due course. Where such an alliance with a family and property in another parish conferred 'betterment' upon him it is not difficult to imagine that a man's centre of gravity would have transferred accordingly with a lessening of his interests in lands back in Cowfold. Death without issue or only female issue also brought with it change of interest and the extinction of a family name from the parish. Rising interests in city life may have contributed to the decline of local family estates. Misfortune as well as good fortune could be a factor. Thomas Steele held Brook and Averys besides other village properties in the 1780s and, though Brook passed into other hands, his son Edward still had Averys as late as 1830. By 1841, however, Edward Steele was a farm labourer living in the village which may suggest that financial trouble led to the loss of his former possessions. The case of the Martins at Dragons around the same period leaves a similar impression.

The Lintotts, Mitchells, Dunstalls, Bulls, Roberts and Gratwickes had, nevertheless, all been essentially Cowfold families and their passing marked a change in the pattern of local land ownership. The 18th century saw an increasing intrusion into the parish of outside and absentee landlords, people with no Cowfold association who doubtless were but names to the villagers and to the farmers who rented their land. The Blunt family of Lindfield, later of Horsham, held Cratemans before 1700 and it still belonged to them in the 19th century. Hill Farm was acquired by Charles Goring of Wiston about 1780 and he added to his estates Brownings and Jervis about 1815: Trenchmores and Searches also belonged to him. Prior to Charles Goring, Brownings and Jervis had been held by Thomas Steele of West Hampnett near Chichester from the mid-18th century. The Rt Hon Thomas Steele owned Bulls and Woldringfold in addition but this family's interests faded in the early 19th century and while the Gorings succeeded to part of these estates Bulls was acquired by the Tredcrofts of Horsham in 1814 to whom it belonged until at least 1840. The Shelleys of Field Place near Horsham had Welches and Kings from 1746 and 1803 respectively until well into the middle years of the 19th century and Lord Selsea and his forebears held Homelands from the 18th into the 19th centuries. The year 1766 saw Peter Whittington of St James, Westminster, admitted to Goodgers and it continued in this family well into the 1800s. These examples illustrate the loss during this period of much of the personal connection which had existed between Cowfold and the owners of the land within the parish and the alienation thus introduced between the labourer and farmer on the one hand and the landlord on the

other reached its sharpest point, in common with other parts of Sussex, in the agricultural troubles of 1830. The balance was, however, to be redressed in the second half of the 19th century with the establishment of the Boxalls at Parkminster, the Hopers at Hill Farm and the Godmans at Woldringfold as owners of a large part of Cowfold land.

The manors and, under them, the land holdings were the framework upon which Cowfold grew from the medieval period to the mid-19th century. In the same way that the skeleton underlies and maintains the human form throughout life which the flesh develops and changes upon it, these elements of the parish structure continued through four centuries while the village and its life evolved about them. Both manor and copyhold were, nevertheless, pliable enough to allow development of their feudal concept of lordship and servile tenure into a form of ownership with land as a transferable and valuable asset until finally even the shadow of their original nature faded out after 1852. Change there had been but on one Cowfold property an unbroken thread ran through most of this period of history. Some time in the first half of the 16th century Thomas Martin had been born the son of William Martin of Bolney. Thomas may have come to Cowfold or it may have been his son, Peter, who first settled at Dragons having married Margery Gratwicke at Cowfold church in 1576. From Peter Martin of Dragons onward through six generations the Martin family held and farmed that property until 1817 and, even after circumstances had obliged James Martin to part with his copyhold title, his son James continued to live on and work the land until the 19th century was more than half over.

3. Agriculture, the Village Economy and the Labouring Poor

The farming topography of Cowfold, and of the Weald in general, long retained characteristics with which it had been endowed from its original exploitation in separated clearances of the woodland cover. Small tree girt fields around the farms remained a feature of the agricultural landscape even when the Wealden forest had been largely developed. The “singular custom” of leaving thick shaws around and between the fields attracted the attention at the beginning of the 19th century of the Rev Arthur Young who commented that they “render Sussex one of the most thickly enclosed of any (county) in the whole island”. “These hedgerows, two, three and even four rods wide” did not commend themselves to him for “when corn is enveloped by such fences, impervious to the rays of the sun, it must necessarily experience very great and essential damage.” In fact it might almost be concluded that with “the country being generally so wet, the means to air and dry it here used are to exclude the sun and wind by tall screens of underwood and forest around every field; and these being so small, a great number are so wood-locked that it is a little surprising how the corn can ever be ripened”.

While Young’s comments were made of the Weald in general it is evident that Cowfold was no exception to the rule and it is only in comparatively recent years that the grubbing out of hedges and shaws has produced some of the larger fields to be seen today. The wide field to the south of Homelands Nursing Home, for instance, was in the latter half of the 19th century six individual fields, some heavily screened by woody shaws. Another on the other side of the main road south of the entrance to Brook had on three of its four sides wide borders of coppice and trees. The open pasture land now lying between Groveland and Gervaise Woods was at the same time cut up into many small fields interlaced with fingers of woodland, some of which have only been removed in the last few years.

If the Weald was a district of small enclosed fields it was also one of small farms. “In the Weald,” commented Young, “although farms sometimes rise to £200 (rental) a year and upwards, yet of this magnitude they are not often to be met with; and in a general enquiry a far greater number fall very considerably below this calculation, insomuch that the average size in the district is under £100 a year.” Again Cowfold testifies to the truth of his statement and between 1780 and 1830 none of the properties in the parish reached a rental value of £100 a year; the average stood between £40 and £60. In contrast Young informs us that farms in the Eastbourne district averaged £350, around Selsey varying from £50 to £400 and between the South Downs and the sea an average of £200. A clearer idea of the size of farms in Cowfold may be given by their acreages and here the average in 1851 was 137 acres. The census of that year records the acreages worked by the various farmers and James Leppard at Brownings had the largest farm at 400 acres. This was rather exceptional for Cowfold, no others exceeding 300 acres. Four farmers had between 200 and 300 acres each, fourteen between 100 and 200 each while nine were with less than 100 acres, the smallest being around 30. This aspect of Wealden farms can be seen from another angle also, again pointing to a sharp contrast with other

districts. The lands of Cowfold were worked in 1851 by some 28 farmers but Young remarks that in his time (c. 1813) on the South Downs and in the neighbourhood of Lewes, Eastbourne and Brighton “many farmers occupy the greatest part if not the whole of their respective parishes.”

The agricultural development of Cowfold seems to have proceeded, and the ultimate size of the holdings to have been reached, fairly rapidly once settlement was established. The extent of Eastlands in 1641, for instance, was 60 acres, the same size recorded for it in the Streatham court books in the 18th and 19th centuries. Swains in 1641 comprised 100 acres against the 125 being farmed in 1871 and Singers and Potters together took in the same area that Richard Baker was farming in the mid-19th century. On the other hand Godshill at the earlier date had 30 acres against 80 two hundred years later and Mockford 80 acres against 130.

The 1641 figures come from a list of the customary tenants of Streatham which also gives Groveland as 60 acres, Massets and Northhaines (evidently the farm later known as Chatfields) 60 acres, Grubbs (part of Woldringfold) 30 acres and Averys with Holdene, 110. The size of some other holdings about this time may also be quoted from manorial court books: in 1659 Bulls was 18 acres, Kings with Hedgeland 140, Lidford 40 and Wilcocks with Buckhatch 30 acres. Little Picknowle in 1668 was 30 acres while Northfields had 16 acres of land in 1678. Cratemans in 1636 had 100 acres and an estate map exists dated 1758 showing a fully developed pattern of fields around this farm.

It is not possible, however, to take very far any comparisons between the earlier extent of farms and their sizes in the 19th century for by the latter time – and indeed from the previous century – larger units were being worked by some farmers, combining earlier individual farms or renting additional land adjoining their own. As has been noted before Eastlands and Little Jervis had been united under the Vincents by 1681 and about 1805 Baldwins was added to these holdings, all of which were actively farmed by the family. By 1780 Brownings and Jervis farms were being worked together by John Hughes; Richard Baker who was farming Potters in 1782 added Singers in 1800. Other farmers no doubt expanded and contracted their farms from time to time and the fluctuation of acreages is apparent from the table below drawn up from information given in the 19th century censuses.

FARM ACREAGES IN COWFOLD

Year:	1851	1861	1871
Averys	193	200	300
Brook	55	36	50
Brownings	400	220	220
Capons	134	100	242
Chatfields	240		a

Coopers	180	120	x
Cotlands	220	208	a
Dragons	93	80	a
Drewitts	200	50	a
Eastlands (with Baldwins & Little Jervis)	170		187
East Ridge	164	175	476
Godshill	80		150
Goodgers	70	52	60
Gratwicke	286	260	270
Kings	150	150	157
Homefields		20	a
Homelands		100	x
Lidford		50	57
Mockford	130		141
Oakendean	138		40
Parkgate	155	30	x
Patches	108		a
Peacocks Hill	18		x
Picknowle	100	112	120
Little Picknowle	60	69	a
Potters (with Singers)	150		a
South Frithknowle	36	36	86
Smiths Cross	-	-	112
Stone House	30		33
Swains			125
Wallhurst	120	186	190
Welches	130	150	95
Wilcocks	38	80	a

a = farmland absorbed elsewhere

x = not given

By the 1800s some of the old farm houses had become cottages for labourers but the yards and buildings from which the farms were worked still existed though some have disappeared now. Singers farm buildings halfway up Pound Lane by the pond have entirely disappeared and only a derelict open shed by the brook south of Gervaise Cottage remains to mark the site of Jervis farmyard. Potters farm buildings from which the land was worked in the 19th century have totally gone as they have also at Godshill. Church Barn, however, remains its active use recalling the time when it was the centre of Little Jervis farm. These old farmyards were generally a compact group of buildings set around and enclosing the yard and pride of place went to the large weather-boarded barn with its wide doors facing each other on either side of the building. The centre of the barn between these doors was the threshing floor and the draught through the double openings helped to fan the

working area of chaff when threshing was in progress. The great barn at Capons affords an example of such a building dating as far back as the 14th century.

Among what would now be termed the 'overheads' which the farmer had to face were rent (assuming he was a tenant farmer), the tithe and parish rates for the poor and for the roads; agricultural wages call for separate consideration. The Rev Arthur Young quotes various crops and shows that these items could account for about a quarter of the cost of producing wheat and over a third of the barley expense. On the clay lands of the Weald about a quarter of the expenses of oats were attributable to rent, rates and tithe. As to rent Young says that it "varies in proportion to the quality of the land. In the Weald it averages 9/- per acre (but in a great part of the Weald is from 12/- to 20/- per acre) excepting the north and north-western parts, comprehending a considerable portion of poor and frequently wet sandy land which is let at 7/- to 8/- per acre." Taking a few samples Cowfold rents seem to have been nearer the latter figures, Potters and Singers at about 7/6 per acre, Eastlands, Little Jervis and Baldwins about 8/6, Goodgers 7/- and Brownings 7/6. These calculations are, however, based on the rental values of the farms for tax and rating purposes and the actual rents obtainable on a letting might have been different, varying according to agricultural conditions from time to time. In regard to the tithe Young says "in the western parts of the county the composition which generally takes place is at an average rate of 4/6d in the pound." The occasion for this was the annual tithe audit which took place about November and the reckoning of the amounts due to the tithe holder, who in Cowfold was the Vicar, was then made. The other expense in the farmer's consideration was the parish rates which will be discussed later. The burden that these charges imposed on the profitability of the farm before any account was taken of labour is evident and would be especially hardly felt in lean years.

Horsfield in his county history published in 1834 stated that Cowfold embraced an area of 4,640 acres, the land being used as follows:

Arable – upwards of 2,000 acres

Meadow and Pasture – 700 acres

Woodland – 300 to 400 acres

By far the greatest proportion of farmland was thus under cultivation and with the first half of the 19th century this type of farming reached a peak. The 1840 Tithe Map shows arable fields predominating throughout the parish where today much of the land is given over to grass and pasture. Along with the high degree of cultivation went the importance of cereal crops and especially wheat. The land given over to these crops in Cowfold in 1801 was rather more than 600 acres to wheat with a slightly lower figure for oats. The remainder of the arable land at that time would

either have been laying fallow or under some other crop as part of the cycle of rotation then practised on the Wealden clays. Pencil markings, presumably contemporary, on an estate plan of Homelands farm dating probably to a year between 1803 and 1808 seem to indicate the use to which each arable field was being put. Of a total of 86 acres, 27 were planted with wheat and almost 19 with oats while 16 acres lay fallow. The remaining fields are uncertain for the writing is not decipherable.

The heavy clay soil was, however, not ideally suited to cereal growing as the yields and the expenses of raising the crop testify. In the coastal belt south of the Downs yields of up to 40 bushels to the acre could be obtained and John Ellman, one of the early 19th century pioneers of farming efficiency and innovation often quoted by Young, whose lands at Glynde bordered the Weald and the Downs, reported “32 bushels per acre on his best lands.” In contrast the yield of wheat was between 20 and 22 bushels at Cowfold. Even then achieving the best results of which the Wealden soil was capable required considerable preparation of the ground and one of the fertilisers used was lime. Many parish field names recorded in the Tithe Map betray the presence of kilns for preparing this essential fertiliser. On the south side of Cowfold Lodge is Lime Kiln Field in which the kiln lay at its south-east corner near the pond and there is another Lime Kiln field south of the old Jervis farmyard beyond the brook. Another example lay south of the A272 in the angle with Stonehouse Lane. Quantities of marl, the friable limey clay, were also used in the Weald to spread on the fields as well as the scrapings of manure from the farmyard. Marl was generally laid on the ground and left through the winter before ploughing in. Whether chalk, another additive, was used at the greater distances away from the downs is not known: wood ash also would probably have been spread when available and was highly regarded. However, apart from lime for which there is good evidence the use of these other fertilising agents in Cowfold must remain a reasonable conjecture based on general Wealden practice.

Along with the nutrition of the land went the ploughing in which the implement in most common use, according to Young, was the Kentish turn-wrest. “It breaks up the land from five to seven inches deep, perhaps better in some instances than the ploughs of Suffolk and Essex, especially when the ground is hard and dry.” But it was a “clumsy and un-mechanical plough and its defects outweigh its advantages. It throws out and drives along almost as much earth on the land side as it does on the furrow side and the fixed sticks which act in union with the moveable one as a mould board are in so awkward a position that with deep ploughing they ride the land on both sides and keep the plough from going close at heel; to remedy which they sometimes hook on great weights at the tail of it.” These heavy implements might be drawn by teams of six, sometimes eight, oxen; alternatively three or four horses were used. At the turn of the century the oxen were being worked until about nine years old and then fattened off and in 1847 it was noted that Red Sussex cattle were worked until the age of six or more, according to type, before fattening. The field name on the north side of the present Eastlands House provides a reminder of the beef raising side of Cowfold farming; it was named in the 1840 Tithe Map as Ox

Fatting Meadow. Marshy ground or lags along stream banks, unusable for other purposes, also provided grazing land for cattle.

Perhaps the major agricultural operation of the year was the harvest over a period of four to six weeks. For the village labourer it was the season in which he had the best opportunity of securing steady employment for with the reaping hook and sickle as the harvest implements a considerable labour force was required to bring the corn safely in. About 1813 when Young's report was published the gathering in of the harvest was generally done under a contract previously made between the farmer and his men whereby the wages and the proportion of the crop allotted to each man was agreed. Wages were paid on a piece work basis of from 9/- to 11/- or 12/- for reaping one acre though Young also quotes earlier (1793) rates based on time work, £3 for a good month with board provided by the farmer. He says that a good labourer could reap one acre in three days. (In Suffolk a usual allotment per man was about 20 acres). For the women and children there would be gleaning in the tracks of the harvesters for which they could earn a much more modest rate. When the crop was safely gathered in it was customary for the farmer to give a 'harvest home' or supper for his workers.

After the harvest came the threshing. The former must have been back aching work for the labourer bending over his sickle day after day but he could earn a higher return for his labour than he would expect for the more general round-the-year work. Then from November through to January he relied mainly on the threshing to keep body and soul together for there was little employment on the land at this time. This, of course, was a hand flailing operation and one of the principal complaints of the depressed 1820s was the introduction of mechanical threshing machines which robbed the farm worker of wage earning capacity during the winter months. Hobsbawm and Rude (in 'Captain Swing') have argued that the value of the threshing machine to the farmer lay in the extra speed with which he could get his corn on to the market rather than greater economy in the threshing process. Wheat prices were high immediately after the harvest but soon dropped off as greater supplies came on to the markets in the following weeks. Whether any of these machines appeared on the Cowfold scene we do not know but as there was no suggestion of machine breaking in the parish or agitation against them they were presumably not a factor on local farms.

With the various charges and the costs of raising his crops what did the farmer get by way of a return? The Rev Arthur Young quotes an account of the expense and product involved in the rotation commonly followed "in the strong lands of the Weald". This crop rotation consisted of a four year cycle of fallow, wheat, oats finally clover though it was not regarded by the commentators as a good system of management. Summarising Young's detailed account we get the following result:

1 st Year: <u>Expense</u>	(i.e. at least 18 months rent)	£1. 1. 0		
2 nd Year: <u>Expense</u>	(i.e. rates & taxes, tithes, ploughings, manuring with lime, seed sowing and harrowing, weeding, labour, harvest, etc)	£7. 7. 0		
			£8. 8. 0	<u>Produce</u> £8. 8. 0
3 rd Year: <u>Expense</u>	(i.e. ploughing, seed sowing and harrowing, mowing, threshing, carriage, etc, taxes, rates and tithe, etc)	£3.13. 8		
			£3.13. 8	<u>Produce</u> £4.18. 0
4 th Year: <u>Expense</u>	(i.e. rates, tithe, seed and sowing, mowing, carriage, (two crops)	£1.17. 9		
			£1.17. 9	<u>Produce</u> £3.15. 0
			£13.19. 5	£17. 1. 0

Profit on four years £3. 1. 7 per acre or 15/- per year on £5 capital.

It is not surprising having regard to these figures that Young found that “many farmers look upon wheat as a losing crop. It appears that a crop of wheat three times ploughed and manured with lime will not more, if so much as pay, the expense of raising it; that all the profit arising must be from the oats and the clover in the two succeeding years”.

The price fetched by wheat which was given by Young in this calculation of its profitability to the farmer was 46/- per quarter. It is, however, not clear to which year the costing relates for although his report on agriculture was published in 1813 his data sometimes comes specifically from earlier years, as far back as the early 1790s, while elsewhere (as here) it is undated. Wheat prices fluctuated considerably and between 1791 and 1895 they varied from around 75/- down to 43/- with the average about 53/-. These figures are not far out of line with Young’s price. Under the influence, however, of the Napoleonic War wheat climbed steeply in price at the turn of the century, when it averaged 80/-, and at times it touched a record price of 126/- (with an average then of 97/-) before the end of the war. It was doubtless this booming situation that in 1801 caused it to be reported that farmers in Cowfold “have been induced to sow a large quantity of wheat for the last two years in consequence of the high price it has been sold for at the Horsham market”.

The farmers obviously did very well during this period with the temptation to spend more freely. On the return of peace, however, the wheat price began to fall steadily and by the 1820s the average was down to 57/- while ranging from a top price of 68/- to a low of under 45/-. It continued to fluctuate with the years but it did not vary

greatly above or below these figures. This drop in the return from their crops hit Sussex agriculture and the farmers themselves very severely. Many found themselves deep in debt, tenant farmers were unable to pay their rents and landlords, conscious of the fact that they would face difficulty in re-letting to new tenants and preferring that the farms should remain occupied, allowed their tenants to run on despite non-payment. To what extent these predicaments were faced in Cowfold we cannot be sure but the circumstances of the sale of Dragons about 1817 may well suggest the farmer's financial difficulties. The Martin family had owned and farmed Dragons for many generations, as we have already seen (p). However they sold the farm and yet remained in occupation as tenant farmers. With such a long association with Dragons it seems unlikely that such a sale would have been made without pressing cause while the fact that James Martin continued farming there leaves the impression that his attachment to the property of his forefathers was not in any way weakened.

With the drop in profitability – and the post-war wheat prices once again approximate to the costing made by the Rev Arthur Young – came cut-back. While prices were good there was a margin of profit sufficient to pay, and to encourage, the expense of labour and manuring to keep the land in healthy productive condition and the clayey soil needed plenty of both. Marl, for instance, was recommended at a rate of 10 to 20 cartloads to the acre and several ploughings were needed before a crop. When on the other hand the profitability was reduced to the slimmest margin, if any, the temptation to cut back on these expenses was great. The post-war years, therefore, saw Wealden farmers become more frugal and more economical in their methods – and in the labour they employed for they had to pay the parish rate for the maintenance of the poor and the unemployed whether or not they retained a work force of their own. Green crops and seeds were omitted from their rotations and land allowed to lie fallow so as to reduce charges. The 'root break' which had been considered one of the most favourable innovations of the previous century was generally abandoned by Sussex farmers in the 1820s and this omission was regarded as disastrous; liming of the land also tended to be dispensed with. The natural result of these trends was that yields fell a good deal below the national average and cultivation in the Weald never fully recovered.

With farming playing a dominant role in Cowfold life the state of agriculture and the rewards it offered to the labourer were obviously a vital factor in the welfare of the parish population. The margin between wellbeing and destitution for the farm worker was slim enough at the best of times and any depression in farming soon had an adverse effect on his standard of life, an effect which was aggravated by other factors which came to prominence in the early years of the 19th century. There seems generally to have been an excess of men in Cowfold who looked to agriculture for their living over the numbers who could readily be absorbed into work on local farms. When the census of 1851 was taken the farmers stated the number of men and boys they employed and the total of these amounted to 108 men and 13 boys. By comparison, in 1841 there were about 150 who claimed agricultural labour as their occupation and, as we have seen, the 1871 figure was 132. When farming

was thriving in the countryside work could probably be found for the additional workers or they may have been able to find employment close at hand in neighbouring parishes. The onset of depression, however, with the cut-back by farmers to the bare essentials of work on their land quickly brought distress and need of relief to labouring families. The consequent increase in expenditure on parish relief complicated still further the farmers' problems and again reacted on the labourers' position. These factors which combined to produce widespread unrest in 1830 must now be considered. In this we also see something of the standard of living of ordinary families from the plentiful figures given by the Rev Arthur Young and though he does not give detail in a specifically Cowfold context conditions in the village are unlikely to have differed materially from the general Wealden picture.

Young gives the following specimen of the annual earnings of a labourer in the Petworth district about 1797:

52 weeks common labour @ 9/- per week	£23. 8. 0
Harvest month - £2.10. 0 – less 4 weeks @ 9/- per week	14.0
Supposed saving in his board, 3/- per week which he must live on if at home	12. 0
3 weeks haymaking @ 2/- per day, less 3 weeks @ 9/- per week	9. 0
By 'barking': 3 weeks - £3. 3. 0 less 5/- per week for lodging and extra living to support hard labour	£ 2. 8. 0
	<u>£27.11.0</u>
Supposing 6 days lost per annum for bad weather and slight illness	9. 0
Average per week: 10/5d	£27. 2. 0

Employment in 'barking' involved stripping the bark from timber for the extraction of tannin at felling time which was usually in April when the sap was rising. It was a valuable supplement to the labourer's earnings in the above specimen but Young says that such work was rarely to be found by the average labourer. Illness and long spells of wet weather could severely upset the countryman's earning capacity and we may also note that the example assumes the finding of full employment throughout the year. It therefore represents the income of a man who might have considered himself comparatively fortunate. If the labourer was relying on casual work such as he could find when he trudged round the farms the wage rates that might be in his mind would probably be such as Young quotes for the Cuckfield area. These labour prices were 1/4d a day in winter, 1/6d a day in summer, 2/- during harvest, reaping wheat at 8/- to 9/- per acre, oats at 1/6d to 2/-, barley at 1/6d to 2/-,

pease at 3/-, mowing grass at 2/- per acre, clover at 1/6d, hoeing turnips at 5/6d per acre, thrashing wheat at 3/- per quarter, barley at 1/8, oats at 1/- and pease at 1/6d. His wife could earn in winter 6d per day or 9d in summer and 10d during the harvest.

In lean times, such as winter, a man might need additional support for his family. This might be relief given by the parish overseers; on the other hand Young comments “those labourers who can rent a cottage and garden can generally keep poultry and fatten a hog, and all have frequent and great help from the charitable and considerable farmers, such as milk, broth and inferior meat, which must make the deficiencies of earnings.” A family’s income would be derived not only from the man’s wages but from the work his wife could find and his older children also: in the censuses Cowfold children from the age of twelve upwards are frequently described as farm labourers.

On the housekeeping side of the account Young gives an interesting statement of the expenses of a labouring family in the parish of Glynde in 1793.

Rent of a cottage and garden	£2.10. 0	
Fuel	If bought, costs £1. 1. 0 to £1. 4. 0	
	Labourers are allowed the old wood,	£1. 1. 0
	Wives pick up sticks	
Clothing:	Man wears a frock per annum	5. 0
	Wear of a working waistcoat	
	And breeches	6. 0
	Two shirts	10. 0
	One pair of stout shoes, nailed	9. 0
	A pair of stockings	4. 0
	Hat, handkerchief, etc	6. 0
		<hr/>
		£5.11. 0
	Woman wears a gown and petticoat	9. 0
	Two shifts	7. 0
	A pair of strong shoes	5. 0
	Two pairs of stockings	3. 0
	Two aprons	3. 0
	Handkerchiefs, cap etc	4. 0
		<hr/>
		£1.11.0
Man's and woman's expenses		£7. 2. 0
Lying in, sickness and loss of time		£1.12. 0
		<hr/>
		£ 8. 14. 0

Food prices about the same time included a half peck loaf of wheaten bread at 1/-, a gallon of flour at 11½d, tea 3d per ounce, moist sugar 9d or 10d per pound, salt butter 8½d or 9d per pound and cheese 5d or 6d per pound. Soap was 4d per pound. The inflation of the war years would have affected Young’s figures and with

the return of peace, despite the depression, the price of wheat tended to maintain a higher level than before the war. Farm workers' wages, however, throughout these years had in effect been 'pegged' by the Poor Law system as amended by the Berkshire magistrates at Speenhamland in a manner shortly to be noticed. Another series of statistics from Glynde in 1793 quoted by Young illustrates vividly the plight of labouring and poor families in Sussex, a plight which must have got worse with rising prices, particularly of wheat, in later years. Young sets out a comprehensive account of the income and expenditure of a number of families with differing circumstances and as a first example the situation of a man and his wife with six children aged between two and twelve may be taken.

<u>Expenses:</u>	Weekly necessities -		
	Bread or flour	6. 8	
	Yeast and salt	. 6	
	Pork or other meat	2. 0	
	Tea, sugar, butter	1. 7½	
	Cheese	.10	
	Soap, starch, blue	. 6	
	Candle	. 4½	
	Thread, worsted	. 7	
	Total per week	<hr/> 13. 1	
	Per Annum:	£34. 0. 4	
	Add rent, fuel, clothes and lying-in	£8.14. 0	
		<hr/>	£42.14. 4
<u>Earnings:</u>	Man earns (mean per week)	9. 0	
	Woman earns	-	
	Children earn	2. 0	
	Total per week	<hr/> 11. 0	
	Per Annum		<hr/> £28.12. 0
<u>Deficiency</u> earnings	of		£14. 2. 4

Next a family of six persons in which the man and his wife have four children in age between three and fifteen years.

<u>Expenses:</u>	Weekly necessities -		
	Bread or flour	5. 9	
	Yeast and salt	. 4	
	Pork or other meat	1. 8	
	Tea, sugar, butter	1. 3	
	Cheese	. 6	
	Soap, starch, blue	. 5	
	Candle	. 4½	
	Thread, worsted	. 6	
	Total per week	<hr/> 10. 9½	
	Per Annum:	£28. 0. 2	
	Add rent, fuel, clothes and lying-in	£8.14. 0	
		<hr/>	£36.14. 2
<u>Earnings:</u>	Man earns (mean per week)	9. 0	
	Woman earns	2. 0	
	Children earn	3. 0	
	Total per week	<hr/> 14. 0	
	Per Annum		<hr/> £36. 8. 0
<u>Deficiency of earnings</u>			6. 2

As a final example we may take a man partially disabled. He has lost a leg, his wife is lame and they have a six year old child.

<u>Expenses:</u>	Weekly necessities -		
	Bread or flour	2.10½	
	Yeast and salt	. 3	
	Pork or other meat	.10	
	Tea, sugar, butter	. 7	
	Cheese	. 3	
	Soap, starch, blue	. 4	
	Candle	. 4½	
	Thread, worsted	. 2	
	Total per week	<hr/> 5. 8	
	Per Annum:	£14.14. 8	
	Add rent, fuel, clothes and lying-in	£8.14. 0	
		<hr/>	£23. 8. 8
<u>Earnings:</u>	Man earns (mean per week)	4. 0	
	Woman earns	3. 6	
	Child earns	1. 0	
	Total per week	<hr/> 8. 6	
	Per Annum		<hr/> £22. 2. 0
<u>Deficiency of earnings</u>			£1. 6. 8

If the manual worker had thus to count and guard every penny he could earn, a more optimistic view could be taken of their income by the shopkeepers dealing in the necessities of life and perhaps by village craftsmen (though shoemakers tended to gain a reputation for radical militancy). Besides the poor man's small purchases the retailers no doubt supplied the wealthier houses in the neighbourhood and the overseers were often substantial customers. Bills such as the £4. 9.10d paid by the Cowfold overseers to William Beeching, the butcher, and the £6.11.11½ paid to William Carter at the Stores in 1807 were considerable amounts by comparison with the labourer's income.

The parish had of course always had its poor but the problem they posed was magnified beyond the bounds of previous experience by the rise in population, the inflation of prices during the war and the slump which followed it. Another factor was the increasing vulnerability of the labourer's situation as the 18th century wore on into the 19th. In the earlier years farmers had customarily engaged their workers by annual hiring and the younger unmarried labourers were taken on with board and

lodging provided at the farm. This meant the farmer's discipline on their lives but their needs were provided for whatever the economic climate around them. We have a Cowfold example of this practice from a Poor Law examination of George Woolven who stated that his father, Henry Woolven, who had been born in the parish in 1781, had "hired himself at the age of 24 or 25 to Mr Hughes of Mockbridge as carter, served under a yearly hiring for a whole year and resided and slept in his master's house." The attraction of the system to both parties diminished, however, as the young men chafed at their employers' discipline and as the farmers found in the '90s that they could obtain a bigger return on the produce consumed by their men if it was sold in a market offering inflated prices. Shorter terms of employment, even daily hirings, became more and more common and in consequence the labourer became more exposed to economic hardship when work was lacking as in winter, bad weather or for any other reason.

The old Poor Law system for relieving those unable to maintain themselves has already come in for mention (p.) and under the Act of Settlement of 1662 such assistance was confined to persons with established settlement in the parish. The system provided relief on the premises of the workhouse or 'poorhouse'. This building in Cowfold still exists in Margaret Cottages and an early reference to it appears in the parish registers in 1773. In that year eight of its inmates died, mainly from an epidemic of putrid fever then in the village. Poor Law expenditure was found from a parish rate levied on the rental values of properties and the fund thus accumulated was administered by two Overseers of the Poor appointed annually.

Poor relief was intended, as mentioned, to provide for those parishioners who could not work and support themselves but a radical change gradually came over the system after 1795 as a result of a decision by the Berkshire magistrates. In a climate of rising prices they attempted to avoid a parallel increase in rural wages by providing for supplementary support for families out of the parish rates when wages would no longer cover living costs. Their ideas spread far and wide and evolved into a scale of relief according to the price of bread and the number of children in a family.

As the emphasis of the Poor Law turned to 'outdoor relief', that is, assistance to men not in the workhouse and indeed often to those who were not even out of work, the expenditure rose alarmingly. The tragedy was that an increasing section of the population and of employed or employable men perforce became paupers relying in part of poor relief for their support. The peak of this expenditure was reached, according to Hobsbawm and Rude, between 1815 and 1820 and 14% of the population of Sussex were being relieved as paupers. Some examples of the annual expense of the Overseers at Cowfold and their receipts from the parish rate show the size of the burden which was being thrown on occupiers of land, a burden which, it is to be remembered, was borne by the small farmer who in the normal course employed little or no labour as well as by the larger employers who benefitted to a greater extent by being saved the payment of a living wage to their men.

<u>Year Ending March</u>	<u>Total Payments</u>	<u>Total Receipts</u>
1813	£1,716.10. 0½	£1,773.14.10½
1814	£1,445.16. 1	£1,504. 5.10½
1815	£1,144. 2. 8	£1,173. 8.10½
1819	£1,723. 4. 4½	£1,958. 1. 3½
1833	£1,210.11 2	£1,366. 6. 5½

The Overseers, who were generally drawn from the ranks of the farmers and tradesmen in the village, kept detailed account books of their expenditure and, to judge from the dozens of individual payments made week by week to parishioners in need, the duties of their office must have been time consuming, to say the least. How the actual process of paying relief was handled is unfortunately not known; whether, for instance, the Overseers were available at some place, say the vestry, during certain 'business hours' for dispensing payments or whether they went round for the purpose to the houses of those entitled to parish assistance. Perhaps it was a combination of both for their activities were a good deal wider than mere distributors of 'dole' money. A glimpse at the Overseers' daily round which we get over a few weeks in 1810 from the account books represents only light activity by comparison with the worst years of rural distress.

1810	Feb 5	Relieved Bett Heasman	7. 0
		12 weeks pay, Eliz Buttup('s) child	£1.16. 0
		Paid Mr Charman for 700 faggots for the (poor) house	£8.15. 0
	Feb 12	Relieved Thomas Moore, senior	7. 0
		Relieved Bett Heasman	7. 0
	Feb 13	Relieved James Boyce	2. 6
	Feb 17	Edward Woollven('s) wife relieved	5. 0
	Feb 18	Relieved James Moore	5. 6
		Relieved Thomas Pierce	7. 0
		Relieved William Tullett, senior	5. 0
	Feb 19	Relieved Bett Heasman	6. 0
	Feb 21	Charles Moore relieved	6. 6
	Feb 23	Relieved Edward Peters at Battell	£2. 0. 0
	Feb 24	Relieved Richard Wales	5. 0
		Paid a bill to Mr Steadman (He was a Horsham solicitor evidently handling parish business)	£27.15. 0
		Relieved Thomas Blake	4. 0
		Relieved William Anscomb	5. 0
		Relieved William Dewdney	5. 0
		Relieved Thomas Moore, Junior	5. 0

Parish business also involved the Overseers in travelling about the county, sometimes considerable distances. In 1807, for instance, an Overseer had to make journeys to Slaugham and to Cuckfield in January, to Broadwater in May and to Lewes and to Ringmer in June. For such journeys the Overseers took their expenses from the poor rate. At the end of each annual term the account books evidently had to be taken to be certified by a magistrate and in the early years of the 19th century counter-signatures in the books included those of Sir Timothy Shelley, Nathaniel Tredcroft and Robert Hurst of Horsham.

A closer look at these account books reveals the main headings under which payments were made from the parish rate. In the first place there were the expenses for the maintenance, feeding and clothing of the workhouse and its inmates. These will be noted when Margaret Cottages are discussed. Then there are the regular payments made to those unable to support themselves or their families, to the old and infirm and to the widows. Some random examples illustrate this relief.

1801	November	Paid Widow Neeve one months pay	8. 0
		Paid Widow Carpenter one months pay	4. 0
1804	April	Paid Widow Neave 5 months pay	£3. 0. 0
1807	November	Paid months pay for Jesse Boyce's children	18. 0
		Paid months pay to Widow Baytop	9. 0
1812	August	One months pay to William Mobsby, snr	£1.16. 0
		One months pay to William Mobsby, jnr	12. 0
1816	December	Paid one months pay to John Woollvin	12. 0
		Paid one months pay to Charles Stoner	6. 0
1824	November	One months pay, Thomas Whales	10. 0

Payments on account of illness, our next heading, were not always confined to parishioners who were disabled from work and occasionally emergency assistance was given to travellers.

1817	December	William Heasman relieved, wife ill	3. 0
		A poor man received, ill	2. 0
1818	February	William Tullett relieved, a bad hand	7. 6
1822	July	Paid sundry expenses for a poor man took ill on the road	7. 6
1824	November	Relieved John Martin, ill	7. 0
		Relieved Ben Anscombe, ill	5. 0
1830	October	Relieved James Botting, Trenchmores, ill	2. 6
1834	December	Relief to Henry Mobsby, wife and children ill	4. 0

Besides such payments as these the Overseers were responsible for arranging medical care for the poor of the parish. Agreements were made with a Henfield doctor in the years from 1815, the following being the memorandum of 1816.

Memo: the Parish Officers of Cowfold agree with Charles Morgan, Doctor of Henfield, to doctor the poor of Cowfold till Ladyday 1817 for the sum of £28; mid-wifing, broken bones and all complaints whatever.

Fuel was allowed to the poor by the parish and the Overseer arranged for its supply, no doubt from the woodland owners in the district. The faggots mentioned in the accounts would have been bundles of sticks, wood being the natural, perhaps the only, fuel in the rural Weald.

1799	March	Paid (for James Moor) for 100 faggots	£1. 1. 0
1807	November	Paid for 200 faggots for John Woollvin	£3. 8. 0
1814	October	Relieved John Woollven for wood	£1.10.0
		Relieved William Tullett for wood	£1. 0. 0
		Relieved John Robards for wood	£1.15. 0
		Relieved for wood for James Richardson	£1. 0. 0
		Relieved William Mobsby junior for wood	£1. 0. 0
1815	December	Paid for 100 faggots for Thomas Akehurst	£1.15. 0

Again in October 1826 we find the Overseer tackling the fuel question in bulk and supplying wood to Thomas Akehurst, senior, Charles Moore at Brook, John Akehurst, William Tullett, William Botting, Richard Fairs, Charles Stoner, James Langford and Thomas Woollven at a total cost of nearly £12.

Another item of relief was the provision of clothing as in the following extracts.

1801	November	Paid for makeing roundfrock for Chatfield	. 8
1814	March	3 yards frocking for Attree	6.11½
		1 pare of breeches, James Moor	10. 6
		1 pare of shoes, Hannah Moor	4. 4
		Shroud and pillow, late Widow Battup	7. 6
		Shroud and pillow, Ben Anscomb, child	3. 6
1815	January	Shroud and pillow, Botting's boy	6. 0
		To cloaths for T Akehurst(s) family	£1. 0. 0
		6 yards flannel for J Stoner	9. 0
	March	Paid for clothing, Edward Botting	£2. 0. 0
		Paid for clothing, Charles Moor	£2. 0. 0
1822	April	Relieved Henry Hisman, daughter's cloths	10. 0
1830	October	Paid John Woollvin towards cloths for boy	£1. 0. 0
	November	Relieved Benj Anscombe for his girl's cloths	12. 0

The rents of poor families were a heavy expense against the parish rates in the period about Ladyday, strings of such entries appearing in the accounts at that time of year.

1799	March	Paid Thomas Mathews' rent	£2.10. 0
		Paid John Richardson's rent	£2.10. 0
		Paid Henry Richardson's rent	£3. 0. 0
		Paid James Moor's rent	£2.10. 0
		Paid John Attree's rent	£1. 0. 6
		Paid John Vinall's rent	£2. 2. 0
1804	April	Paid Philip Anscomb, 1 years rent	£3. 0. 0
		Paid 1 years rent for William Shaw	£2.10. 0
		Paid 1 years rent for John Brown	£3. 0. 0
1822	April	Relieved Henry Woolvin, Keymer – 1 years rent	£3. 0. 0
		Relieved Charles Stoner, 1 years rent	£2.15. 0
1825	March	Paid Mr Vincent (for) Thomas Mobsby's rent	£2.12. 0

It seems that one means by which the Overseers sought to relieve families of expense they could ill afford was to board out one, or perhaps more, of their children in better endowed homes in the parish. The liabilities of the parish rate to provide relief during the period of board was presumably commuted by the payment made to the host and though we do not know from the accounts the ages of the children concerned it would seem probable that they gave some domestic service in the households where they were quartered.

1799	March	Paid Charles Burtenshaw for keeping girl one year	£3.18. 0
		Paid Thomas Steele for keeping girl one year	£3.18. 0
		Paid John Knowles for keeping girl	£5. 4. 0
		Paid Thomas Wood for keeping boy one year	£5. 4. 0
		Paid Thomas Dudney for keeping girl one year	£1. 6. 0
1808	April	Paid Edward Steele for keeping William Attree for one year @ 2/- per week	£5. 4. 0
1815	March	Paid Edward Steele for keeping Edward Botting, one year @ 2/3d (per week)	£5.17. 0
1822	April	Paid Mr Gravely (for) keeping W Vinall, 36 weeks @ 9d per week	£1. 7. 0
1825	March	Paid Mr Baker for keeping John Mobsby – 52 weeks and clothing	£1. 6. 0 £2. 0. 0

Lastly in this review of Overseers' expenditure mention may be made of the innumerable items of relief paid without reference to its nature, items such as those previously observed from February 1810. Some of these may relate to unemployment for payments specifically so described only start in 1817. On the other hand, while assistance of an extraneous sort was probably required in individual cases, a proper description of many of these payments might place them under one of the foregoing headings. Unemployment became a serious problem after the war and expenditure on this account will be noticed more fully at a later stage.

These allowances from the parish rate were, in the economic climate of the early 19th century, vital to a large section of the rural community if they were to keep body and soul together. In consequence, with eligibility to Poor Law relief being confined to persons with established settlement in the parish, the labourer was increasingly deterred from leaving his native place. A move to a new district would, if he could not establish legal settlement, offer little promise; should employment there be lacking the prospect would be starvation and deprivation if not his enforced removal to his original parish of settlement. For, on the other side of the coin, the parishes were hardening their attitudes in face of the problem before them of the rising cost of Poor Law relief. The rates charged in Cowfold in 1813, by way of example, were at 6/- and 4/- in the pound though how the differential charges were applied is not clear. (In later years a rate seems to have been determined about March/April time and October/November – 3/- and 2/6d in 1840 – though these were presumably assessed on a six monthly basis and cumulative). With a greater natural increase in population and a diminishing loss by emigration the parishes sought to limit their liabilities under the Poor Law. One approach was by a progressive reduction over the years of what had been accepted as the basic subsistence needs of a man and his family, thereby reducing the cost of relief among those already living in the parish. Another object of their endeavours was to prevent new legal settlements being established by immigrants who might at some time have a call on the Overseers for support. The principal qualifications required for a man to establish legal settlement were birth or serving an apprenticeship in the parish which included board and lodging or an annual hiring under which service was performed for at least one year. It was partly significant of parish attitudes that the latter, annual hirings, became increasingly less common, if not frowned upon: a man from another village might serve a farmer for years but if he were employed by successive hirings each less than twelve months it would not avail him if he were subsequently out of work and a Poor Law removal order would probably result sending him back to his last village of settlement. Sometimes parishes engaged in prolonged disputes with each other over these questions. The case of Edward Botten and his wife, Hannah, who had moved from Cowfold illustrates the technicalities of legal settlement. He was examined at Mountfield on this point and, in the sworn statement taken from him, he “saith he was born in Cowfold where his father was and still is an inhabitant legally settled, as he has heard and believes. His first place of service out of Cowfold was with his uncle, John Botten of West Grinstead whom he served a year under distinct half-yearly agreements”. In consequence of this a removal order was made in May 1835 sending him back to Cowfold. Other instances of removal orders have been given in the first section of this chapter (p27).

How hard or how lenient an attitude towards removals was adopted by the Overseers of Cowfold? The answer to this question is not known but at least no particular rancour seems to have been shown towards the administration of the Poor Law in the village at the time of the disturbances of 1830. Nevertheless the parish officers were evidently careful in the case of persons then in Cowfold who might have a legal settlement elsewhere, to enquire into the facts and a number of Poor

Law examinations exist which, incidentally, cast light on the lives of some individual Cowfold people in this period.

When Henry Woolvin was examined in January 1813 he stated that he had been born at Lower Beeding where his parents were legally settled. About 19 years previously he had hired himself to John Hues of Cowfold, farmer, to serve a year at wages of two guineas and he entered service at Ladyday. He served a year and received his wages. He had not changed his settlement since. Again, in December 1804 Mary Woolvin was examined and said she had been married to James Woolvin twenty years earlier. Her husband had belonged to West Grinstead and she was removed thither with him soon after her marriage. Her husband had left her eighteen years before her examination took place. She had gained no other settlement since then and had frequently been relieved by West Grinstead parish. Philip Stoner, a labourer at Cowfold, said at his examination in November 1803 simply that he had been born at Shermanbury, his parents being legally settled at Nuthurst, and that he had not changed his own settlement. William Mitchell similarly said in November 1793 that he was born at West Grinstead where his father, John Mitchell, was settled and he also had not changed his settlement. Thomas Pierce's story in 1790 was that he had been born at Lindfield where his father was settled. He had been bound apprentice in July 1779 to Thomas Leppard, a blacksmith of Cuckfield, and he duly served his apprenticeship with his master there. His statement ended with the usual assertion.

With the passing of the years through the 1820s the wellbeing of great numbers of country people was precariously balanced between the continuation of a bare existence on the one hand and destitution, even starvation, on the other. We have seen something of the factors which contributed to this depressed state of affairs and their action and reaction upon each other may be summarised before we arrive at the events of 1830. The rise in population had meant that for much of the year there was simply not enough work for the hands available and seeking to live by it: the decay of old hiring customs, furthermore, had left the labourer more at risk when employment was short. The decision at Speenhamland and the low level of wages in an inflating economy forced more and more men onto parish assistance. The resulting steady increase in Poor Law expenditure could find little alleviation from migration for by the application of its basic principles it bound the poorer sections of the population to their parishes. Meanwhile in the post-war years the farmers felt the draught of falling prices and the economies they introduced lessened the work available for village labour. This in its turn adversely affected the cost of the Poor Law; for when one farmer reasoned that he could dismiss his workers since he was already paying for their maintenance by parish relief – and he could always engage casual labour as required from the abundant numbers of unemployed – other farmers were likely to follow suit rather than be left bearing not only their own labour costs but also those of their neighbours as well. At the same time the smallholder needing little or no extra labour to work his land was crippled by the rising parish rate levied to relieve the men who should have had employment on more substantial farms. In this spiralling situation unemployment increased and labourers were

reduced to trudging daily around the farms looking for casual work or to waiting for the Overseers to allocate them to farms where work could be found. While the labourers felt the hardest pinch the whole state of agriculture and of village life was bound to suffer harm from such developments.

There is ample evidence of unemployment in Cowfold in the 1820s. Parish relief given specifically for this cause first appears in the Overseers' accounts in 1817. Thus in the winter of that year we find:

1817	December	William Anscombe relieved – no work	2. 0
		Thomas Moore relieved – no work	2. 0
		Thomas Willet relieved – no work	6. 0
		William Stoner relieved – no work	4. 0
		William Anscombe relieved – no work – Bolney	6. 0
		Charles Moore relieved – no work – Blackstone	6. 0
		William Anscombe relieved – no work	3. 0
		Charles Moore relieved – no work – Blackstone	5. 0
		Henry Heasman relieved – no work	5. 0
		William Anscombe relieved – no work	3. 6
		Henry Woolven relieved – no work – Keymer	10. 0
		William Stoner relieved – no work	2. 6

Such entries continue in the following year and they are numerous in the spring of 1822, as in the following limited sequence of entries:

	30 April	Relieved Ned Botting – no work	6. 6
	2 May	Relieved Charles Moor, Looter – no work	9. 0
		Relieved Thomas Moor – no work	3. 0
		Relieved Henry Tidey – no work	2. 6
	3 May	Relieved James Moor, Ashurst – no work	2. 6
	5 May	Relieved Ned Botting – no work	4. 0
		Relieved Charles Moor, Looter – no work	8. 0
		Relieved Peters – no work	2. 6
		Relieved John Geer – no work	7. 6

Again in the following winter five persons were named as receiving relief on October 18th, four on October 19th and six on October 21st. Entries recur again and again in 1823 and in 1825 and coming to the 'mobbing winter' of 1830 the Overseers' lists are as interminable as ever.

	(November)	Relieved Charles Tullett – no work	3. 6
		Relieved Peter Roberts – no work	5. 0
		Relieved William Heasman – no work	5. 0
		Relieved Thomas Akehurst jnr – no work	4. 0
		Relieved Thomas Wales – no work	3. 0
		Relieved John Langford – no work	3. 0
		Relieved Charles Tullett – no work	3. 6
		Relieved James Roberts – no work	2. 6
		Relieved James Botting – no work	2. 6
		Relieved John Mobsby – no work	2. 6
		Relieved William Tullett jnr – no work	2. 6
		Relieved James Stoner – no work	8. 0
		Relieved Charles Moor, Brook – no work	4. 0
		Relieved Benj Anscombe, boy out of work	2. 6
		Relieved James Moor – no work	5. 0
		Relieved Thomas Wales- no work	2. 0
		Relieved John Stoner – no work and wife ill	10. 0
		Relieved John Mobsby – no work	2. 0
		Relieved William Stoner, carpenter – no work	5. 0
	December	Relieved William Tullett jnr – lost two days	2. 6
		Relieved John Attree, Brighton – no work	1. 0
		Relieved John Geer – lost time and ill	4. 0
		Relieved William Fowler at Mr Burrage's – no work	2. 6
		Relieved James Peters – no work	6. 0
		Relieved Charles Tullett – no work	10. 0
		Relieved John Mobsby – no work	7. 6
		Relieved George Willett – no work	5. 0
		Relieved James Roberts – no work	7. 6
		Relieved William Stoner, carpenter – no work	4. 0
		Relieved William Cleark – no work	5. 0
		Relieved William Gillam – lost two days	3. 6
		Relieved William Hill – no work	3. 0
		Relieved James Wadey – no work	6. 0
		Relieved Henry Woolvin, Keyer – lost 5 days	4. 6
		Relieved William Roberts – no work	2. 6
		Relieved James Peters – no work	2. 6
		Relieved Charles Tullett – no work	2. 0
		Relieved James Peters – no work	4. 0
		Relieved John Mobsby – no work	5. 6
		Relieved James Roberts – no work	6. 0
		Relieved George Willett – no work	6. 0
		Relieved William Clark – no work	5. 0

These extracts are not the complete record of the winter of 1830 but even so some thirty men are named representing probably at least a fifth of Cowfold's labourers and a much larger proportion of the population when dependent families are remembered.

Years of abundant harvest might ease the pangs of villagers and their families and the summer months were no doubt less of a burden but the more severe the winter that followed the harder was it for men to sustain their morale in the face of shortage of work, food and adequate heating. With their status of free born labourers reduced to paupery and with starvation as no remote prospect rural workers were near the end of their tether. And the political background of the later 1820s was one of radical agitation to which the Horsham area was no stranger: Horsham itself was described by a magistrate as a “hotbed of sedition”.

“What sort of a year was 1830?” The question is put by Hobsbawm and Rude in their study of the disturbances of that year and they proceed to give their answer. “As the labourers saw it, it was first and foremost the year that followed one of the hardest periods in their appalling history. The harvest of 1827 had been good. Eighteen-twenty-eight . . . was as good a year – if the term has any meaning in this context – as the labourers had known since 1814. The harvest of 1828 was poor, though the winter was mild; the harvest of 1829 was worse and not gathered in until the snow was already on the barn in early October.” (It may be added, however, that as regards Sussex the Brighton Herald was reporting on September 12th that the gathering of the harvest was all but completed and its comments were not unduly pessimistic in tone.) “Eighteen-twenty-nine was, as we know, an entirely disastrous year, as bad (if criminality is anything to go by) as 1817. The labourers must have faced the spring of 1830 with the memory of cold, hunger and unemployment and the reflection that another winter like the last was more than flesh and blood could bear.” As we have seen the labourers of Cowfold were indeed to face another winter of unemployment. It is not, therefore, surprising that when the discontent of rural workers erupted across the Weald in that year the resulting disturbances sent their ripples across the surface of life at Cowfold.

The first stirrings of trouble had come in the summer of 1830 in Kent and East Surrey and as the winter closed in incidents of rick-burnings, breaking of threshing machines and riotous assemblies increased in frequency. On November 5th the disturbances spread westward to Brede and Battle and soon parishes widely scattered over the county were involved in the ‘revolt’ which was directed with varying emphasis against the use of machines which deprived men of employment, against titheholders and landlords (with no little encouragement from the farmers) and for an increase in the agricultural wage on which point the farmers themselves sometimes became a target of the agitation: wages, it will be recalled, stood around 16d per day.

Anticipating that the storm was about to break around Horsham, Thomas Sanctuary, High Sheriff for Sussex, in a letter post-marked 17th November, wrote to Sir Robert Peel:

The disaffection of the labouring men and the excitement of the present times are beginning to show themselves in my neighbourhood and some incendiary fires have taken place in this county of an extensive nature – indeed from what I

can collect the spirit indicatable by the agricultural men here is worse than in Kent, I mean about Hastings.

It is the duty of every individual to do his utmost to discover these pests of society and destroyers of the good of the people which, if persisted in, will create a scarcity and increase the evil complained of – I cannot prevail upon myself to think that these fires are the acts of the agricultural men as in every case they have used their utmost endeavours to put out the fires and salve the property but there are persons of a peculiar character (employed I fear by a political faction) travelling about the country making strange enquiries and as to the number of stacks, whether the poor are well paid and whether threshing machines are kept, and in some cases notes are made by these querists.

He asked Sir Robert for advice in handling the situation and then, having closed his letter, he added a note on the back:

Horsham 5pm. There is now a rising of labourers of considerable extent and in all parts. Pray tell me what you would advise me to do.

The events of which Mr Sanctuary had had warning soon materialised and have been recounted by William Albury in the Sussex County Magazine.

On Thursday, 18th November 1830, an organised mob met for the purpose of marching on Horsham. It is evident the meeting was arranged beforehand for altogether about 1,500 marched upon the town. Armed with pitchforks, 'stick-bitters' and various other agricultural implements, they assumed a most determined attitude and compelled many unwilling or indifferent people to join them as on many previous and subsequent occasions. They called upon the magistrates of the neighbourhood, unceremoniously entered their drawing rooms and marched them also into the town. Old Sir Timothy Shelley, then about 80 years of age, received his share of the rioters at Field Place with that generosity for which he was famed; he gave them plenty to eat and some good strong ale to drink. Allowing the 'stingo' time to work, the old gentleman then addressed a few words to the men, wished them well, hoped for better times, etc, and begged to be excused the journey to Horsham. But the liquor appeared to have fixed, rather than relaxed, the mobbers' determination. "You shall come!" Lady Shelley was much alarmed and cried, "Oh, pray don't hurt Sir Timothy; I hope you won't hurt Sir Timothy." "We won't hurt he," they replied, "but we will have our demands." Compelling the magistrates and the vicar to join them the whole crowd marched in a body to the old church and inside an informal discussion took place. The labourers demanded 2/6d per day each and, I have been told, they compelled the magistrates to swear agreement to it on the communion table. The vicar also consented to take 10% less tithes.

The scene at the church was recorded by a contemporary who said that all the gentlemen stood up at the altar while the farmers encouraged the labourers in the body of the church. "Mr Hurst held out so long that it was feared blood would be shed, the doors were shut till the demands were granted, no lights were allowed, the iron railing that surrounds the monuments torn up and the sacred boundary between the chancel and the altar over-leapt, before he would yield."

In explaining the magistrates concessions (short-lived as they proved to be) Mr Sanctuary excused himself in another letter to the Home Office:

I should have found it quite impossible to have prevailed upon any person to serve as special constable – most of the tradespeople and many of the farmers considering the demands of the people but just and reasonable – indeed many of them advocated them – a doctor spoke about the taxes but no one backed him.

The Home Office, however, did not approve of the acceptance of the labourers' demands and offered this advice in a letter of 18th November.

Sir Robert Peel is satisfied that there is no advantage in giving way to illegal demands of a mob. It is quite right to take into patient consideration the condition of the labouring peasantry but the attempt to extort a compliance with the wishes of large bodies of persons by the threat of violence ought in Sir Robert Peel's opinion, to be firmly resisted.

On the same day Sir Robert Peel told Walter Burrell of West Grinstead, another of the magistrates,

I have requested that every effort may be made to reinforce the troops in the western part of Sussex and you may judge of the difficulty of doing so when I mention that the most expeditious mode of effecting this is to bring from Dorchester the only cavalry force that is in the west of England. It shall, however, be done and 100 men (infantry) shall be brought from the garrison of Portsmouth.

Concern was evidently felt for the state of affairs in West Sussex. Mr Burrell wrote on November 19th that the magistrates were "in hopes that the excitement occasioned by the meeting (in Horsham) may subside though they cannot answer that there may not be a renewal of it." At the same time the Home Office was writing to Mr Sanctuary earnestly to "recommend a general meeting of the magistrates of the western part of the county and the public expression of firm determination on their part to act with vigour and in concert in maintaining public peace."

The outbreak in Horsham had been an alarming show of militancy on the part of the labourers from the villages on the west side of the town. Feelings were evidently

also strong to the south and Mr Burrell at West Grinstead expressed concern “in case of actual violence in the parishes about me”. The Horsham events were no doubt the talk of the moment in the surrounding countryside and Mr Burrell’s anxiety had some justification. In the following days grievances were aired in many parishes in some calmly, in others less so, and on November 25th the Brighton Gazette summarised the events of that week.

There have also been tumultuous assemblages at Steyning, Cowfold, Hickstead and Shermanbury claiming an increase of wages which was in each case agreed to.

Yesterday a meeting of much more quiet character took place on Henfield common with a similar result and tomorrow the tithe audit at Bolney is expected to produce a large assemblage.

Upwards of 100 labourers met the clergyman of Beeding parish in the street one day last week and extorted from him by threats a promise that he should lower his tithes. We have also heard that the labourers of Poynings parish went on Monday in a body to the Rev Dr Holland’s house and obtained a similar promise.

Meetings of agricultural labourers have also taken place, we understand, at Laughton, Wadhurst, Hellingly, Rotherfield, Herstmonceaux, Withyham, Barcombe and Uckfield.

On Thursday Mr Whicker of Houghton had a threshing machine destroyed. The most violent threats were used.

At Steyning the scale agreed was 2/3d till Ladyday and 2/6d afterwards.

At Cowfold, 2/- per day when employed and 1/8d per day when unemployed; single men, 1/6d and 1/3d. The Rev. Richard Constable also agreed to return 15% on his tithes.

In this parish married men with four children are allowed 40/- per year for rent; with five children 50/-; and six, 60/-; also from 20/- to 50/- for fuel according to the number of children.

At Hickstead the demeanour of the mob was very rough. They compelled the Rev Mr Goring to lower his tithes and the farmers to sign an agreement to give 2/3d till Ladyday and 2/6d afterwards. Single men to receive 1/8d.

We also regret to learn that at a late hour the same night a fire broke out on the farm of Mr Sharp of Twineham against whom there seemed to exist among the labourers a most discontented feeling. Mr Sharp had retired from the meeting at Hickstead before the scale of wages was agreed upon.

The Cowfold meeting took place on November 22nd and a fuller account of it comes from the page of the Brighton Herald published the following Saturday.

On Monday afternoon the labouring men of Cowfold met by agreement the Rev Richard Constable (the vicar) and the farmers of that place at the parish church on the subject of an advance in the price of labour. A long consultation took place at the close of which the farmers decided on giving the married men 2/- per day, married men out of employment seeking work, 20d per day and single men, 15d. The previous prices for single men were about 3/6 per week! This, although an advance, we could perceive was anything but satisfactory either to the men or to the farmers – the former declaring they could not live on it and the latter (the generality present being small farmers) stating the impracticability of them paying the advance decided upon. In this state of things the parties adjourned to the Red Lion where each of the farmers presented the labourers with a gallon of beer. Some little hostility was manifested towards one of the farmers who had advocated at the vestry the giving of 18d in lieu of 20d to married men out of employ seeking work. On the whole, however, there appeared to exist tolerable cordiality between the farmers and the men – the latter expressing their conviction that unless their masters were exonerated from their present heavy burthens, they could not advance their wages and live; and this too they hinted in terms anything but respectful to the landlords and the tithe receivers. One general feeling prevailed which was that the farmer must be relieved or agricultural operations would come to a standstill in a district noted for both quality and quantity of produce. At the tithe audit a fortnight back no abatement was made but at the above meeting the Rev Incumbent expressed his intention of returning the farmers 15%.

This report in the Brighton Herald suggests that the Cowfold meeting was a good deal less ‘tumultuous’ than the mention of it in the Gazette implies. Though frank talking took place the animosity which existed at some other places between the two sides of the agricultural community does seem to have been absent at Cowfold. No cases of arson or machine breaking are known within the parish and the complaints were directed against the tithe holders and landlords. Nor does it appear that any Cowfold men were implicated in the numerous criminal charges which arose out of the Sussex ‘rising’.

Just how moderate an atmosphere reigned in the village can be gauged from the demeanour of the Twineham men who met at Hickstead on the same day. This meeting was described by the Gazette as “very rough” and the correspondent of the herald – the man who attended the Cowfold gathering went on to Hickstead afterwards – endeavoured to convey the tone of the proceedings. The men had met the farmers at 2pm and “at half past six the parties were not a jot in advance from the time of their assembling, the labourers vociferously demanding 2/6d per day

throughout the year and the farmers declaring their inability to give more than 2/-." The reporter continued:

We will endeavour to give, as well as the din and confusion which prevailed will admit, a specimen of the language used on the part of the men to the farmers. "There," cried a sturdy fellow, a mender of roads who stood at our elbow, "do you suppose I'll break stones at 2/- a day? I won't, and there's an end on't. I'll have half-a-crown or you may take the consequence". "Yes," said another, "damn old B-and all his crew; he's a curse to the parish; and there's you, Sir," pointing to another gentleman, "are as bad as any of them. There's old --", (mentioning the name of a rich country squire) "he'd starve anybody in the world on 2d a day." "Well," rejoined a third, "what are you going to do about the half-a-crown?" "why, have it, have it," resounded from a hundred voices. "yes," added a fourth, "you farmers are always boozing about at the vestries and that's where all the money's spent." A farmer: "I never spent your money at the vestries." "Well," rejoined another, "will you give us the half-a-crown or no?" The farmers: "We'll give the 2/-." "We won't have it, we'll bring 500 more men tomorrow." And again the shout of "half-a-crown" burst forth until the din was absolutely unsupportable.

It was only after independent testimony from the reporters present as to what wage levels were being agreed in neighbouring parishes that agreement was reached and the Twineham labourers reluctantly accepted 2/3d from Michaelmas to Ladyday and 2/6d during the summer months.

These militant and threatening assemblies had largely died away in Sussex by the end of November but a degree of resentment seems to have remained in the countryside round about Horsham throughout that winter. Indeed Mr Albury recounts a plot to attack the gaol in the town and free "a lad who had been imprisoned on suspicion only of writing and sending threatening letters to magistrates and others." The gaol was put in a state of defence and violence was averted by "the timely arrival of a troop of Life Guards and two companies of Foot Guards armed with ball ammunition." Troops were stationed in Horsham until after the Winter Assizes at Lewes at which a terrible retribution was taken of mobbers and machine breakers from the more disturbed parts of the South East. An East Preston youth was hanged at Horsham gaol on 1st January 1831 after his conviction for rick burning.

Fortunately, as we have seen, Cowfold avoided the more violent manifestations of the 'Labourers' Revolt'. Whether the improved wage rates agreed at the meeting at the church were maintained is unknown but the lists of unemployed men to whom parish relief was given continued to be prominent in the Overseers' accounts of the '30s. Distress and privation still dogged the lives of villagers in the middle years of the 19th century and this is attested in a resolution which was carried at a Vestry Meeting on 15 October 1844. It was then agreed,

That there is at present great distress amongst the labourers of this parish of whom many able and willing to work can find no employment.

That this want of employment is owing in great measure to the distressed state of the farmers who have not funds to employ so many labourers as might be engaged with advantage to the land.

That if the men are not employed upon the land they must either go with their families into the Union House or be employed upon the parish roads, of which resources the former if above all things to be deprecated and either of them would bring a heavy charge upon the parish without any adequate returns, the roads being at present in a sufficiently good state of repair.

That the only course, therefore, by which justice can be done either to the labourer upon the land, which is his natural support, but that under present circumstances as the assistance of the landlords is absolutely necessary in order to enable the farmers to employ the whole of the poor upon the land, that a respectful application be made to the non-resident proprietors, representing the state of the parish and inviting them each of them to aid his own tenant in employing his share of the surplus labour.

That a letter be written to each landed proprietor embodying the purport of the above resolutions.

This state of depression was equally evident in farming on which so many Cowfold families relied for a living; the point, indeed, is made in the Vestry resolutions. The Weald was still being criticised in 1847 as having farms only partly cultivated and partly stocked and James Judson noted in 1836 that many farmers were living almost entirely on their own produce. Rents had been reduced by half. Stock raising was not prominent at this time and any dairy produce was mainly for home consumption. One of the few successful aspects of Wealden agriculture was poultry 'cramming' and higgles used to go round the cottages buying up 3- and 4-month old chickens for fattening. In the early 19th century before the coming of the railways cartloads of birds were already being sent regularly up to London to provide the demand there.

It was the end of an era for the cultivation of what the Rev Arthur Young had called the "strong lands of the Weald", the damp, heavy clays on which most of Cowfold lay. It has been estimated that between 1872 and 1909 forty per cent of the arable land of Sussex reverted to grass and any comparison of the land use in Cowfold in 1840 when the Tithe Map was drawn up, with the extensive areas of grassland in the parish today confirms, in local terms, this fundamental change.

4. Roads and Communications

One of the first impressions made on the Cowfold landscape by men penetrating the forest lay in the highways they established to take them to their swine pastures and settlements in the area. It was an enduring impression principally represented for us today by the route followed by the A281 road through the parish. We tend to take the course of roads for granted but a little reflection on the line followed by this one does seem to tell us something of the terrain through which it was pioneered and why the route was chosen. In the first place the A281 takes a fairly direct line northwards through the parish suggesting that its objective was a point beyond Cowfold which merely became a settlement on the road. Secondly, it avoids valley bottoms and unnecessary proximity to the streams draining through the area; these it approaches directly where the route requires and, having crossed, regains higher ground beyond. The suggestion that the flatter areas adjacent to the streams made heavy going for early travellers is borne out as late as 1795 by Gardner and Yeakell's map of Sussex which shows a broad belt of marshland on either side of the Whitingroll stream as it flows southwards from St Leonards. Indeed even at that time the road leading eastwards from the village stopped short at Averys, leaving Oakendean isolated on the further side of the marsh, though the first Ordnance Survey map eighteen years later shows a lane connecting these two points.

Travellers, then, chose higher and drier ground which probably meant that there the forest was more open and less congested with impenetrable thickets. In the beginning they could choose their direction freely through the vacant forest and the route they chose represented the most direct line towards their northern pastures consistent with ease of travel over ground which tended to be heavy and sticky where moisture gathered. Local diversions could be made to avoid damp areas but eventually these possibilities became limited by the enclosure of woodland holdings round about. The bounds of the highway, established loosely by usage, were thus narrowed and fixed by the developing farms on either side into a pattern lasting for centuries to come while still further enclosure of the roadside waste for cottages, gardens and other purposes at later dates tightened these limits. In the same way tracks through the forest to and between the new settlements subsequently crystallised into definite lanes as the land around was taken up by the farms. The only exception to this customary evolution of highways in Cowfold is the A272 which originated as a piece of planned road building by a turnpike trust in the 1820s.

The first detailed map of Sussex was Budgen's of 1724 at one inch to the mile and this gives some idea of the topography of Cowfold at that time. However though the principal thoroughfares appear it seems that some routes which are likely to have existed as lanes, or at least as tracks, have been omitted. A fuller picture of the parish is gained in 1795 from Gardner and Yeakell's map. The A281 was, of course, the main highway but other lanes existed, some of which are now metalled roads while others have shrunk to unmade or farm lanes. Littleworth, Stonehouse and Burnt House Lanes lay on the west side of the parish and in the years before the turnpike road was opened this western lane was connected to the village by a lane

which led off at Trenchmores and, coming down through Brownings Farm, turned eastwards onto the present road line past Capons. The course taken by this western exit from the village is still clear and hedged on each side at the Trenchmores end but below Brownings the old green lane has practically merged into the fields. Picts Lane and Kent Street are unmarked by Budgen but can hardly have been non-existent. They are however shown by Gardner and Yeakell at the end of the century and it would appear that when road access was required from Cowfold to Bolney the appropriate route was by Picts Lane.

At this time (1795) some lanes such as Buckhatch Lane had a much greater importance than their neglected state today suggests; the lane at Brownings is another example. Buckhatch Lane from Kent Street to the eastern end of Shermanbury Park was then a regular line of communication on that side of the parish. Another regular route was from the A281 via Picknowle (Parkminster), Mockford and Godshill to Pound Lane and thence onto the road again; the lane on the north side of the monastery is comparatively modern dating from the foundation of the latter. The unmade right of way to Parkminster and Mockford attests to this old route but its further line northwards to Godshill and beyond has completely disappeared except at Pound Lane itself. Other old by-ways still in evidence led to Eastlands and to Dragons and Cratemans while from Kent Street there was access to Lidford and to Oakendean. Goodgers could be reached, as now, from Welches (Longhouse) on Warninglid Lane.

However important these highways were as arteries of communication they were country roads and the roads of Sussex had a particularly notorious reputation. Their upkeep will be considered shortly but an idea of their general condition, "ful of dyrt and myre", can be gained from a comment by a traveller who used to visit Shermanbury from Surrey before the era of the turnpikes and who may therefore have followed the road through Cowfold. Even in summer, he said, "the deep and sticky mud (was) still lying in the narrow trenchways and liable to splash up suddenly so that the horses could not keep their feet but slid and tumbled on their way and almost on their haunches, so that with all their haste we got on but slowly." The early roads were in fact little more than the natural ground surface which in the Weald meant clay, slow to drain away moisture and rainwater and dried rock hard in prolonged hot weather. Wagon wheels sank deep ruts into it while animals and timber haulage churned up the surface. In consequence the traveller had only two alternatives, in wet weather a tenacious muddy quagmire or in the dry, a deeply rutted, hard surface on which an unwary step might lead to a strained ankle.

Increased appreciation in the eighteenth century of the need for steps to improve inland transport brought about the birth of turnpike roads. Trusts formed under Act of Parliament provided proper maintenance for an increasing number of high roads on which they were empowered to levy charges on traffic to finance repairs and upkeep. Initially they were content to improve existing highways but as time went on the activities of trusts sometimes widened to the provision of new roads to supplement or rationalise the existing network. In the former category a trust

assumed responsibility for the road from Handcross to Henfield through Cowfold in 1771, a scheme which was extended when the road from Horsham to the Crabtree was turnpiked in 1792. A tollgate on this road stood within the parish close to the mouth of Picts Lane on the verge near the present Tollgate Cottages. To the south there was another gate at Corner House, beyond the parish boundary. An example of the second type of turnpike scheme lies in the A272 which provided a new cross-country route where most of those existing tended in a north-south direction. Dating from 1824-25 the scheme involved for the most part entirely new lengths of road connecting Ansty, Cowfold, West Grinstead and Billingshurst, which were presumably constructed soon after sanction was given. Apart from the stretch between Brownings and Alfreys the road was an addition to the highways of Cowfold and it left the lane north from Brownings to fade into the shadows. There was a tollgate at the crossroads east of Oakendean.

Responsibilities for upkeep of parish roads rested on the parishes themselves under the local administrative jurisdiction of the magistrates; the later turnpikes were of course the sphere of the respective turnpike trusts. For this purpose the parishes annually appointed Surveyors of the Highways but these were local men, farmers and shopkeepers, without professional experience and the cost of upkeep had to be found from local rates. In consequence maintenance in the earlier centuries often tended to be a last resort when the state of roads verged on the impassable and an inconvenience to the people of the district themselves. As the cost fell on the parish, the highways rate being levied on the occupiers of land within it, the minimum work which sufficed to lessen the inconvenience to an acceptable level probably provided the standard. Indeed, at first normal maintenance consisted simply of ploughing and harrowing the roads annually to restore a level surface and it is little wonder carts sank up to the axles and horses floundered giving rise to complaints as to their state. However, in time broken stone was used to improve the durability of the surface and one aspect of the Surveyors' duties was to find sources of stone while an obligation lay on farmers to provide horses and wagons for a number of days a year to cart road materials. On secondary lanes the plough still seems to have had its place as late as the early 19th century. The traveller on turnpike roads could, of course, expect higher standards for these were the objectives which had brought them into existence.

Cowfold duly appointed its Surveyors of the Highways (or Waywardens) and the parish registers record these appointments from 1642; two each year except in 1704 when three names are mentioned. The Surveyors were unpaid and, like the Overseers, they kept detailed account books of their receipts and expenditure from which we can learn something of local road upkeep in the 19th century and of the expenditure involved. Highway rates were decided by the Vestry Meetings of ratepayers and the Vestry minutes themselves sometimes deal with particular highway matters which had arisen. It is appropriate therefore to consider what these sources tell us of the maintenance of Cowfold roads which by the 19th century was a subject viewed much more earnestly than is probable in earlier times before consciousness of the wider importance of communications had developed.

The Vestry minutes record the receipts for and the expenditure on the highways from 1844 to 1879. These figures are tabulated separately and with these are noted the highway rates for the respective years. It appears from the minutes that these rates were made rather as the need for funds arose than at specific times of the year. Thus in some years more than one rate was made while in a few none seems to be recorded. The intensity of work clearly varied considerably. This also comes out in a comparison of the Surveyors' account books which are available to us for four years, 1838-9, 1841-2, 1843-4 and 1848-9. In the first mentioned year two to three men were being employed between April and July, two men or less until October and four to six men from November to the following March. Not more than three men were engaged in road work in 1841-2 except during October to February when the number sometimes rose to between five and eight. A low level of employment is also recorded in 1848-9. In 1843-4, however, up to eleven men were employed on the roads between April and July and again around November-December time with an average of 40 man-days per week being worked in April-May and 36 man-days in November-December. Apart from July to September of that year at least three to four men were generally concerned in road work or getting materials such as stone. It is possible that some of this work was influenced by the need to provide support for labourers who could not find employment on farms and whose distress is recorded in a Vestry minute of 1844 (p.71). The soaring expenditure of the late 1870s was set in the particular context of the building of the monastery which will be discussed later.

In detailing expenditure on the roads the Surveyors' account books give little indication of what was done or where, though work on the east and west sides of the parish is generally specified separately: one of the two Surveyors seems to have had responsibility for each sector. The accounts simply set out who was employed, for what period and what they were paid. One series of accounts concerning the 'west side' does have some marginal notes which, though tantalisingly brief, enable a vague impression to be formed of road work at this period. The entries thus annotated cover the winter of 1827 and through to the following summer and start on November 11th when three men, John Woolvin, William Botting and Henry Mobsby were each paid for a single days work at "breaking stone and putting in"; the definition of the phrase 'putting in' is not amplified but was presumably laying the broken stone in the roadway. The men were paid at a rate of 1/8d per day which seems to have been the top rate. Other day rates of 1/6d, 1/- and even 10d are later recorded but it is not entirely clear whether it was the particular job in hand or the status of the labourer as adult or juvenile which determined the wage.

In the following two weeks work on "breaking stone and putting in" was practically full time for three men in the first week and four men in the second. Six men were at work at various times at the beginning of December but the note of their activities is lacking. On December 8th the Surveyor recorded "opening a stone pit" and he noted his own expenses in "trying for stone at sundry times". Six men; John Martin, John

Woolvin, Henry Mobsby, John Stoner, Charles Moore and James Peters, were employed for 3½ days in opening the pit at wages of 1/6d per day, after which they received payment for “digging 27½ square of stone @ 1/- per square”. At the same time William Botting was “dtichmaking” for the highway. A week later the same six men had dug out a further 55 square of stone and the Surveyor also employed three horses and a man for “drawing stone at pit for sewers.” On December 22nd William Botting had been at work for six days “letting out water, etc”; the significance of this is again not stated but the most likely meaning may be drainage of the ground where the road work was going on. Meanwhile 69½ square more of stone was gained from the pit; the men also got some “sewer stone out of pitt” which might suggest slabs suitable for covering a channel. As the new year, 1828, came in a further 62½ square of stone was dug and the Surveyor “gave the men over for getting large stone out of pitt, 4/6d.”

By January 13th the men had transferred their attention to work on “new sewers and repairing road” and for the next two days John Stoner and Charles Tulett were “digging gravel” for which they were each paid 1/6d per day. The number of workers dropped to four in the following week when they were “filling stone, etc” for 5½ days. The intensity of the work seems to have fallen off until the middle of February, only one or two labourers being employed for occasional days without mention of their activities. Then William Botting resumed his labours again, “siding road, letting off water, etc” for five days. After this activity appears to have ceased altogether until the beginning of April when two, later three, men found employment and the “gravel cart” was in use. As the month ended gravel digging and carting necessitated the engagement of a fourth man: the gang now consisted of William Botting, Henry Mobsby, George Willett and Charles Tulett.

COWFOLD HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE: RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE

Year (to March)	Rates made in year	Receipts (including balance from previous year)	Expenditure
1831			£174. 0. 7
1832			£191.13. 2½
1833			
1834			
1835			
1836			
1837			
1838			
1839)	
1840) not recorded in	
1841)	
1842	10d) Vestry Minutes	
1843	10d)	
1844	10d	£148. 9. 8	£140.11. 0½
1845	9d & 6d	£234.10. 6	£208.15. 7
1846	4d	£ 86. 3. 1	£ 79. 8. 1½
1847	-	£ 97. 9. 8	£ 69.12. 7½
1848	-	£119. 5. 3½	£ 77. 2. 0½
1849	3d	not recorded	
1850	6d	£118.12.10¾	£104. 5. 2
1851	3d & 3d	£106. 2. 8¼	£ 81. 0. 2
1852	3d	£ 70.19. 6¾	£ 52. 0. 8
1853	6d	£100. 4. 2½	£ 66. 7. 4
1854	6d	£108.18. 5	£ 89.14. 9½
1855	8d	£125.12.10	£101. 4. 7½
1856	6d	£113.16. 2½	£104. 3. 7
1857	8d & 8d	£242. 3. 5½	£166. 6. 1½
1858	8d	£194. 1. 3	£158. 8. 6½
1859	8d	£271.12. 6½	£163. 7. 3
1860	6d	£130. 0.11¾	£126. 2. 0
1861	6d & 6d	£159. 8. 6½	£147.17. 9
1862	6d	£187. 8. 1¼	£166. 2.10¼
1863	6d & 6d	£124.13. 7½	£119.18. 2½
1864	6d	£114.17. 7	£107. 6. 5½
1865	-	£115.12. 5½	£102. 8. 5
1866	4d	£ 64. 0. 4	£ 55. 2. 8
1867	4d	£109.18. 2¼	£ 82. 5. 6
1868	4d	£ 97. 2.10½	£ 80.14. 2¼
1869	6d	£122. 4. 0	£107. 0. 7½
1870	4d	£112. 8. 4¼	£111. 7. 7½
1871	6d	£145.12. 4½	£138. 9. 3
1872	4d	£148. 9. 7	£116.14. 3
1873	6d	£141. 3.11¾	£127.16. 9¾
1874		£122.13.11½	£110. 9. 2¼
1875		£133. 4.10	£ 70. 5.10¼
1876		£141.15. 9	£127. 6. 5½
1877		£211.13. 7¼	£238. 6.11½
1878		£630.10. 5¼	£551. 8. 5¾
1879		£652. 9.1¾	£572.13. 9½

May was evidently a crucial period – the Surveyor, Charles Lee, devoted a full day in person to the job in the first week and he enrolled his two sons briefly into his work force. During that week the men were active for about three days with the “stone cart, laying on stone, breaking, etc and setting out new road” and again in the days up to May 11th with “breaking stone and laying on new road.” With this stage surmounted the work recorded for the days up to 17th May turned to “filling in pitt, levelling, breaking stone etc” and the gang rose to seven in number. They continued “filling pitt and levelling, letting out water, etc” and as the month ended, “filling and levelling pitt and carting up road.” As these accounts show so clearly, road making involved local materials as well as local labour and as operations ended the Surveyor “paid Mr Golds for damages in his field digging stone and roadway, 10/-“. Which Mr Golds’ farm is not apparent but ‘Stone Field’ occurs as a field name on several Cowfold farms and the potential of these lands for yielding road material was probably tapped from time to time when their situation was convenient to the work in hand. One such field lay opposite Brownings and adjoining Capons.

Transport was necessary for the quantities of stone dug from the pit and for sand and gravel. This was provided by farmers in the parish and the account ends with their reimbursement for wagons and animals supplied. James Pierce (of Mockford) was one of these farmers while Henry Burtenshaw (of Swains) was paid £2 for “2 carts and 3 horses 2 days and 2 carts and 2 horses, part of statute duty, stone and gravel carts” and Charles Fuller (of Stonehouse) received £2. 5. 0 for “4 horses and 2 carts 2 days, 2 horses and 1 cart one day and ploughing the lane, statute duty.” The mention of ploughing the lane is of interest and suggests that this implement had not yet entirely lost its place in road construction and upkeep.

Which of the highways had been the subject of these operations it is difficult to say but various factors suggest it may have been in or around Stonehouse and Burnt House Lanes: the three farmers who carted stone had land bordering on Stonehouse and Littleworth Lanes. Mr Golds does not seem to have been a farmer in the parish and as the parish boundary lay along Littleworth Lane the stone pit could have lain across the border in West Grinstead. Furthermore one of the expenses towards the end of the work was “for putting up post and rail at Trenchmores Bridge and mending stone slide.”

Road repair, then, depended on local initiative, local labour and local direction at a non-professional level. The tools of trade were also such as might furnish a well equipped garden shed: those in the arsenal of the Cowfold Surveyors in 1834-44 consisted of 2 large stone sledges, 2 stone hammers, 3 iron bars, 1 scraping hoe, 2 pick hoes, 3 wheelbarrows 1 stone pick, 1 underminer and 1 billhook. At the same time cartage was provided by ordinary farm wagons. The raw material, as we have seen, was stone, broken for surface dressing or in slabs where necessary for the job in hand, this too, in the first half of the 19th century was from local sources, the dressing being merely applied thickly over the road surface without any binding agent such as tar. It seems that in the last resort property owners whose land contained deposits of suitable stone may have been under some obligation to make

it available for parish road repairs. When road stone was under consideration by the Vestry in 1880 the Surveyor reported that he would not have had to call for the rate then being authorised “had he not been refused stone where he wished to dig it.” In consequence he “had been compelled to apply to the Justices of the Peace for this district for a licence to dig stone on land belonging to the Rev John Goring and Richard Ramsden Esq which licence was granted by the said Justices sitting at a Highway Sessions at the Town Hall, Horsham.” The fact that this matter arose for comment suggests that in most cases stone digging was allowed willingly by landowners; as, for instance, when the Vestry minutes recorded in 1842 that “an agreement was entered into between the parish and Mr William Greenfield respecting the digging of stone on his farm, the parish to pay to Mr Greenfield a pound for each pit.”

The importance of local stone supplies would have owed something to the prohibitive cost of obtaining and carting large quantities of this material from anywhere far distant. With the coming of the railways and, so far as Cowfold was concerned, of the branch line from Horsham through West Grinstead, new horizons were opened up. The increasing use of the roads by more and larger vehicles meant a need for more and more surfacing material and rail transport was equipped to carry in bulk. Later in the century the Surveyors were using flints on the roads and the change from local stone, which if available in sufficient quantity was laborious to obtain, probably dates from the opening of the rail link to West Grinstead. Nevertheless the Vestry was debating the relative cost of stone and flints for road repairs at the time of the Surveyors’ confrontation with Mr Ramsden over digging rights but no decision against flints is recorded.

On one occasion in 1884 an incident concerning the supply of flints gave rise to some ruffled feelings at a Vestry Meeting. This both illustrates the quantities of material which were then required to maintain parish roads and the diligence the Surveyors were expected to exercise in looking after parish interests. It seems that one of the two Surveyors, Mr Longhurst, had complained that there was a “deficiency in the weight of flints” supplied to the parish by a Mr Stapley who, with the station clerk at West Grinstead, was also present at the meeting. He agreed that he had not informed Mr Yeates, the other Surveyor, of the complaint which had led to the meeting and in which the imputation of lack of diligence seems to have lain against Mr Yeates. Mr Longhurst then made a statement which his fellow Surveyor requested be recorded in the minutes.

A consignment of flints had evidently arrived at West Grinstead station and Mr Longhurst said,

“ . . . when I thought about the flints about which this meeting is called I went and measured them but could not make eight tons, but the flints did not lay level so that I did a great deal by sight or measurement.”

He recounted how he had tried to get several parishioners "to take out this truck". Eventually he met

'Mr H Hoadley in his field carting hay. I asked him to go the next day to carry out some flints; his reply was, he would go the day after. He asked me the quantity; I said, "ten tons." Then he said, "it is a different truck to what I carried out before." He said, "there was no more than eight tons in that truck"; he said he would offer me a wager that there was not over eight tons, he thought not eight tons."

Eventually Mr Longhurst said to Mr Hoadley,

"You are a ratepayer"; he replied, "Yes", "And you wish a proof as to the weight of the flints" was my reply to him. "It is not to my interest", he said, "that I should complain; it is easier for me to take out eight than ten tons but it is not right for me to send my cattle out to be paid for that I do not do, and so do wrong to the parish." I said, "If you will spare your time, I will spare mine. We will hire Tidey's scales and weigh one truck."

They went to the station and weighed a truck of flints, making it 7 tons 18 cwt 3 qtrs. The following day they weighed another truck there, finding 7 tons 18cwt 1 qtr. Mr Hoper having told Mr Longhurst it was advisable to weigh the one remaining truck also as "the greater would be the proof", the latter

'went to Mr Hoadley on Saturday evening to know if he would go and weigh one more truck of flints on Monday morning. He said, "Not much to my interest to go there and work all day to fill eight tons of flints at my own cost, then to return 6/- short of the day, less than my neighbours receive."

At this point in the statement Mr Yeates objected to its going further and he asked Mr Longhurst some questions.

Mr Yeates: After we were appointed Surveyors, did you or did you not ask permission to take the carting?

Mr Longhurst: Yes

Mr Yeates: I asked you who should pay the men?

Mr Longhurst: I said you had better; you always did.

Mr Yeates: Did you ask if you could arrange the carting?

Mr Longhurst: Yes

Mr Yeates: To whom are the flints consigned?

Mr Longhurst: To Mr Yeates

Mr yeates: Then why take it upon yourself and make this change without consulting me?

Mr Longhurst: Because it was more convenient.

Mr Yeates: What guarantee will you give me that these flints are weighed correct?

Mr Longhurst: I have given you the statement.

Mr Yeates: Whom do you suspect in this matter of the short weight of flints?

Mr Longhurst: I do not suspect anyone.

Mr Yeates: Do you impute anything to me in this matter?

Mr Longhurst: No, I do not; I never expected anything wrong of you.'

The meeting was adjourned at this point to allow the weighing of a truckload of flints on the weighbridge in Horsham and the resulting figure was 9 tons 8 cwt. When the Vestry next gathered a motion was carried that "this meeting has full confidence in Mr Yeates' integrity and that measures be taken for weighing the flints by the railway company from time to time as the Surveyors may deem fit" while Mr Hoper had also written, calling for a "very full, independent and searching enquiry." The matter was still a subject of debate nine months later when the Vestry approved a resolution by Mr Hoper "that an independent competent solicitor be asked to arbitrate by taking evidence on the question of the three trucks of flints." Finally the affair was concluded in May 1885 by the report of the arbitrator, Mr J G Langham, whose findings offered crumbs of comfort to both sides. He found that "Mr Yeates had failed in his duty in looking to the interest of the parish, in having paid for more flints than had been delivered" but at the same time he repudiated "any reflection on Mr Yeates' integrity."

That the office of Surveyor was no sinecure for its holder is clear; and furthermore it was unpaid and an additional burden on top of a normal occupation. As the duties became more onerous and more time consuming in the 19th century the Vestry found it necessary to appoint an additional Surveyor to deal with the day-to-day functions on a salaried basis. In March 1840 "John Martin was appointed Surveyor of the Highways for this parish for the ensuing year with a weekly salary of 12/- payable every week and an annual salary of 5 guineas payable half yearly." He was, however, to be under the general supervision of the parish officers "with regard to the employment of workmen on the highways in this parish and also with regard to his own services in discharging the duties of his office." When he was reappointed

the following year it was additionally provided that “whatever he may collect in the shape of highway rates are to be placed at the time of collection in the hands of Mr Henry Carter” at what is now Bacon’s Stores and he was continued in the post annually until 1853. The Vestry had second thoughts on John Martin’s remuneration in 1844 when, perhaps with his concurrent appointment as the village’s paid constable at a salary of £5 in mind, his annual salary as Surveyor was reduced to one guinea; in 1846 his weekly wage was also reduced to 10/-.

The arrangements for Henry Carter’s oversight of John Martin led to difficulties in 1852. The former had been Assistant Overseer of the parish and it appeared at a Vestry Meeting on 4th June that Mr Carter’s accounts showed an amount owing from him to the parish. When it was subsequently discovered that “John Martin, Surveyor of Highways, was unable to make his accounts good” a committee was appointed to investigate. It found that there was a deficiency in the highway rates collected by the latter of £13. 16. 6¾ and some other sums paid to Mr Carter were also short. Recalling the arrangements for supervision of the Surveyor by Mr Carter the committee observed that these had been “very imperfectly fulfilled and that control and supervision exercised over the Surveyor’s accounts have been very insufficient. The only book used for this purpose is indeed entitled ‘Surveyor of Highways in account with H Carter; but it contains intermixed with sums received and paid by Mr Carter on account of the highways a general account between Martin and Carter in which the former is debited with the amount of bills for shop goods and with arrears of church and poor rates collected by him for Mr Carter and apparently not accounted for at the proper time, such items having no proper connection with an account between the Surveyor or Highways on the one side and the Assistant Overseer acting on behalf of the parish on the other.” Despite this deficiency, the recovery of which was directed from Mr Carter, John Martin was reappointed Surveyor, the last time being in 1853 at a salary of £1. 12. 0 annually and 9/- per week. It was then discovered, however, “that the appointment of a paid Surveyor of Highways in addition to the (two unpaid surveyors) is illegal” and the appointment was rescinded. He continued to be employed, no doubt to take advantage of his experience, the Surveyors in 1854 being “requested to employ John Martin at the weekly wages of 8/-“. By 1859 when his remuneration was last considered by the Vestry he had been concerned with the maintenance of Cowfold’s roads and the collection of the highways rate for nearly 20 years – and in fact his name appears in the road gang, the work of which was noticed in 1827 on p.78. In 1862 it was resolved that “in future the Surveyors be required to collect their own rates.”

The Surveyors’ duties went further than highway repairs and the collection of rates. They included a general oversight of the roads and the parish interest in them. In 1848, for instance, the Surveyor reported to the Vestry an encroachment by a certain Joseph Foster “in the shape of an enclosure contiguous to a cottage inhabited by the said Joseph Foster . . . which enclosure is considerably nearer to the centre of the parish carriageway or cartway than 15 feet” and he was instructed to give notice “to remove the said encroachment.” In the same year complaints were made by neighbouring farmers as to the dangerous state of Picts Bridge. There seems to

have been some doubt whether the parish was responsible for the upkeep of this bridge and the Surveyor, having reported on it, was “desired not to interfere in the repairs of the said bridge.” The question of its repair arose again in 1880 and on this occasion the solicitor consulted by the Vestry advised that “in some particular instances private persons are liable by reason of the tenure of their property. I understand from you”, he continued, “that as to the bridge now in question, Mr Hoper and Mr Durrant have on previous occasions done the repairs. This is prima facie evidence of their liability to repair and before calling upon the County or taking any proceedings I think the Surveyors should serve formal notices on Mr Hope and Mr Durrant requiring them to do the necessary repairs.” When a similar question arose in 1863 concerning “a certain part of the road near Kent Street” it was unanimously resolved that the Surveyors “should decline to repair it and thus leave the parties complaining of it to prove the liability of the parish to repair it.”

A problem arose concerning the highway in Burnt House Lane in 1865. The Surveyor having reported an encroachment there by Mr Ankerson, the owner of High Hurst (Ivories), a committee was appointed to investigate the matter and found that “a portion of the wasteland by the side of the road that may have originally formed part of the highway has in three different places for a distance amounting altogether to 75½ rods been enclosed from the highway by a bank with a hedge planted upon it.” This waste had been used by the parish as a dump for road mending materials and some of this material had been removed to make way for the embankment. The encroachment had taken in the ditch draining the road and as Mr Ankerson had “diverted the water into other channels quite incompetent (as being too small) to carry the water away when there is any amount of it”, flooding of the road was occurring. Refusal to remove this encroachment led to the parish officers consulting solicitors, then trying (evidently unsuccessfully) to negotiate an amicable settlement with Mr Ankerson before seeking a summons against him, and ultimately to asking the opinion of their solicitor as to “what would be the expense of taking the opinion of the Court of Queen’s Bench on the case.” What transpired in these proceedings is not known for the subsequent correspondence and committee reports were not included in the Vestry minutes. However, it would seem that the encroachment of the High Hurst property went undisturbed since the Surveyor reported in March 1866 that “he had completed the alterations to the drain in the western lane as directed by the magistrates in Petty Sessions on 3rd March last.” The efficacy of these measures to prevent flooding of the lane appears to have been limited if a final minute on the subject 13 years later bears upon the same locality. In 1879 the Surveyors were requested “to open the ditch and take up the drain pipes leading from a culvert near Ivories Lodge on the highway and make an opening through the bank to allow free course for the water.”

Consideration has so far been given only to the parish responsibility for highway maintenance. Until 1771 this was all inclusive but then the main road northwards to and beyond the village came into the orbit of a turnpike trust while the road from Bolney towards West Grinstead was the creation of another such trust. For these highways the trusts had their own surveyors while the revenue for their repair was

gained from the tolls taken at the gates along the road. Whether the parish retained responsibility for the road through the village itself is not clear though this might seem probable. Bulls Bridge (then of course some little distance from the village street proper) was certainly a charge on the Trustees. If the dividing line between the responsibilities of parish and trustees is uncertain on the ground, the latter had in some cases the power to call for a contribution to their funds. In 1868 the Cowfold Surveyors received "an application from the Trustees of the Cuckfield and West Grinstead Turnpike Road for a contribution from the highway rate of £9. 7. 0 towards the maintenance of the road." They questioned the Trustees' authority for this demand and contested it through their solicitor before the Horsham Bench in October 1869 but this resulted in "the making of an order by the magistrates for the payment of the sum claimed by the Trustees" as was reported to the Vestry in January 1870. Parish interests may in effect have had some representation on the turnpike trusts through the presence of local gentry on the boards of trustees and Mr Boxall and Mr Hoper were among those for the Cowfold and Henfield Old Turnpike Road.

Some years later the Cowfold Vestry and the Turnpike Trustees found themselves in common cause facing a more than usually damaging threat to their roads. The threat arose in connection with the building of St Hugh's Monastery at Parkminster in the years from 1875 to 1883 on land acquired from W P Boxall. Great quantities of building material were, of course, required as the work proceeded and some of the stone is believed to have been brought over from France, taking advantage of the railway now conveniently near, while other stone was supplied by Mr Ankerson of High Hurst. At the same time road transport had entered the industrial age with powerful traction engines, weighty themselves, enabling far greater loads to be moved by road. These 'juggernauts' of the Victorian era were a far cry from the farm wagons and carriages, the standard traffic with which country roads normally had to cope. Even horse drawn wagons when heavily laden could be damaging to the unmacadamised road surfaces of flint chippings and toll charges often discriminated against vehicles with wheels less than 6 inches wide: the broad wheels of the older vehicles in some measure served to roll out the surface whereas narrow wheels under heavy weight simply cut into it. The problem posed of parish road maintenance by the use of locomotives weighing up to 14 tons and drawing trailers with 20 ton loads does not need to be stressed; it is apparent in the phenomenal leap in the Cowfold Surveyors' annual expenditure in 1877 and the following year.

The details of this episode in the story of Cowfold's roads can be followed through the correspondence of the Trustees for the Cowfold and Henfield Old turnpike Road and in the Vestry minutes. One of the contractors for the Monastery was William Cooper of Henfield who was using a traction engine for haulage and a report by Mr Wood, Surveyor to the Trustees, in May 1875 pointed out that "the road is not strong enough for such traffic." He went on to comment on the extent of the resulting damage and the outlook if such use continued.

There has already been 12 tons of flints used just to fill up the holes made by (the locomotive traffic) and the stone trucks and if they are allowed to continue running (which I think they will do) it will cause a very bad road to travel on all the summer and a very great outlay for material and labour in the autumn. We cannot at this time of the year do anything except fill up but it will require at least 150 tons more flints to make it good enough to carry them.

The bridge called Bulls Bridge must be repaired and I suppose you will decide if Mr Cooper is to pay for it or a portion of it; it is very much out of order. I should recommend a double ring as the material is so very thin on top; we should not want to pull the present one out but put another course of bricks round it at a cost of something like £5.

The naming of Bulls Bridge is puzzling for in December of the same year Thomas Coppard, the Trustees' solicitor, was writing to Mr Borrer at Cowfold referring to the use by the monks of "a traction engine between Partridge Green and their house." Partridge Green was evidently the railhead for some of the building material, perhaps that shipped in from France, and it is difficult to reconcile the situation of Bulls Bridge with a route from that station to Parkminster. Although other sources of building stone existed north of Cowfold which would have involved haulage over the bridge it seems clear that it lay within the context of the Partridge Green run (see Arnold & Co's letter quoted below) and one can only wonder at the route planning in these operations.

However this may be, the damage to Bulls Bridge caused Mr Coppard to write to Mr Cooper in May 1875 requesting him to make repairs and at the same time to prohibit the use of "any locomotive . . . propelled by steam or any other than animal power upon any part of the turnpike roads." The Surveyor placed a notice to this effect on the bridge itself. The prohibition prompted the next move from the Monastery in December 1875: the Rev Fortune Devroux formally requested permission to use the road in default of which he would apply to the Home Secretary. His solicitors, Arnold and Co, summed up the situation in a letter to Mr Wood, the surveyor.

Our client wants to use his locomotive at once between Partridge Green station and Parkminster and we believe there is no time to wait until the meeting of the Trustees on 17th (January). There is only one bridge between Parkminster and the station and the engine has already passed over it twice which is, we consider, ample proof that it is sufficiently strong to bear the weight which is only 9 tons. The locomotive which we understand has previously been causing some damage weighs 14 tons and does not belong to our client and was dragging 20 tons of stone. This cannot of course be taken as a precedent for this case and we consider the circumstances are sufficient to justify our applying forthwith to the Home Secretary in case we do not hear from you with the necessary consent

by tomorrows post. Our client is exposed to serious inconvenience and has indeed incurred special damage by reason of the notice having been placed on the bridge.

On 19th January 1876 the question was discussed between the two parties after which the trustees resolved to “withhold the consent asked for to allow the locomotive to pass over the road and to take what proceedings they might be advised to adopt with respect to the matter generally.” Arrangements were made of the Home Office engineer to inspect the bridge in early February but unfortunately the outcome of these proceedings is not known. The damage suffered by Bulls Bridge on this occasion may well have been a factor leading to its rebuilding in present form in 1891.

The case arose once more in 1877 when in April the “monks had again begun running their engine and trucks over the road.” On this occasion the Trustees successfully brought a prosecution for a technical offence and their solicitors noted “defendants fined £1 and costs and they undertook not to run locomotives again on the road till the wheels had been altered so as to comply with the (Locomotive?) Act.”

By this time the Vestry was seriously concerned at the effects of haulage over the roads in their jurisdiction and a memorial to the Home Secretary was approved “to forbid the use of traction engines for drawing stone for building purposes on the high roads in Cowfold parish.” They had also to consider a contribution sought by the Trustees towards the costs of making good the damage to the road and the Vestry appointed a committee “to confer with the Trustees of the Cowfold and Henfield Turnpike Road and with any representatives who may be appointed by the parishes of Lower Beeding and Nuthurst and otherwise to take action on behalf of the parish of Cowfold in the matter and particularly as to the demand made upon the parish by the Trustees.” What transpired from this is not revealed in the minutes but having considered the soaring cost of the highway account in 1878 it was decided to make a tactful approach to the Monastery for some alleviation of the burden. A report on the accounts was sent to the Rev Fortune Devroux with a letter reminding him that “he had frequently expressed a wish to be presented with the particulars of the extra expenditure on the highways of the parish caused by the excessive traffic to the Monastery.” This had some effect and at their next meeting the Vestry noted the reply to their letter which “contained an offer by (Rev Fortune Devroux) to contribute the sum of £117 towards the extra expenditure.” This was accepted. Their success prompted the parish to send a copy of the same report “to the contractors who are building the Monastery and likewise to Mr Ankerson who is supplying stone of the same with a statement that the Rev Fortune Devroux had kindly contributed and that in large works it was usual for contractors to be asked to contribute something towards extra wear and tear of roads.” As the minutes are silent on the outcome it

can only be hoped that the kid-glove approach was equally rewarding in this instance.

Perhaps the chief significance of this episode is to underline the vast change which had taken place over little more than a century both in the traffic using country roads and in the consciousness of the parish to their importance. Villages were no longer self-contained islands separated by miles of neglected roadway, 'ful of dyrt and myre', and Cowfold displayed the attitude of a responsible custodian, proud of the state of the roads in its care. The improvements from the 18th century onwards heralded a change in the countryside which had become accessible to outsiders and we have already noticed some inflow, small though it was at this stage, of people coming to settle or retire in Cowfold (p23). Manufactures could be transported in bulk to fill the shelves of the village stores and to insinuate a greater variety of household articles into local homes. The railway branch line through West Grinstead and Partridge Green which came around the early 1860s added to this accessibility, introducing a new depth to the concept of 'public transport'. By the end of the century Mr Hale at Potters Green was operating a number of small horse buses to connect Cowfold with the station at West Grinstead. If information is lacking concerning public stage coaches running from Horsham southwards through Cowfold the existence of such services in the 19th century is probable and is suggested by the Venture coach which operated along the route about the turn of the century, more as a nostalgic reminder of the 'old days' than as a full public service. The *raison d'être* of course signified a high standard of maintenance judged by contemporary practice but the parish Surveyors also gave considerable attention to the roads in their sphere. When motor cars came on the scene a few years later the highways were not unsuitable for their use and it required only the refinements of later technical knowledge to transform them into the motor roads of today.

5. Village Life and Government

Life in past ages for the ordinary person, particularly the countryman, was so very different from our own that much imagination and mental readjustment to the conditions of those days is necessary if one is to reconstruct its setting and sense the feel of it. We have looked at certain topics which form the background against which Cowfold had its existence and at the agricultural scene but it is less easy to recreate the all round life of individuals. Furthermore while more information is available as to happenings in the village in the 19th century, any records to fill out the earlier picture are very limited. Even in the 1800s there are aspects which no doubt were important then to parishioners about which, in the absence of further records, little can be said; for instance, friendly societies became prominent in the countryside and branches are known in Cowfold of the Oddfellows, the Foresters and the Hearts of Oak but the pattern of their activities in the village is obscure as well as the extent of their membership. Similarly, details are lacking of sporting activities and recreational pastimes which no doubt assumed increasing importance as the 19th century progressed. Nevertheless an attempt will be made to pinpoint some events in the past which must have influenced or been of concern to Cowfold people at the time and note can be taken of institutions including local government which affected their lives.

Work and the need to earn a livelihood for one's family must have been the dominant factor for most people and at certain times of the year, haymaking, harvest and threshing, the farm labourers can have had little relaxation from sunrise to sunset. Shop boys and domestic servants, too, would have worked long hours six days a week and labourers' wives went out charring or took in washing when not busy with their younger family or making a homecoming for their menfolk. A working life started early for children and most of those aged twelve or more claimed gainful occupations when the 19th century censuses were taken.

Taking up the trade which would provide for one's future could be a matter of some formality and apprenticeships were frequently the doorway by which young people entered their working lives. These occur not only in crafts such as blacksmithing and carpentry with which we are accustomed to associate apprenticeship but for less technological trades also as is shown by some Cowfold examples. They were sometimes the instrument by which the parish officers provided poor children with a start in life and at the same time relieved the parish of responsibility for their support; the apprentice acquired in effect a new family in the house of his master. In July 1649 the Churchwardens and Overseers joined in an apprenticeship indenture with John Michell, a yeoman of the parish, under which the 13 year old John Ellis, son of Thomas Ellis, "a poor inhabitant" of Cowfold, was placed out as "apprentice to the said John

Michell to serve until he shall attain the age of 24 years, during all of which time the said John Ellis to serve his master well and truly and to be of good demeanour towards him and all his family. The said John Michell to find meat, drink and apparel, etc, and not to chastise him but in due manner to give him two suits of apparel at the end o the term.” The young John Ellis was presumably to be instructed, like John Mote, another Cowfold labourer’s son who was apprenticed in December 1642 to Thomas Goffe, yeoman of Cowfold, for 9 years, “in the full knowledge and skill of husbandry, as to plow and sow, reap and mow, hedge and dike and the like.” In the case of John Mote his prospects also included “moderate chastisement when need requireth and finding for him convenient and sufficient meat, drink, linen, woollen, hose, shoes during the said term and at the end of the said term not to send him away empty but to give him two good and sufficient suits of apparel furnished from top to toe, 2 hats, 3 shirts, 2 pair of hose and 2 pair of shoes and 6 bands, one purse and two shillings of good and lawful money.” Girls were also sometimes placed in apprenticeships; Margaret Turner in July 1631 to Thomas and Elizabeth Geere to be taught “the art of good huswifry” and Joane Terry to Thomas Whiting in July 1649 as “apprentice to the art, trade and mystery of huswifrie.”

Apprenticeships are less commonly encountered later on except in the craft and shop trades and the restraints upon their conduct probably irked the young people as they grew up. The good behaviour enjoined upon John Mote forbade his “haunting taverns or alehouse and playing at dice, cards or other unlawful games” while Margaret Turner was not to “absent herself day nor night unlawfully.” In later years we read more of young men being hired out whether at their own instance, as in the case of Henry Woolven who went as carter to Mockbridge in 1781 (p55) or at the instance of the Overseers. Hiring fairs in country areas were a forum in which men and girls offered themselves for employment but whether the practice prevailed in Sussex is not known though hiring may have been one of the aspects of the fairs regularly held in Horsham. The impression is rather given in Cowfold records that seeking and giving employment was a local affair effected on the farms themselves or through the Overseers. By the 19th century the casual element in employment seems to have gained at the expense of hiring for regular terms, on the land at least, and most labourers had their homes or lodgings in the village or around the parish and not in the households of the farms where they worked.

From the age of about twelve, then, many village children were in the labour market but they were not without an education of sorts. In the census returns of the mid-19th century the younger children from about 4 years of age upwards are generally recorded as being ‘scholars’ and there were several schools in the village. Although St Peter’s School in its original guise was not established until 1875-76 and the existence of any educational facility for Cowfold children before 1800 may be doubted, the Vicar, the Rev Richard Constable, erected in

1801 a brick building to serve as a school on glebe land beside the Horsham road almost opposite the point where now stands Brook Farm house. Col C B Godman compiled around 1930 a manuscript volume in which he recorded many memories of old Cowfold and this book, beautifully written and illustrated, is kept in the parish chest at the church. In it Col Godman recounts something of this early school, which was known as the National or Free School, and of the life associated with it. Evidently with the school's books before him, he says,

The first minute records, "the school master to be selected should be a man who can read and write." A later minute states "the older Children are to teach the younger." Later Charles Kettle was appointed. On Sundays he led the boys to church, he himself being dressed in a white smock frock and wearing knee breeches, grey stockings, a tall hat and carrying a long stick. The boys sat in the front row of the gallery.

Parents paid 2d per week for their children to be taught reading, writing and arithmetic; for geography an extra 2d was required. The old saying 'so-and-so never had the extra 2d for manners' is said to have come from this.

It was no unusual sight for a visitor to the school to find a boy standing on a form with a dunce's cap on his head. The schoolmaster usually had a switch in his hand.

Charles Kettle lived in the cottage at the Lodge leading to Brook Hill House. The boys used to bait him by collecting stones and all throwing them at his door at the same moment. When he rushed out with a stick not a boy was to be seen. On some occasions he distinctly saw who threw the stones; the following day when school began he would make the culprit stand for an hour holding a brick over his head. The boys, however, would sum up, "'t was worth it". On one occasion when out for a walk in the late evening in the woods near Longhouse – there was a greater extent of wood than there is today – he lost his way. Suddenly an owl hooted, Too-Who, Too-Who. The old man did not know where he was and, thinking it was someone calling to him, replied, "Old Charles Kettle of Cowfold, old Charles Kettle." His reputation remains; "he was a good 'un at learning the boys."

The old school on Brook Hill probably ceased its activities in the 1870s when the new National School was built by Mr Richard Hoper on the site of Potters house. Before the new building was raised at Potters that house seems to have been the venue for "a Dame's School for girls." Here, Col Godman says, "a

Mrs Richardson, a very uneducated person, taught (and) the Misses Otter used to go twice a week and help.” Mrs Ann Richardson, who described herself as a schoolmistress in the census of 1871, lived at Potters and was the widow of an agricultural labourer, Henry Richardson. They had been at Potters since 1851 at which time Mrs Richardson was already teaching, but whether at this house is not clear.

Other schools existed on Henfield road. Col Godman again: “Mary Bates, a better educated woman, had a small school at the next house to where Sprinks’ Stores are now; here the charge was 3d per week.” The house is now called Church Farm House and Mary Ann Bates was the daughter-in-law of John Lindfield whose wife, Barbara, was the schoolmistress in 1851. After her death a few years later Mary evidently continued teaching at the house and following her marriage to William Humphry about 1862 the house combined the functions of bakers shop and school until at least 1871. Further down the road at an earlier date an old lady had a small dame school at the present baker’s premises (Knights). In 1841 this school, run by Kitty Knowles who was about 80 years old and the younger Elizabeth Knowles – their relationship is uncertain -, housed ten resident pupils, girls between the ages of 5 and 15, and others may have attended on a day basis. The schoolhouse here probably existed as early as 1836 but the building was in other occupation by 1851.

Finally there was Cowfold Grammar School at the house now known as Wood Grange. This, Col Godman says,

Was chiefly for farmers’ sons. A man named Armiger was an early master there. He was followed by Stephen Yeates who was a good teacher and much improved the school. He had one peculiarity, a hasty temper, and did not always get on too well with his neighbours. He set bounds for his boys and made them adhere to them. They were from the school as far as the first gate leading into Cowfold Lodge. Occasionally he quarrelled with the occupant: at such times he would drill the boys up and down the road, on reaching the gate he would give repeated commands, “Right Turn, Left turn and Right About Turn”, till the owner of the Lodge could stand it no longer, ordered his dog cart and went for a drive.

Yeates was succeeded by B Botting who for some time carried on the school well. He used to march his boys to church; they formed the choir.

The house (then called Noah’s Ark) became a school before 1861, probably around 1858, when its master was George Baines who then had 7 boarding pupils (boys) between the ages of 7 and 13. The Mr Armiger mentioned by Col Godman has not been otherwise traced but presumably followed Baines for by

1871 Stephen Yeates was in charge and the school had grown to 18 boys aged from 8 to 15. Other local boys attended also and Stephen Yeates had an assistant master, a young Frenchman, under him and a 14 year old boy was described as Junior Tutor. When Benjamin Botting became principal is not certain but it was probably around 1890; whether the school was known as Cowfold Grammar School before Mr Botting's time has not been established. Under him the school had a wide curriculum, even catering for the necessary exams of boys with university aspirations; the prospectus reproduced elsewhere (**not in the book!**) gives an idea of its educational scope. At this time also the schoolhouse at Knights premises was in occupation again and Mrs Botting had the Girls' Department there. The field where South Leas and the houses south of it now stand formed the playing field of the Grammar School. Exactly when it closed is not known but though it exists still in 1914 the school does not seem to have survived the war.

Quite a wide range of schooling was thus available in the village in addition to which a few of the more well-to-do families had their resident governesses. Mrs Laker, for instance, at Laurel Cottage (later Barrington Cottage) had one in 1871 and so did the doctor, Thomas Gravely. Indeed, the latter's house must have had some of the atmosphere of a boarding school for the governess had nine of the doctor's eleven children on her hands, of whom six were receiving instruction.

Mention of Thomas Gravely reminds us of the important function of the doctor in the community. The Gravely family in fact provided the village with a medical man for over a century, from the 1820s to the 1930s, and Thomas was the second in the line. His father, John Gravely, was of West Grinstead origin and evidently came to Cowfold following his marriage to a Cowfold girl, Susannah Burtenshaw, in 1817. He lived at Cotlands which he acquired in 1824 and during the renovation of the house some years ago one of his medical books was found and is now in the possession of Mr Tom Mills. On his death in the 1840s his son, Thomas, continued to practice in the village living first at Laurel Cottage and later at Furze-field House. One of his sons, William Homewood Gravely, succeeded him and was in partnership with Dr Dickens at the same house in the early 20th century. Mention of another doctor appears in 1843 when the Vestry recorded their thanks "to Henry Holman Esq for his late services as medical Attendant to Cowfold parish."

We do not know of a resident doctor before John Gravely and it will be recalled that when the Overseers arranged medical attention for the Cowfold poor in 1816 their agreement was with Dr Morgan of Henfield (p58). Going back into the 18th century the function of healer of the village ills may have fallen to the lot of Richard Weekes, an apothecary of Cowfold, who died in 1738.

Turning to the shops which supplied the daily wants of villagers Bacon's Stores, still a familiar landmark, was a 'shophouse' at least as far back as 1765. In the 19th century the business was principally associated with the name of Henry Carter, for many years the Assistant Overseer and prominent in Cowfold life. His father, William, had had the shop before him and together they spanned a period of almost fifty years up to the 1850s. The Carters were grocers and in the old building next door backing onto the churchyard was a butcher, again a trade occupation which was perpetuated into the very recent past. The building itself belonged to William Beeching who occupied the butcher's shop for over twenty years from about 1820. He was succeeded by the first of the Sendall family, Charles, whose tenure was short owing to his premature death. William Sendall, possibly his brother, later opened the second butcher's shop on the opposite side of the street. The latter was originally in what are now Farren's motor trade premises where the business remained until Palmerston House next door was built in the present century.

Returning to the Olde Shoppe building, another grocer and fruiterer and a shoemaker, besides the butcher, had their abodes there in the mid-19th century. While we have no record of the earlier trades carried on in this building such occupation was clearly of longstanding: the building was known as the Old Shop House in 1780 and in the 1600s the possession of a house backing onto the churchyard by Henry Lintott, a mercer, will be recalled (p15). The villagers had the choice of yet another grocer in Victorian times. This shop was to the north of the Red Lion in a building which then occupied the area of the low walled garden in front of Jersey (now Trelawney) Cottage. Drapery requirements could also be obtained there as they could later at the Stores. There was another shoemaker's shop along the West Grinstead road run for thirty years or more from about 1841 by William Sherlock and, after his death, by his wife with the assistance of their family. The location of this business may have been in the premises known as far back as 1790 as the Old Butcher's Shop which seems to have been in the vicinity where Miss Humphreys had her shop until recently: the use of the prefix 'Old' again suggests that trade had been carried on there back into the distant past. Finally, and importantly for a rural community, the smithy was situated by the churchyard fence on the south side of the present lychgate. The post of village blacksmith lay in the Leppard family, father, son and probably grandfather before them, for nearly a hundred years after which the business passed to Thomas Leppard's journeyman assistant, George Sims, on the former's death in 1865.

These, then, were the principal shops for Cowfold people, some of which had been in existence long before the 19th century, and there were other tradesmen as well; the saddler and harness maker at Old Steyne House, Stephen Fowler's builders yard on the West Grinstead road from about 1853, a dressmaker's

opposite the Old Shop House in the 1850s and a baker round the corner where Mr Bob Farren had his electrical shop until recently.

In those days also brick making was a feature of Cowfold life. There was, as the name implies, a brickfield with a kiln at Brickkiln Cottages on the Horsham road and the copse behind Tollgate Cottages has encroached over much of the ground where the clay was dug. The brickfield does not appear to have existed until after 1851 but it was functioning by 1871. Production continued there at least until the turn of the century though probably not on a large scale for in 1871 Edward Brewer, the brickmaker, and his son seem to have been the only workers. Brickfields made a transient appearance towards the end of the century in other parts of the parish as well. The small copse beyond Church Field by the path to Gervais Cottage represents natural growth over the disused clay diggings of a brickfield and land at Singers bordering Pound Lane was used for similar purposes.

Cowfold men had a resort for their leisure hours at the Red Lion which was no doubt (along with the later clubs of the friendly societies) the social centre of the village; indeed it was sometimes the place where the village government was transacted for on several occasions in the 1840s the Vestry meeting found it convenient to “adjourn to the Red Lion Inn” before continuing its deliberations. The original Red Lion dates back at least to 1780, probably much further back still, and stood in its central position in the village, built in cottage style under a Horsham stone roof with a large spreading tree to shade its frontage, until around 1880. Early photographs and pictures of it suggest all the atmosphere of a rustic country hostelry, an impression enhanced by the smithy opposite, and together with the not dissimilar Old Shop House on the other side of the street, it must have given the centre of the village a distinctly Wealden character and unity. However, with the construction of the monastery going ahead and more cosmopolitan visitors frequenting Cowfold the old inn had to give way to its present successor.

For over a century the Red Lion was perhaps Cowfold’s only communal centre where farmers and parishioners could gather over a jug of ale. By 1851, however, James Foice, a carpenter and builder living at the corner of Eastlands Lane, had begun dispensing that beverage at his cottage and the beershop thus launched eventually became the Hare and Hounds. From the later 19th century it had a frontal extension over the ‘terrace’ above the road which presumably housed the public bar until remodelling after the Second World War enabled it to be contained inside the building. Another pub had a short lived existence within the parish. This was the Jolly Farmer which served the community up towards the Crabtree, itself an inn of more ancient lineage lying over the boundary in Lower Beeding. The Jolly Farmer is mentioned in the census of 1871 but after F Ducane Godman acquired the tenements with which

it was included, known as Drodges, in 1900 the licence for this pub was dropped.

Further afield parishioners could find entertainment and excitement at the July Fair in Horsham. Cowfold itself does not seem to have had any ancient fair – none is listed by the Rev Arthur Young – though there is some tradition of one in more recent times on the site of Fairfield. The Horsham Fair was of great antiquity having been the subject of a grant by Henry III in 1233 and though theoretically lasting three days, it could cover up to nine days. This event in a Carfax not then built up drew visitors from all over the surrounding district who could taste there life in plenty, its amusement, interest and excitement, around the crowded stalls. It was a window onto a wider world for the villager and traders, too, could obtain supplies of merchandise to stock up their shops for the months to come. Perhaps the contacts made there opened opportunities for the young men and girls from Cowfold to find employment beyond the confines of the parish and its immediate district. There were other lesser fairs at Horsham, in April for instance and in November, but the July Fair was one of the more important events of the annual calendar.

National events rarely impinged upon Cowfold life and the events of 1830, already recounted (p69), seem to be the only time that the parish found itself near the centre on a wider movement affecting the country at large. Moments of national history affected Sussex but we get only an indistinct impression of their effect on Cowfold. Nevertheless such moments sometimes came close and must have been subjects for much concern and discussion in the village. Such a case was the Civil War in the 17th century.

This conflict found Sussex divided in its loyalties though weighing generally in favour of the Parliament. The main events of the war took place elsewhere but there were incursions by both the Royalist and Parliamentary forces into Sussex as when the latter marched on Chichester which had been seized by supporters of the King. Severe damage was done to the town in a six day siege. Again, the Royalists seized Arundel precipitating the investment of the castle by Waller and a Parliamentary army. This siege lasted until January 1644. An army in Sussex meant enforced billeting of soldiers, requisitions of food and the growth of resentment among farmers and local people. Whether any billeting took place in Cowfold we cannot tell but at least one local man declared openly for the King early in the war. Richard Pierce, whose memorial is in the church, was with the Royalist army at Edghill in 1642 and was wounded in the engagement there. However he survived and lived to the age of 94 before his death in 1714. Later flurries of excitement must have reached the village in 1648 when Royalist militancy increased in the Horsham district. A correspondent wrote that “the country is generally risen about Horsham and protest they will fight for the King and the country” and, following seizure of a

local magazine, he added, “with us at Horsum we are now 500 men in arms.” Rustics drilled on Horsham Common. The clash came on 19th June 1648 when Parliamentary forces arrived and a sharp skirmish occurred in which the King’s men were driven from the town and one soldier and three townsmen lost their lives.

There were other occasions when violence, or at least the rough edge of life, showed itself close to the surface. The stormy episode connected with the iron workings of St Leonard’s Forest and the rivalries for their riches illustrates the readiness to resort to strong arm methods in the earlier days. According to Straker the St Leonard’s ironworks were associated with the Lower Forge at Cinderbank Copse, Roosthole Pond and Hawkins Pond and the Upper Forge at Hammer Hill and Hammer Pond; these were probably established about 1553. Roger Gratwicke, a son of the Sullington branch of this family, was the underlessor and ironmaster in the 1570s and he and Walter Covert had the lease of the forest for ore and timber. About 1580 the Gosden Furnace was erected probably by Roger Gratwicke, a development touching the borders of Cowfold for the Furnace Pond lies in the woods a little to the north of the old house at Gorsedean. By 1586 this furnace had passed into the hands of Edward Caryll of Shipley and a fierce rivalry followed between Gratwicke at St Leonards and Caryll at Gosden. Fighting between the two factions in what must then still have been wild surroundings was not ruled out in the ensuing contest and law suits were waged resulting in a grant of St Leonard’s to Caryll. A ‘state of war’ is said to have existed between the two contenders before the apparent dispossession of Gratwicke whose will in 1596 did not mention the ironworks. This forest feuding close to the doorstep of Cowfold probably caused reverberations in parish life, whether the attitudes taken were of partisanship or of keeping clear of a dangerous situation.

Gosden Furnace probably closed once Caryll had secured the St Leonard’s ironworks but even these had a short life. Sir John Caryll received a grant in 1601 for 60 years but the furnace at St Leonard’s may have been in ruin by 1615 and the forges had closed by 1664. This was the nearest the iron industry came to Cowfold. Its main centres were further to the east where it flourished until the 18th century when the northern iron industry based on coke began to put the Wealden charcoal based processes out of business.

Another shadow to cast itself over Cowfold life at times was smuggling, the tentacles of which spread across Sussex from its long coastline open to the continent. The smuggling fraternity became so powerful in the early 18th century when the small numbers of excisemen could not match the widespread network of a trade founded on fear and interest that the writ of the smuggler had more influence in the county than that of the government. The magistracy was often tainted with it and even when arrests were made the officers found it

almost impossible to obtain convictions; confiscated contraband was even on occasion forcibly 'rescued' from the custody of the law. Terrible retribution could be expected by anyone bold enough to inform on those involved in contraband trade and the government could provide little effective protection. Consequently the traffic in illicit goods flourished and if one was not directly involved it was advisable to turn a blind eye to anything about which one was not supposed to know. Eventually, however, the smuggling gangs, of whom the most notorious was the Hawkhurst Gang, went too far and the shock occasioned by the capture and horrific murder of two excise officers in 1747 provoked a strong reaction. An increase in the manpower and energy exerted against smuggling led to the Hawkhurst Gang being broken and gradually the trade declined as authority was reasserted.

Nevertheless the trade took some fifty years to die out and throughout the 1700s Cowfold people would have been conscious of it and careful at times not to put a step wrong with either the free-trader or the law. Some probably had sympathy with it or received occasional benefits from the exercise of their discretion. William Albury gave an account in the Sussex Magazine of a link between Cowfold and smuggling which speaks for itself.

Towards the end of the 18th century at Burnt House, Coneys Farm and Eelsfoot or Hills Foot between Nuthurst and Cowfold, there lived a nest of smugglers, chief of whom was one, Elliott, nicknamed Old Saucy Elliott. He was a higgler or eggler by trade but all his life had been spent in smuggling to which business his trade served as a cloak. He was a stern grizzled old man who in his younger days must have been a contemporary with Walter (the most successful of the Sussex customs officers who was based at Horsham) and his men and (Elliott's) face had been scarred by their, or some other person's, cutlasses. He had two sons, Richard and George, neither of whom did anything besides helping his father in his smuggling. Elliott had trained his horse, an iron grey, to find its way home if by any chance it was separated from its owner. The old man and his sons would ride armed to the coast to help in running in cargo and sometimes the farmers in the neighbourhood would find as they went to the stables a horse or two missing and perhaps carts as well. They had been borrowed without permission to assist in an expedition but were always returned and never without recompense in kind – a cask or two of spirits or a dollop of tea. The old smuggler would receive the goods at his farm where he had concealed holes in the ground and other means of hiding them and where too he would receive neighbouring sympathetic farmers and others to do a little unconventional business and spend a jolly day drinking and singing. A lad named James Lindfield who lived at New Lodge used frequently to go to Burnt House, a distance of four or five miles, for a bottle of brandy – the price of which was 2/6d – for his father. One day somewhere about 1785

whilst birdsnesting on the way he found about 40 casks of spirits concealed in a hedge and covered over with a lot of grass and other growths. When he got home he told his father of his find. "Have you told anyone else?" asked the old man sharply. "No," replied the boy. "Then don't; it will be all right", declared the old man. The next time the boy passed the spot the casks were all gone.

The most immediate effect upon the people of Cowfold of the wars with France at the turn of the century was the increase in the cost of living and the consequent plight in which the poorer sections of the community found themselves. This and the troubles caused by the subsequent slump have been discussed earlier in more detail. But the Napoleonic Wars impinged on peoples lives in other ways as well. England in 1804 lay under the threat of invasion and a particular awareness of the dangers and of the steps being taken for the national defence must have been in the minds of Sussex people at the time. The feeling of being close to the front line and in a possible battle ground permeated their thoughts, conversations and activities much as in 1940 in similar circumstances. One of the first considerations was to raise manpower to meet the emergency and Sir Arthur Bryant, describing the measures that were taken, says that the Government found a strong attraction in the enrolment of Militiamen and Volunteers. "Regulars had to be wooed to the Colours by state bounties. Volunteers were to be had gratis by an appeal to patriotism and Militiamen could be raised by compulsory ballot. Yet, as every man balloted could avoid service by paying a fine or hiring a substitute, any increase in the Militia was automatically followed by a scramble for substitutes."

The raising of the Militia brings echoes from Cowfold in some entries in the Overseers' accounts. The following items appear in 1804.

8 th April	Paid Mr Vincent, Melitiah	£8. 0. 0
	Paid for Henry Carter serving in the Melitiah	£2. 0. 3
	Paid for a substitute for John Martin	£2. 0. 3

Again in April 1808 £10 was "paid John Brown, being drawn for the Melitiah" and in April 1812, £10. 9. 0 "paid Charles White's substitute." Some of these items are clear: John Martin and Charles White found proxies for their military service – cheaply, it would seem, by national standards – but were the payments on account of Mr Vincent, Henry Carter and John Brown made to avoid their personal service? While the brevity of the accounts does not explain the payments exactly it seems more likely they were for substitutes. These men are not known to have been absent in Militia units at any time and if they were, one may wonder why the payments? Indeed, it is puzzling why any of these moneys were paid, for substitutes or otherwise, from the parish funds.

The threat of invasion passed but the military presence in Sussex remained and there was a permanent barracks of troops in Horsham by the present Cricket Field throughout the war. These were the scene of frequent comings and goings and between 1797 and 1815 when the barracks were closed 69 different regiments were in occupation. Their presence was not a welcome one with the Horsham townsfolk (other than the publicans) for when the soldiers were not drilling on their parade ground or undergoing battle training on Denne Hill, they were liable to soak themselves in drink and roam brawling round the town. The Carfax was on occasion the scene of some ugly battles and of the various regiments, volunteers and militia who were quartered in Horsham only the King's German Legion left without a stain on their character. The sight of Redcoats in and around Cowfold was, therefore, probably a familiar one during this period; there is a record of a group of soldiers calling at the Crabtree for refreshment and, on being supplied with drink but no food, buying the landlady's canary and obliging her to cook it for them. It would be interesting to know if any young men of Cowfold were tempted by the call to the Colours – or the bounty offered – but the reputation gained by the garrison in Horsham must certainly have spread widely around, with what reaction in the parish we can only guess.

One other occasional incident of life which perhaps aroused interest in the parish may be mentioned, namely Parliamentary elections. Before successive extensions of the franchise from 1832 onwards began to bring Parliamentary institutions nearer to the people any feeling of involvement on the part of villagers can only have been minimal and little of the excitement of town elections with their hustings and the wooing of a popular response to the candidates is likely to have been aroused in country districts, so few and scattered were the voters. Apart from the boroughs two MP's were returned for the county of Sussex by a total of between 5,000 and 6,000 voters and of these the share of Cowfold barely reached double figures. The record of the 1705 election, for instance, shows ten persons as having cast their votes on that occasion; they were Peter Heald, the Vicar, Thomas Mitchell, John Gratwicke, Esq, Thomas Lintott, gentleman, John Whitebread, John Mitchell, John Gratwicke, gentleman, William Povle, Thomas Easton and John Lintott.

If government at national level was remote from the ordinary villager, local government in the parish sometimes seems surprisingly democratic and comprehensive when we read the proceedings of the Cowfold Vestry. Matters handled by District and County Council today are found among the subjects coming before the Vestry, not merely for comment but for action. The superintendence of the roads has already been examined (p75) and the parish was also concerned with its own finance including the rating of properties within its bounds, with the administration of the Poor Law – the sphere of social security -, with the provision of constables to maintain the peace of the village, with drainage and sanitation, maintenance of the church and of property belonging to the parish and with the protection of public interests as, for example, in footpaths. Besides its traditional officers whose services were

unpaid, the Vestry had its officials remunerated, if only on a part time basis, from parish funds. When it is remembered that Cowfold contained only about 1,000 souls this is a formidable list of responsibilities falling to its lot. In terms of democracy the Vestry was a public “meeting of the ratepayers of the parish” and presumably all those liable for rates were entitled to attend. A wide section of the community thus had a potential voice in its affairs though attendance at the Vestry tended to be limited in numbers: at the March meeting perhaps around twenty persons might be expected, a number which could vary from as many as thirty to less than a dozen, but other meetings of the year tended to a smaller attendance. Sometimes the Vestry consulted a wider opinion as in 1843 when there was disagreement concerning the appointment of a Churchwarden and a public poll of the ratepayers was taken – at the Red Lion, it may be noted!

At the head of the local government structure was the bench of magistrates for the county. Their approval, or perhaps the approval of someone of such status – and Cowfold had one to two magistrates among its ratepayers who attended the Vestry –, was necessary for certain decisions of the parish meeting: for instance, the appointment of Overseers and Constables. We have also seen, as in the matter of stone getting for the roads, that if the Surveyors were unable to carry out their functions through local negotiation they had an appeal to the magisterial bench. The magistrates, therefore, had overall jurisdiction in the local government of their districts though under the later Poor Law certain matters fell to the authority of the Board of Guardians of the Union. At the lower level the parishes had responsibility through their Vestry meetings.

The Vestry nominated annually various officers, Overseers, Surveyors and Constables, to exercise administrative functions. These unpaid posts were of considerable antiquity but by the 19th century the increasing work load required by local administration seem to have received recognition with the appointment of paid officers though these posts did not surplant the older appointments to which they were probably legally inferior. Certain clerical posts were also filled on a remunerated basis. The Vestry elected one of the churchwardens, the Vicar appointing the other: it also appointed a Guardian to serve on the Board of the local Poor Law Union.

The Assistant Overseer was in effect the ‘executive officer’ of the parish, Town Clerk and Treasurer rolled into one. It appears that this post was created in Cowfold in 1843 with the appointment of Henry Carter at an annual salary of £25. Though the changing mind of the Vestry with regard to its officials and the responsibilities they bore is sometimes confusing, the post of Assistant Overseer seems in the first place to have grown out of that of the Vestry Clerk when extra duties were added. One clerkship, otherwise undefined, is mentioned in a minute of March 1842. The salary of this clerk was then set at “£8 a year (to commence from this day) provided he once a week to the satisfaction of the Churchwardens cleans the church (finding his own brooms) and makes no charge for attending the Sacrament, nor for cleaning the leads of the church; in default of which, his salary be reduced to £5 a year.” These duties are, however, hardly consistent with an office held by Henry Carter nor with the status suggested by the functions of either Vestry Clerk or Assistant

Overseer and as there was also a post of Parish clerk the reference is probably to the latter.

Henry Carter became Vestry Clerk in April 1843 at a salary of £10 a year but four months later his responsibilities were enlarged with his appointment as Assistant Overseer. For the time being the separate office of Vestry clerk lapsed. The Vestry Minute defines the duties attaching to the Assistant Overseer.

The duties of his office shall consist in making out the rates of the relief of the poor; of keeping the Overseers' accounts; of making out the jury lists and lists of voters for the county and the borough; of collecting the poor rates and the rents of parish property; and in performing the general duties of an Overseer of the Poor.

A further memorandum incorporates the functions appropriate to the Vestry Clerk.

Mr Carter undertakes in addition to the duties of Assistant Overseer to make out the Highway rate and to keep the accounts of the Surveyor of the Highways.

To act as Vestry Clerk, keep the records of the proceedings of Vestry meetings, to make out and collect the Church rates if required to by the Churchwardens: on the commencement of his office as Assistant Overseer he will resign the office of Vestry Clerk, the duties of which according to the proceeding minute are merged in that of Assistant overseer. Mr Carter agrees that the minute book and other papers referring to parish affairs shall be considered hereafter as the property of the parish.

Henry Carter continued in this office until May 1850 when on the ground of ill health he resigned. In his place was appointed a Deputy Assistant Overseer at a much reduced remuneration of 5/- per week, whose duties were to cover "keeping the parish accounts and minutes of the Vestries and in writing all notices, letters and other documents connected with parish business." Charles Kettle, who we have met as schoolmaster, was the new Deputy. However, Henry Carter resumed his office ten months later, when the Vestry "resolved that a gratuity of £5 be presented to Mr Kettle" in appreciation of his services.

The scope of the Assistant Overseer's responsibilities must have involved much time and labour on his part for which the salary of £25 might seem reasonable in contemporary terms when one remembers that it cannot have been far short of the total annual earnings of a farm worker. However, the parish seems in mid-century to have been inclined to greater economies in the salaries paid to its officers and this attitude led in April 1852 to Mr Carter's resignation for the second time. The record runs as follows.

Proposed by Mr James Anscomb and seconded by Mr James Leppard jnr that the salary of the Assistant Overseer be reduced from £25 to £20 a year.

Carried: Whereupon the Assistant Overseer immediately tendered his resignation of the office.

Proposed by the Rev W B Otter and seconded by Mr Baker, resolved unanimously that Mr Carter be reappointed Assistant Overseer (to which minute was added in the Vicar's handwriting) at a yearly salary of £20 as proposed above.

What exchanges passed at this meeting of the Vestry we can only guess but Mr Carter was presumably persuaded to continue in office though his remaining time was short. In June of the same year he resigned for the third and last time. This was the occasion when it transpired that the accounts of the Surveyor could not be balanced (as related on p 83) and the investigating committee subsequently attached the blame to the Assistant Overseer. Poor Henry Carter! – at one meeting his resignation was drawing a vote of thanks “to Mr Carter for his services as Assistant Overseer during the past eight years as well as of the gratuitous assistance which he has rendered to the parish for a considerable period previous to his appointment”, while a few weeks later the Vestry was sternly reiterating its intention to recover every last penny from him, an objective which was presumably realised in due course.

The office of Assistant Overseer was not immediately refilled; instead Charles Kettle was “appointed Vestry Clerk at a salary of £5 per annum (, his duties to) consist in keeping the minutes of Vestry meetings, in making out the Church, Poor and Highway rate books and in keeping such parish accounts as may be required.” Later, in 1854, he was promoted to the larger post, the salary being £10 and the functions in line with those when Henry Carter was appointed though collection of rates and rents was not specified. What arrangement for this was made in the meantime is not known but from March 1862 the surveyors were directed to collect their own rates. Though Charles Kettle was allowed a sum of £5 in 1864 “for his extra labour in making out the valuation lists for the parish in pursuance of the provisions of the Union Assessment Committee Act of 1862,” he had to wait until April 1869 for his salary to be raised. It was then decided that he should have the “additional duty of collecting all the rates and that his salary be increased from £10 to £30 per annum.” Four years later in 1873 he resigned these extra duties and in consequence on his reappointment as Assistant Overseer his remuneration was reduced to £20. Charles Kettle died some months after and his successor was James Ireland, the village saddler, at a salary of £35. A new parish valuation list was required in 1875 and, as with his predecessor, James Ireland was allowed an extra £5 for this work.

One final increase in the pay of the Assistant Overseer took place in 1878 when it was “raised from £35 to £45 per annum in consideration of the extra work placed upon him.” The complexity of local government had been growing throughout the last half of the 19th century and a new structure was to be inaugurated in 1895 marking the end of the civil responsibilities of the Vestry. Until this change, however, the Assistant Overseer continued in office. Throughout these years the age old unpaid offices of Overseers of the Poor had been filled annually and their last appointments were made in March 1894.

Besides the Assistant overseer there was another paid clerical post, the Parish Clerk. The Vestry minutes are never specific as to his duties but when Henry Hill filled the office in 1854 the pay was increased from £6 to £7. His request to have an increase two years later was rejected and in fact it was reduced to £5 in 1859. A further request in 1862 met with limited success when the salary was raised to £6. One of the later Parish Clerks in the 1870s was Peter Woolven.

The tenure of the office of Surveyor of the Highways by John Martin from 1840 to 1853 has previously been related (p 82) and in the following years the superintendence of the roads seems to have fallen once more on the unpaid Surveyors. However despite the fact that the additional appointment of a paid Surveyor had appeared illegal three years before, the Vestry minutes report in March 1856 that "John Anscomb was appointed Surveyor of Highways for the ensuing year at a salary of £10." Perhaps the difficulty was overcome by making one of the two annual Surveyors a paid official responsible no doubt for the day to day work on the parish roads; John Anscomb was one of the two Surveyors appointed for the next three years. The minutes make no reference to a salary for this office in later years.

The Sexton was another paid official of the parish. Earlier in the 19th century he had received a salary of £3 per annum but in 1846 it was decided to pay him 1/- per week instead. The Sexton at that time was John Akehurst, then aged 46 and a farm labourer. He continued as Sexton until his death in 1877 and he appears in an early photograph outside the Red Lion arrayed in a tall top hat and a typical labourer's smock frock. Col Godman gives the following picture of him.

John Akehurst was a small man. His own seat was the first pew on the right when entering the north door (of the church). By way of keeping order if the boys in any part of the church were making a noise he used to put on list slippers over his boots, he was not heard approaching, he peeped over the tope (of the old high pews) and admonished the noisy ones, if any one individual was particularly obstinate he walked him off to his own pew.

The Vestry appointed as his successor "Peter Woolven, the present Parish Clerk, to the office of Parish Clerk and Parish Sexton conjointly . . . (at) a salary of £12 for the joint post." When it was decided to have a fire lighted in the church on two days a week from November to March in 1885 the Sexton's salary was increased by 12/-.

Brief mention may be made of three other posts which were filled by the Vestry, namely two Collectors of Income Tax and the Guardian. The latter appointment evidently came with the introduction of the new Poor Law system which had been enacted in the 1830s. This person was the parish's representative on the Board of Guardians of the local Poor Law Union and, though the post was not a salaried one, a voluntary rate of 1d was raised in the parish from 1857 to defray the Guardian's expenses in attending Board meetings.

Finally, among those people concerned with the local government of Cowfold we meet the Constables. The body responsible for law and order was, of course, the bench of magistrates but the Vestry was required to put forward each year a list of persons suitable to serve as Constables. From this list, normally of ten names, the magistrates appointed the number of officers they required, more usually two but sometimes as many as five. This office was unpaid and no doubt provided a reserve body of men available to act on the magistrates' orders when necessary. Their nominations first appear in the Vestry minutes in April 1842 but Constables were certainly appointed before this date; earlier appointments may perhaps have been made more directly and nominations only circuited through the Vestry later on.

In 1843 the parish added a paid Constable to its roll call of officers and the man they recommended for the post was our old friend, John Martin of Godshill. Paid by the Vestry £5 per annum, his would have been the more immediate responsibility of ensuring that law and order reigned in the village. John Martin was regularly reappointed and by 1851 – he was now living at the cottages later to be known as the Hare and Hounds – he was 66 years of age. 1853 saw a reduction of his salary to £1 and the appointment of a second paid Constable, John Lindfield, at £5 a year: could the reason behind this have been some increasing frailty of John Martin for the full performance of his duties? On the other hand, perhaps the shadow of his troubles the previous year over the deficit in the Surveyors' accounts still lingered in the minds of the Vestry. However that may have been, by 1854 he was again Cowfold's sole paid Constable with his money restored to £5. John Martin's last reappointment was in February 1855 and his retirement seems to have come within the next year or so though death did not take him until at least 1859 or later. No successor was named in 1856 but in the following year William West became the paid Constable. This is the last of this office to be found in the Vestry minutes though unpaid officers were nominated regularly until 1872. The date on which the regular Sussex Police Force was inaugurated is not known and this would have affected the continuation of the more historic appointments. Cowfold had a police constable by 1882 for the late Patrick West when at the Police House extracted a list which he displayed of village policemen going back to this date.

Among the topics which came before the Vestry that of roads has already been discussed (p83). The old Poor Law has also been considered in the earlier part of the 19th century. The burden of this on the parish under the post-1830s system was clearly much reduced as is apparent from a comparison of the examples of Poor Law expenditure on p56 with that of the mid-19th century in the table overleaf. Under the new system parishes combined in Poor Law Unions with a central Union House for the non-self-supporting poor while outdoor relief came to an end. By 1840 the Old Workhouse in the village had ceased its original functions and Cowfold fell within the Cuckfield Union in which it remained until 1889 when the Vestry supported plans for its transfer to the Horsham Union. (the old Cuckfield Union House, it may be added, is now part of the Cuckfield Hospital while the Horsham Union was at the present mental hospital in Roffey.) From 1853 when the Overseers' accounts seem no longer to have been formally examined by the Vestry it may well be that the rates were levied mainly to meet the contributions required towards the central budget by

the Board of Guardians. When in 1870 an increase was made in the previously agreed poor rate it was because the Guardians had “called for a larger contribution than was anticipated.”

Nevertheless the parish had some of its own expenses to meet from the poor rate, the salary of the Assistant Overseer being one. Some relief was still administered by the Overseers and during the 1840s there was continuing distress in the countryside as is shown by the Vestry minute of October 1844 (noted on p 71). In November of that year “the Assistant Overseer was directed in cases of emergency to administer relief to applicants standing in immediate need” and again in December a committee was appointed “to take into consideration the best method of making some permanent provision for the better employment of the poor.” Their report is unfortunately not recorded in the Vestry minutes.

COWFOLD POOR RATES AND OVERSEERS' ACCOUNTS: from Vestry Minutes

Year (to 25 March)	Poor Rates made in year					Receipts	Expenditure
1841	3/-	2/6					
1842	3/-	2/6					
1843	3/-	2/6					
1844	1/-	1/-					
1845	1/-	1/-	1/-	1/-			
1846	1/-	1/-	1/-	1/-			
1847	1/-	1/-	1/-				
1848	1/-	1/-	1/-	1/-	1/-	£796. 6. 9¼	£667.19. 4
1849	1/-	1/-	1/-			£869. 7. 7½	£771. 9.10
1850	1/-	1/-	1/-			£657.19. 9	£656.19. 9½
1851	1/-	1/-	1/-			£993.17. 5	£773.12. 4
1852	1/-	1/-	1/-			£725. 4. 5½	£678.12. 8½
1853	1/-	1/-	1/-	1/-		allowed but not recorded	
1854	1/-	1/-	1/-			£644.10. 8½	£568. 8. 6½
1855	1/4	1/-	8d			£612.13. 3½	£521.17. 1½
1856	1/-	1/-	1/-				
1857	1/-	1/-					
1858	1/-	1/-					
1859	1/-	1/-	1/-				
1860	1/-	1/-					
1861	1/-						
1862	1/-	1/-	1/-	1/-			
1863	1/-	1/-	1/-				
1864	1/-	1/-	1/-				
1865	1/-	1/-	1/-				
1866	1/-	1/-					
1867	1/-	1/-					
1868	1/-	1/-					
1869	1/-	1/-					
1870	1/-	1/6					
1871	1/4	1/-	1/6				
1872	1/4	8d					
1873	8d	1/-					

no references made to allowing the accounts after 1852

One approach to easing the problem of unemployment was, however, aired on several occasions. This was the period of empire building and emigration could be encouraged among the poorer section of the population with whom local employment was short. In 1842 an application was considered from a labourer named Mobsby for a sum of £30 “to induce him to emigrate to a British colony” but the Vestry decided against making “a present from the parish funds to a person who for a long period has been no expense to the parish.” However, when Henry Stoner with his wife, Naomi, and their three young children were contemplating emigration to South Australia in 1848 the Vestry were more co-operative. It was then resolved “to raise the sum of £15 as a fund for defraying

the expenses of emigration of poor persons having settlements in this parish and being willing to emigrate, to be paid out of the rates raised or to be raised for the relief of the poor in this parish and to be applied under such rules, orders and regulations as the Poor Law Commissioners shall in that behalf direct.”

When the Old Workhouse ceased to be occupied for that purpose it became cottage property rented out by the parish; one of its occupants was John Akehurst, the Sexton. While it remained parish property this building continued to be a source of expense for maintenance and as time went on its condition became steadily more dilapidated. Hence we find in April 1844 that the question of its sale came before the Vestry and it was “resolved unanimously that the Parish Workhouse be not sold except to be used for charitable purposes for the benefit of the poor parishioners.” This resolution was the start of a debate regarding disposal or otherwise of the building which took over a hundred years to complete, a debate marked by the Vestry’s reluctance to part with their property despite the problems it caused: it was 1953 before Margaret Cottages, as it had become, finally passed into the hands of the Horsham Rural District Council. This is not the place to follow the long extended discussion with its resolutions made and rescinded but one proposal which was considered may be noticed. In 1865 the Vicar suggested that he should take the old building on a repairing lease “for the purpose of converting it to the following purposes . . . viz partly as a church of England School, partly as a library and reading room and partly as an asylum for aged persons of good character belonging to the parish.” Though this was agreed to and preliminary steps were set in hand with the Board of Guardians, no further reference suggests that the plan was ever carried into effect.

The Vestry was not only responsible for making and collecting the rates to finance its administration; it was also concerned with the valuation of parish properties. The procedure, foreshadowing that of more modern days, can be followed in the minutes of December 1842.

The Committee met on the 9th, 10th, 12th and 15th November on the latter of which days the valuation was completed and was submitted to the public until 1st December, on which day the Committee heard and determined appeals and revised and amended the valuation of the house property. The 8th December was fixed on as the final day on which appeals against the amended valuation (so far as it related to house property) should be heard and determined and the valuation was subsequently to the 8th declared to be settled and completed.

After the lapse of a twelvemonth should any error be discovered to have crept into the valuation or anything require altering, the Committee reserve to themselves the power of rectifying such error or of making such alteration, subject however to appeal as when first valued.

The work involved in a project such as this can be imagined and mention has been made of the additional £5 allowed to the Assistant Overseer for his extra labour on the occasion of subsequent valuations in 1864 and 1875.

From time to time objections were made to ratings or there were new houses requiring consideration. In 1847, for example, it was “resolved that the new house belonging to Mr Baker, called Prospect House, be assessed at £22 gross and £18 rateable value” while a few months later the Vestry agreed “that Mr Baker’s assessment upon his land be lowered 10/- in consideration of a portion of the said land having been annexed to the new house occupied by Mr John Higgons, the value of which land is included in his assessment.” On another occasion “Mr George Baines complained that the assessment of the house (now Wood Grange) occupied by him was greater than the rent, he paying £16 per annum while the house was assessed at £18 rateable value. The Vestry, taking this into consideration, agreed that the assessment should be reduced to £15 rateable value.” These valuations of parish property appear to have had from the mid-19th century a wider validity than for local road and Poor Law finance only. In 1845 “a return of the rateable property in the parish liable to the assessment of County rates was submitted to the Vestry by the Assistant Overseer” though to what purpose these charges related is not clear.

Rating relief for poor persons, another topic which came up for discussion, also foreshadows modern local government practice. Cases were considered, however, on the basis of individuals rather than on scales of relief and a few examples will suffice to illustrate this. In 1844 “a list of persons (87) unable to pay the poor rates on account of poverty was laid before the Vestry and allowed. The amount excused was £7. 5.10½.” Similarly in 1845 an ‘excused list’ was submitted “and the same was recommended to the magistrates to be excused.” This item came up for review annually but applications were not always granted. Thus, in 1850 the Vestry resolved “that John Stoner of Gervaise and Thomas Leppard of Burnt House be not excused from payment of rates.”

In old Cowfold, as in other rural communities, the conditions of life had always been attended by a certain primitiveness; the water supply relied on wells, lighting would have meant tallow or wax candles and sanitation at best was provided by a cesspit. Such a lack of refinements was what one expected when living in the country. The Vestry minutes, however, bear witness as the 19th century progressed to a growing awareness of proper standards and of the requirements for maintenance of health. This may have been partially due to the prompting of national enactments but the parish was not slow to adopt the new standards or to improve conditions in the village. Much of the responsibility for these developments again fell on the Vestry and its officers to whom the widening ramifications of local government must have seemed at times almost bewildering. In November 1855, for instance, it was decided that “the Guardian, Surveyors of Highways, Churchwardens and Overseers of the parish be appointed the ‘local authority’ for carrying into effect the provisions of the Nuisances Removal Act for England, 1855,” but the Vestry also felt in 1857 that “an Inspector of Nuisances is for the present unnecessary.” The parish kept conditions in the village under review and in 1865 was considering improvements to the Churchyard drains. Three years earlier George Baines had been complaining of “the offensive state of a ditch running through his premises and carrying with it the whole of the drainage of the village”. A committee was appointed “to communicate with the owners of houses in the

village respecting their co-operation in improving the village drain in connection with that from the Churchyard.” The following year the Vestry had before them a complaint by the Inspector of Nuisances concerning “the state of the drainage and the insufficient privy accommodation on the property belonging to the parish” (the Old Workhouse). Faced with the inadequacy of the rents received from the cottages it was felt that the Guardians should make the necessary alterations themselves. It was nevertheless agreed in 1867 “that it is of the greatest importance to the health of this parish that the occupiers of houses be careful in attending to the state of their drains and cesspools” and “that the Inspector of Nuisances be requested to spare no pains to enforce the provisions of the Sanitary Acts in this parish.”

“The inefficient state of the drainage of the property adjoining the Churchyard and of the village in general” was still a headache for the Vestry in 1872 and the formation of a Special Drainage District under the Sewage Utilization Act 1867 came up for serious consideration. The problem became a major topic in the minutes for many years to come. A committee was appointed, reports were obtained and the estimated cost in 1872 of a sewage scheme was £300. Following a further complaint from the Cuckfield Union Rural Sanitary Authority of “a foul ditch by the side of the Henfield road” in 1880, a scheme was formulated under which “the old drain be left as it now is and that a new socket stone pipe be put in to take the sewage only. This drain to start from J Roberts’ cottages in the West Grinstead road, to the Red Lion, and from Dr Gravely’s to Red Lion. These two drains to be of nine inch pipes brought into junction with a twelve inch pipe at this point which shall be carried down by side of road to opposite Mr Sprinks’, through his premises and across his meadow to ditch in Church Fields. The drain to branch above junction at Red Lion, connected with a water drain and fitted with a sluice valve for flushing drain at any time.” This project, however, does not seem to have got off the ground; the vestry felt that “considering the scheme of draining the village by voluntary subscriptions cannot be carried out in consequence of insufficient contributions and other considerations”, the whole matter should be left to the Board of Guardians. In 1887 a special sanitary rate of 6d was agreed to meet demands of the Sanitary Authority which produced its own drainage scheme estimated in 1891 at £500 or more. Finally, by May 1893 the works were well in hand – and the Vestry learned that the Sanitary Authority had borrowed £1,400 on their account! With works on this scale becoming the accepted and necessary standard for village amenities the parish could no longer rely on itself. Larger administrative units with their greater resources were beginning to assume a place in Cowfold’s affairs. Local government, so long the province of parishioners through the Vestry, had reached a time of change.

Before leaving the activities of the Vestry it may be observed that, naturally enough, their deliberations were mainly concerned with the practical aspects of village life. Only on rare occasions did the meeting allow its feelings to be voiced on matters of national interest. Once, however, the village fathers did consider that their protest should reach the highest circles and the following resolution was made in 1850.

That a humble memorial from the inhabitants of this parish be addressed to Her most Gracious Majesty praying that measures be taken by Her Majesty to repress the late arrogant and unprecedented assumption of the Pope of Rome in appointing dignitaries of the Romish religion and in parcelling out this Realm into dioceses and districts as being a direct attack on the prerogative of Her Majesty and the rights and liberties of the people of England.

Strong stuff indeed – and very Victorian in its affronted dignity!

St Peter's Church has so far received no comment in the context of this time and it undoubtedly played an important part in the lives of most Cowfold people. To this, therefore, we will return briefly in conclusion. The main structure of the church has stood unaltered since the south aisle was added in the first half of the 16th century but the interior was very different in the period with which we have been dealing. The seating was then in high square pews bearing the names, presumably, of the farms and houses in the parish; this labelling of the pews can still be seen in Shermanbury and West Grinstead churches today. In 1866, however, the Vestry requested "the Churchwardens to exercise their power by erasing all the names from the pews in the parish church and to take such further steps for a more equitable distribution of the seats in the church for the benefit of the parishioners in general". At the same time also there was a gallery at the west end of the church. A major renovation of the building took place in 1876 and the Vestry decided on the complete removal of the gallery as part of the internal alterations then made. The old pews were also displaced by the present seating which was made at the timber shop, the Long Shop, only recently pulled down by the Church Path. In these changes the church must have lost much of its period flavour and distinctive atmosphere. During the 19th century most of the stained glass windows were inserted.

Outside in the churchyard, on the other hand, the scene lacked the attractive variety and contrast which the yew trees give it today: then it was treeless and simply the parish 'burial ground'. And in this capacity the churchyard had become crowded and inadequate so that the Vestry accepted with gratitude the gift of William Percival Boxall in 1893 of the new burial ground to the south west of the church.

To St Peter's Church every Sunday came, we may be sure, the majority of Cowfold's inhabitants, many trekking long distances across the fields from distant farms. For 36 years from 1840 to 1876 they came to hear the Rev William Bruere Otter, the Vicar, who later became also a Prebendary of Chichester and Archdeacon of Lewes. He was an active man in Cowfold affairs, generally taking the chair at Vestry meetings as well as following his ministerial duties. Col Godman says of him,

The Archdeacon visited his parishioners very constantly. His custom was to dine with the 'Oddfellows', 'Foresters' and 'Hearts of Oak' clubs. On Christmas Day everybody in the parish of 65 years of age and over was invited to dine at the vicarage; sing-songs followed and a pleasant afternoon was spent.

The Archdeacon's last year the stipend amounted to £660. Mrs Otter played the harmonium. The Misses Otter at Christmas time decorated the church and so thoroughly that it took a whole week to complete.

The picture which comes out of this account of Cowfold down the ages is rather like a jig-saw with many missing pieces. From the institutions which shaped village life, the events which influenced it and the general conditions of the countryside we can complete much of the background of the picture and appreciate some of the great transformations that have taken place since then. But there is a certain lack of figures, individuals with their varying circumstances, habits and characters, to people this scene and much of the flavour of village life is made up of these more intimate portraits. Some glimpses have been possible of personalities – Charles Kettle, the schoolmaster, John Martin, the Surveyor and Constable, Henry Carter, grocer and Assistant Overseer, John Akehurst, the Sexton, Old Saucy Elliott, the smuggler, among others – but on the whole the individual villagers have slipped away leaving little trace of themselves or of their influence among their neighbours to complete the picture. To such personalities are, however, remembered in the Churchyard. We may therefore conclude this chapter by observing the impressions they left with their contemporaries and feeling, perhaps, that they had other parallels among the people of old Cowfold. William Haybittle, who died in 1895 at the age of 68, was remembered as “a faithful friend and servant all his life in the Constable and Hoper families.” And the second inscription runs as follows:

SARAH MOBSBY
widow of William Mobsby of Cowfold, labourer
and daughter of John Bachelor of Rusper
Died March 20th 1850, aged 82.
This stone was erected by W.B.O. Vicar of Cowfold
in memory of one who, poor in this world's goods
but rich in Christian graces
lived long, beloved and respected
an example to her own generation and to those that shall come after.

5 cont. Cowfold Parish Council (unfinished)

On 7 January 1895, a new era in Cowfold history was ushered in with the first meeting of the Parish Council at which Col C B Godman was elected chairman. It might in fact almost be called the Godman Era, for he continued to be chairman of the Council until 1939, a period of over forty years. Col Godman, whose first appearance in the public life of Cowfold was in 1883 as a ratepayer attending the Vestry Meeting, lived at the spreading Jacobean mansion, then crowning the hill at Woldringfold and he was one of the principal landowners in the parish, as is his descendant, Miss Godman of South Lodge, to this day.

This inauguration which placed Cowfold in the modern local government framework foreshadowed the developments which were increasingly to change its aspect and its life in 1895, much of the old world still remained. We may recall that at this time, Cowfold was a village without any mains water supply and without electricity. The basis of a public drainage system had, as we have seen, only just been installed and the presence of a regular police constabulary was not many years old. Social services were still represented by the Poor Law Union Workhouses set up in the mid-19th century, Cowfold being in the Cuckfield Union, though shortly to be transferred to Horsham. There was no established recreation ground and opposite the Stores a stile still gave access to meadows beyond. And, of course, the roads were still unused to motor traffic, any motor car that might be seen being an interesting eccentricity.

Nevertheless, new features which are now a familiar part of the Cowfold scene were beginning to appear. Though the Henfield Road was still unbuilt up, the first houses had been erected alongside the Bolney Road, those just beyond Fowlers yard bearing the date 1882 and by 1906 houses stood as far as the fields where the Oakfield estate was later to be built. The village hall, where the Parish Council was to meet from 1898, filled the formerly empty corner site within a year or two of its first meeting and the church had already assumed its present internal appearance. The provision of street lighting was exercising the minds of councillors though the primitive, no doubt oil burning lamps eventually erected must have been more of a gesture to the 20th century than an effective lighting of the roads at night.

The new Parish Council formed the lowest tier in the new system of local government in England. Above it were ranged the Horsham Rural District Council and the West Sussex County Council and it was these bodies which assumed responsibility for many of the functions which at the practical level had fallen to the lot of the old Vestry Meeting. Henceforth while retaining powers in some minor matters such as street lighting the Council became a forum for village opinion on parish affairs, a channel for local matters to be brought before the executive departments and a watch dog over village interests. The Council minutes therefore provide us with much of our information concerning affairs in Cowfold in the 20th century as did those of its predecessor in the 19th. But while the parish had been shorn of many of its

powers, it saw them go with some reluctance. It had been proud of its own administration and could in consequence be a sharp critic of the higher authorities when matters were not to its liking. A week after the initial meeting of the Council it decided that a petition "be sent to the County Council of West Sussex requesting them to defer the passing over of the parish highways to the Horsham Rural District Council for the next three years and that the same be left to the management of the Parish Council". The request was refused and in October 1900 the Parish Council added to a complaint made to the County about the state of the main roads in wet weather a statement that they considered "the present condition of the roads in the parish under the County Council as very inferior to what they were at the time they were handed over to the County Council although they cost a great deal more". The Cowfold fathers made "protest against the roads in the immediate vicinity of the village not being sided(?) and otherwise kept decent" and also against the dumping of road stone on the 'green', which today has shrunk to the 'islands' by the village hall with their jungle of dominating road signs. On the last point at least the Council obtained satisfaction and dumping was stopped. Another matter which brought a protest from the Council was the bye-laws proposed for the village in 1896. The Cuckfield bye-laws submitted by the Horsham Rural District Council for parish consideration drew the comment that "as urban powers (they were) utterly unsuitable to little country parishes like Cowfold". The Council felt "that these bye-laws will seriously retard legitimate enterprise in the parish and they earnestly ask the District Council to quash them or leave them unused". What the contents of the bye-laws were or the points of contention are not known but the Parish Council had their way and the bye-laws were rescinded in favour of an enquiry into local circumstances. Teething troubles inevitable in such a profound re-organisation as the new local government system were probably responsible as much as anything for such village reactions to the new centres of authority, with whom relations were generally much more smooth, as they should have been for Col Godman was himself a County Councillor and Cowfold had Mr Rigg of Walhurst as its representative on the Rural District Council.

The first Parish Clerk was James Ireland who had been Assistant Overseer under the old administration. The functions of the latter office were included in Mr Ireland's brief and in fact he continued to be designated Parish Clerk and Assistant Overseer. It would seem that while the old Poor Law system continued to operate, as it did until 1929, the need for an administering officer in the parishes remained. The post of Assistant Overseer probably lapsed in 1927 at the same time as the far older annual appointments of unpaid Overseers of the Poor: they were last appointed in 1926. Those appointed in 1895 were William Sprinks, Thomas Grace Fowler and W T Duke.

The Parish Clerk was the only paid official of the new Council, which agreed that Mr Ireland should receive "a salary of £50 per annum commencing from 25 March 1895, being a very slight increase on the salary he has hitherto received, although his duties under the Local Government Act 1894 are considerably increased." On his death in 1907 after nearly 34 years as Assistant Overseer and later Parish Clerk, the Council paid tribute to "the good work Mr Ireland had done for many years, how punctual he had always

been in all duties (and) the high respect and esteem in which he had always been held". The new Parish Clerk was T H Gates, appointed at a salary of "£40 per annum with the prospect of a rise" for which he waited until 1913, when his remuneration was increased to £50. By now, however, the country was on the brink of war and within a few months of the outbreak of hostilities in 1914, Mr Gates was granted "leave of absence from his duties as Clerk to the Council and Assistant Overseer as he was about to offer his services in His Majesty's Army". Mr Beale of Eastlands filled the post temporarily, but a new appointment was necessary in 1916 and the Council's remarks on one of the four applicants underlines the social change, accelerated by the war, which was beginning to break the male prerogative in matters of government and administration. One of the candidates was Miss E L Sprinks and her father said "he thought his daughter had applied to let it be known that ladies were ready and willing to help in any post if they could be of service, as it was quite an idea of her own". One almost has the impression that while Dr Gravely "appreciated the spirit of the lady" the Council were reluctant for such an innovation at that moment and G W Arkcoll(?) was appointed.

There were however stop-gaps and when Mr Gates returned safely from the wars his post was vacated for him to take up the pen once more in 1919. The brave new world to which he and so many others returned was also a changed world and most immediately in the effect of inflation. The Clerk's salary was still £50 and in 1920 Mr Gates asked for an increase. The minutes concerning this matter remind of the fall in money values consequent on the war and the economic strains which villagers were feeling along with people all over the country. A sub-committee had considered the Clerk's salary and suggested that an increase of 5% be granted. Dr Gravely proposed that this be raised to 20% and Mr Sprinks said "that everything had gone up 100% and more and the £ being about half its original value, he considered the proposed rise compared with the cost of everything was not sufficient. "However, the sub-committee's recommendation was carried. At the next meeting, Mr Gates made his dissatisfaction known and having pointed out that the extra £5 represented only 3½d a day, he considered "that taking into account the great increase in the work which had taken place since the £50 was first allotted and the responsible nature of the post ... it was unfair to offer the sum named" and he would prefer to carry on as before. If the Council felt, he said, that "they could get the work done better and cheaper, it was in the power of the Council to do so".

Whatever the feelings left by this incident, Mr Gates went on to equal the long tenures of office of Cowfold Parish Clerks. He had been over 34 years in the post when he resigned in 1941. "as he felt he was unable to do the work to his satisfaction". His death occurred three years later. In the meantime, however, there is the puzzling record of the apparent reduction of the Clerk's salary in 1927. In that year it was fixed at £10 per annum. The reason is unexplained in the minutes but can probably be linked to the last appointment made in the previous year of Assistant Overseer of the Poor and the likely demise of the office at the same time, which the Parish Clerk had also filled. The last vestiges of the old locally administered 'workhouse system' were, as already mentioned, abolished by the Local Government Act 1929. It would

seem likely, therefore, that in 1927 the remnants of the Poor Law functions which involved the parishes, and these had once required a great deal of the Assistant Overseer's time, were removed, leaving simply the spare time duties of Clerk to the Parish Council. There must, at any rate, have been a radical drop in the work expected of the Clerk and no debate on the reduction in salary was recorded at the Council Meeting.

The new Clerk was Capt Kerr Jones at an unaltered salary. Now that the clerkship had taken on more of the character of a public service, changes were more frequent and Mr P R Slocombe followed Capt Kerr Jones in 1946 when his remuneration was raised to £15 and then in 1948 to 15 guineas. Mr Matheson became Clerk in 1952 until in his turn he was followed by Tom Mills in 1955 who set the record for the more recent past with a tenure of about 17 years.

After Col Godman, the changes in the chairmanship were also more frequent. The Hon C G Cubitt was the next chairman until 1945, though Dr Dickins took his place during his absence on military duties in the 1939-45 war and he was followed by Col Colvin. With a new Parish Council in 1946, Mrs J F Colvin became chairman, the office being filled by Capt Lovett Cameron in 1952, Mr R T Gander in 1955 and Mr R G Moore in 1958.

ENDS

APPENDICES

David Pavitt Properties - Glossary of Terms

Alienation	Alienation , in property law , is the capacity for a piece of property or a property right to be sold or otherwise transferred from one party to another. Although property is generally deemed to be alienable , it may be subject to restraints on alienation . (Wikipedia)
Amercements	<p>An amercement is a financial penalty in English law, common during the Middle Ages, imposed either by the court or by peers. Amercmnts are much mentioned in Magna Carta, particularly article 20:</p> <p>"A free man shall not be amerced for a trivial offence except in accordance with the degree of the offence, and for a grave offence he shall be amerced in accordance with its gravity, yet saving his way of living; and a merchant in the same way, saving his stock-in-trade; and a villein shall be amerced in the same way, saving his means of livelihood--if they have fallen into our mercy: and none of the aforesaid amercements shall be imposed except by the oath of good men of the neighbourhood."</p> <p>While it is often synonymous with a fine, it differs in that a fine is a fixed sum prescribed by statute and was often voluntary, while an amercement is arbitrary. They were commonly used as a punishment for minor offenses (such as trespassing in the King's forest), as an alternative to imprisonment.</p>
Beeding Manor	<p>King Alfred (d. 899) devised BEEDING manor to his nephew Aethelm, (fn. 37) but it was later evidently resumed, for in 1066 King Edward the Confessor had it as part of his feorm. William de Braose held it in demesne in 1086, when some outlying parts had been separated from it. (fn. 38) Thereafter it descended with Bramber rape in the Braose, Mowbray, and Howard families until 1547, (fn. 39) except between 1290 and 1326 when Mary, widow of William, Lord Braose, held it in dower, (fn. 40) and between 1524 and 1542 when Agnes, widow of Thomas Howard, duke of Norfolk, so held it. (fn. 41) William, Lord Braose (d. 1290), was granted free warren there in 1281. (fn. 42)</p> <p>In 1553 the Crown granted the manor to John West and Roger Gratwicke, (fn. 43) but Thomas Howard, duke of Norfolk (d. 1572), evidently regained it, since he granted it in 1558 to Thomas Bishop of Henfield (fn. 44) (d. 1560). (fn. 45)</p>

	<p>By 1569 it was again descending with the rape, (fn. 46) as it continued to do until 1641, (fn. 47) except that at least between 1597 and 1618 the manorial courts were held in the name of Anne, widow of Philip Howard, earl of Arundel (d. 1595). (fn. 48) In 1641 Thomas Howard, earl of Arundel, sold the manor to Piers Edgcumbe (fn. 49) (d. 1666 or 1667), and afterwards it descended from father to son through Sir Richard (d. between 1686 and 1697), Richard (created in 1742 Lord Edgcumbe; d. 1758), and Richard, Lord Edgcumbe (d. 1761). The last-named Richard's brother and heir George (fn. 50) sold it in 1764 to Harry Bridger of New Shoreham, lessee of the demesnes since 1749. (fn. 51) Thereafter the manor descended in the Bridger family with Erringham Walkstead manor in Old Shoreham until 1944 or later. (fn. 52) The lands had been sold by 1981. (fn. 53)</p> <p>A manor house at Beeding manor is recorded from 1326, (fn. 54) and there was a dovecot in 1398. (fn. 55) The present building, called Beeding Court, from which there is a steep drop to the river Adur almost immediately below, is L-shaped. The main range running east-west is probably late 16th-century, and has re-used medieval timbers in its roof; there is a possibly contemporary lean-to at the east end of its south side. A new range was added at the north-west end in the early 17th century. In the later 18th or earlier 19th the house was cased in flint with brick dressings and hung tiles.</p> <p>To Beeding manor belonged all the land in the north-east corner, comprising Denwood, Drewitts, Goodyers, Hookland, and Long House (formerly Welches), three farms in the north-east, but west of the Cowfold stream, namely Frithland, Frithknowle, and Parkgate (formerly Patchgate), and Westridge (formerly Ridge or Ridgeland) in the south-east quarter and Chates (or Singers) in the south-west. (fn. 25) What was referred to in 1764 as COWFOLD manor, when sold with Beeding manor to Harry Bridger, was evidently the land in Cowfold that was held of Beeding. □□</p>
Court Baron	<p>A Court baron is an English manorial court dating from the Middle Ages. It was laid down by Sir Edward Coke that a manor had two courts, "the first by the common law, and is called a court baron," the freeholders ("barons") being its suitors; the other a customary court for the copyholders.</p> <p>Stubbs adopted this explanation, but the latest learning, expounded by Professor Maitland, holds that court baron means <i>curia baronis</i>, "la court de seigneur," and that there is no evidence for there being more than one court. The old view that at least two freeholders were required for its</p>

	<p>composition is also now discarded. Prof. Maitland's conclusion, is that the "court baron" was not even differentiated from the "court leet" at the close of the 13th century, but that there was a distinction of jurisdictional rights, some courts having only feudal rights, while others, had regalities as well.</p> <p>When the court leet was differentiated, the court baron remained with feudal rights alone. These rights he was disposed to trace to a lord's jurisdiction over his men rather than to his possession of the manor, although in practice, from an early date, the court was associated with the manor. Its chief business was to administer the "custom of the manor" and to admit fresh tenants who had acquired copyholds by inheritance or purchase, and had to pay, on so doing, a "fine" to the lord of the manor.</p> <p>It is mainly for the latter purpose that the court is now kept. It is normally presided over by the steward of the lord of the manor, who is a lawyer, and its proceedings are recorded on "the court rolls," of which the older ones are now valuable for genealogical as well as for legal purposes. (Wikipedia)</p>
Crown Post	<p>A king post (or king-post or crown post) is a central vertical supporting post used in architectural, bridge, or aircraft design applications.</p> <p>A king post (or crown post) extends vertically from a crossbeam to the apex of a triangular truss. The king post connects the apex of the truss with its base, holding up the tie beam at the base of the truss. King posts were used in roof construction in Medieval architecture in buildings such as parish churches and tithe barns, and also appear in Gothic Revival architecture and Queen Anne architecture. A similar structure may be used to construct a simple bridge.</p> <div data-bbox="480 1496 708 1794" data-label="Image"> </div> <p>Roof beams in Old Romney Church, Kent</p>
Distrain	<p>Distrain or distress is "the seizure of someone's property in order to obtain payment of rent or other money owed", especially in common law countries.^[1] Distrain is the act or process "whereby a person (the <i>distrainor</i>), traditionally even without prior court approval, seizes the personal property of</p>

	another located upon the distrainer's land in satisfaction of a claim, as a pledge for performance of a duty, or in reparation of an injury." Distraint typically involves the seizure of goods (chattels) belonging to the tenant by the landlord to sell the goods for the payment of the rent. In the past, distress was often carried out without court approval, but today some kind of court action is usually required.
Enfeoffe	Under the feudal system , enfeoffment was the deed by which a person was given land in exchange for a pledge of service. This mechanism was later used to avoid restrictions on the passage of title in land by a system in which a landowner would give land to one person for the use of another. The common law of estates in land grew from this concept.
Ewhurst Manor	The farmsteads of the land in Cowfold held of Ewhurst manor lay scattered over the western half of Cowfold, including Brownings, Capons (formerly Arnolds), Crateman's, Gratwicke, Parkminster (formerly Picknoll), and the submanor of Woldringfold; in the eastern half it included part of Oakendene. □□
Fealty	<p>An oath of fealty, from the Latin fidelitas (faithfulness), is a pledge of allegiance of one person to another. Typically the oath is made upon a religious object such as a Bible or saint's relic, thus binding the oath-taker before God.</p> <p>In medieval Europe, fealty was sworn between two people, the obliged person (vassal) and a person of rank (lord). This was done as part of a formal commendation ceremony to create a feudal relationship. Such as a vassal to his lord.</p> <p>Fealty and homage are a key element of feudalism. Under the feudal system, the smallest unit of land a fief could own was called a fea or fee, giving rise to the term freehold. (Wikipedia)</p>
Fief	The fief (alternatively, fee , feoff , fiefdom), under the system of medieval European feudalism , often consisted of inheritable lands or revenue-producing property granted by a lord , generally to a vassal (who holds seisin), in return for a form of allegiance (usually given by homage and fealty), originally to give him the means to fulfill his military duties when called upon. However, anything of value could be held in fief, such as an office, a right of exploitation (e.g., hunting, fishing) or any other type of revenue, rather than the land it comes from.

	<p>Originally, vassalage did not imply the giving or receiving of landholdings (which were granted only as a reward for loyalty), but by the eighth century the giving of a landholding was becoming standard. The granting of a landholding to a vassal did not relinquish the lord's property rights, but only the use of the lands and their income; the granting lord retained ultimate ownership of the fief and could, technically, recover the lands in case of disloyalty or death. By the middle of the tenth century, fiefs had largely become hereditary. Eventually, great feudal lords sought also to seize governmental and legal authority (the collection of taxes, the right of high justice, etc.) in their lands, and some passed these rights to their own vassals. (Wikipedia)</p>
Heriot	<p>Heriot, from Old English <i>heregeat</i> ("war-gear"), was originally a death-duty in late Anglo-Saxon England, which required that at death, a nobleman provided to his king a given set of military equipment, often including horses, swords, shields, spears and helmets. It later developed into a kind of tenurial relief due from villeins.</p> <p>It was the right of a lord in feudal Europe to seize a serf's best horse and or clothing upon his death. It arose from the tradition of the lord loaning a serf a horse or armour or weapons to fight so that when the serf died the lord would rightfully reclaim his property. When knights as a class emerged and were later able to acquire their own fighting instruments, the lord continued to claim rights to property upon death, extending sometimes to everyone not just the fighting knights. Serfs could make provisions for heriot in their wills, but death in battle often meant no heriot was required, because the winner of a fight would often take horse and armour anyway as was often the custom. By the 13th century the payment was made either in money or in kind by handing over the best beast or chattel of the tenant.</p> <p>Heriot is one of the many curious laws from feudal times that started because of a logical need between two parties, but because of the custom of noble rights, where whatever rights a lord had before continue on by way of custom, even if the original reason for it no longer existed.</p>
Idem	<p>Id. (Latin, short for "<i>idem</i>", "the same") is the term used in legal citations for the previously cited source (cf. ibid.). It is also used in academic citations where it replaces the name of a repeated author.</p>

Manors	<p>The land of Cowfold parish was mainly within four manors centred in nearby parishes, namely Ewhurst and Shermanbury manors in Shermanbury, Stretham manor in Henfield, and Beeding manor in Upper Beeding.</p> <p>Other manors outside the parish with land in Cowfold were Woodmancote, Hewells in Horsham, Tottington Wowood in Upper Beeding, of which Dragons farm was held as a copyhold or customary tenement by the Martin family in the 17th century, (fn. 27) and Bidlington and Kingsbarns in West Grinstead, which itself derived from manors in Bramber and Upper Beeding (fn. 28) and of which Stonehouse farm was held. (fn. 29) A reference to land in Cowfold held of Wyndham or Lord Leconfield's manor (fn. 30) may result from confusion between the names of the half-hundred and of Lord Leconfield's family.□□</p>
Messuage	<p>In law, the term messuage equates to a dwelling-house and includes outbuildings, orchard, curtilage or court-yard and garden. At one time <i>messuage</i> supposedly had a more extensive meaning than that comprised in the word <i>house</i> or <i>site</i>, but such distinction, if it ever existed, no longer survives.</p> <p>A capital messuage is the main messuage of an estate, the house in which the owner of the estate normally lives.</p> <p>The word <i>messuage</i> derives from the Anglo-French <i>mesuage</i> (holding), probably a corruption of popular Latin <i>mansio</i>, whence modern French <i>maison</i> (house), from <i>manere</i> (to dwell). (Wikipedia)</p>
Moiety Title	<p>Moiety is a Middle English word for one of two equal parts under feudal system.</p> <p>Moiety title is legal term for a variable portion of ownership of property.</p> <p>In English law, the term is used in parsing aspects of ownership and liability in all forms of property.</p>
Quit Rent	<p>Quit rent or Quit-rent, in practically all cases, is now effectively but not formally a tax or land tax imposed on freehold or leased land by a higher landowning authority,</p>

	<p>usually a government or its assigns.</p> <p>Under feudal law, the payment of quit rent freed the tenant of a holding from the obligation to perform such other services as were obligatory under feudal tenure, or freed the occupier of the land from the burden of having others use their own distinct rights that affected the land (e.g., hunting rights which would have impaired farming). As such, it was a rental of distinct things that were not parcelled up in the ownership of the land itself, although connected with the full enjoyment of the land, and formally it was a sort of buy back rather than a tax. Where a true tax can be varied by the taxer, and must be paid on pain of penalties that can be varied by the taxer without formal limit, the only sanction for not paying a feudal quit rent was that the alternative burdens would return - which imposed a ceiling on how much could be demanded in payment of a quit rent in practice. Where the sanctions for non-compliance are limited in this way, a quit rent is a rent in fact as well as in form and name, and not a tax; where they are not so limited, a quit rent is not a rent in fact but only in form and name, being rather a tax in fact. The latter is the usual case today, as the former was in earlier times.</p> <p>In post-feudal times, quit rents have continued to be imposed by some governments, usually attached to land grants as a form of land tax.</p> <p>The quit rent system was used frequently by colonial governments in the British Empire. Many land grants in colonial America in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries carried quit rent. Quit rents went on to be used in British colonies, protectorates, etc. in Asia and elsewhere in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.</p> <p>Some governments have now abolished the quit rent system and relieved those with a nominal quit rent obligation from the requirement to pay it, replacing quit rents with a uniform system of land tax. However, in other countries, such as Malaysia, quit rent remains an important means of raising revenue from landowners.</p>
Reeve	<p>In Anglo-Saxon England and later medieval England, a reeve (Old English <i>gerefa</i>) refers to a variety of administrative and judicial officials serving under the king or other nobles and before the Conquest, generally ranking lower than the ealdorman or earl. Attested reeves before the Conquest include the high-reeve, town-reeve, port-reeve, shire-reeve</p>

	<p>(predecessor to the sheriff), reeve of the hundred and the reeve in charge of an estate.</p> <p>In later medieval England, a reeve was an official elected annually by the serfs to supervise lands for a lord. The reeve himself was a serf. He had many duties such as making sure the serfs started work on time and ensuring that no one was cheating the lord out of money.</p> <p>England in the early 1000s employed the services of shire reeves to assist in the detection and prevention of crimes. Groups of 10 families or "tithings" were commissioned for an early form of neighborhood watch, and were organized into groups of 100 families or "hundreds." The hundreds were supervised by a constable. Groups of hundreds within a specific geographic area were combined to form shires and were under control of the king. The reeve of an entire shire was a Shire-reeve, predecessor to the Sheriff. (Wikipedia)</p>
Rod	<p>The rod is a unit of length equal to 5.5 yards, 5.0292 metres, 16.5 feet, or 1/320 of a statute mile. A rod is the same length as a perch and a pole. The lengths of the perch (one rod) and chain (four rods) were standardized in 1607 by Edmund Gunter. In old English, the term lug is also used.</p> <p>The length is equal to the standardized length of the ox goad used by medieval English ploughmen; fields were measured in acres which were one chain (four rods) by one furlong (in the United Kingdom, ten chains).</p> <p>Because the furlong was "one plough's furrow long" and a furrow was the length a plough team was to be driven without resting, the length of the furlong and the area of the acre vary regionally, nominally due to differing soil types (causing differences in how far a team could be driven until it needed to rest). In England the acre was 4,840 square yards, but in Scotland it was 6,150 square yards and in Ireland 7,840 square yards. In all three countries, fields were divided in acres and thus the furlong became a measure commonly used in horse racing, archery, and civic planning.</p> <p>Bars of metal one rod (16.5 feet) long were used as standards of length in surveying land in the past. One example of a surveyor's rod is a one piece metal bar encased in a cylindrical canvas tube (to keep the sun from heating it and making it increase in length) with a piece of the semiprecious gemstone jasper at each end of the rod (to prevent wear of the metal bar). The rod was still in use as a</p>

	<p>common unit of measurement in the mid-1800s, when Henry David Thoreau used it frequently when describing distances in his work Walden.</p> <p>The rod was phased out as a unit of measurement that could legally be used in the United Kingdom as part of a ten year metrication process that began on 24 May 1965.</p> <p>Despite no longer being in widespread use, the rod is still used in certain specialized fields. In recreational canoeing, maps measure portages (overland paths where canoes must be carried) in rods. This is thought to persist due to the rod approximating the length of a typical canoe. In the UK, the sizes of allotment gardens continue to be measured in square poles in some areas, being referred to simply as poles rather than square poles.</p>
Seized	<p>Seisin (also spelled seizin) is the possession of such an estate in land as was anciently thought worthy to be held by a free man. As ownership and possession of land was paramount in the Middle Ages, seisin approximates modern "freehold" ownership of land, or the right to immediate possession.</p> <p>Seisin is of two kinds, in law and in deed. Seisin in law is where lands descend and the heir has not actually entered upon them; by entry he converts his seisin in law into seisin in deed. Seisin is now confined to possession of the freehold, though at one time it appears to have been used for simple possession without regard to the estate of the possessor. Its importance is considerably less than it was at one time, owing to the old form of conveyance by feoffment with livery of seisin having been superseded by a deed of grant, and the old rule of descent from the person last seised having been abolished in favour of descent from the purchaser.</p> <p>At one time the right of the wife to dower and of the husband to an estate by curtesy depended upon the doctrine of seisin. The Dower Act (1833-1834), however, rendered the fact of the seisin of the husband of no importance, and the Married Women's Property Act 1882 practically abolished the old law of curtesy.</p>
Shermanbury Manor	<p>Shermanbury manor's farmsteads in Cowfold were mostly in the south-east quarter adjoining Shermanbury parish, namely Eastridge, Kings, Lydford, and Wilcocks, but also included Aglands and Homelands in the north-east quarter, Gosden on the northern boundary, and Gervaise in the</p>

	centre of the western half. □□
<i>sic</i>	<i>Sic</i> is a Latin word meaning "thus", "so", "as such", or "in such a manner". In writing, it is placed within the quoted material, in square brackets – or outside it, in regular parentheses – and usually italicized – [<i>sic</i>] – to indicate that an incorrect or unusual spelling, phrase, punctuation, and/or other preceding quoted material has been reproduced verbatim from the quoted original and is not a transcription error.
Solar Wing	A solar wing, I believe, is the end of a hall, boarded over so as to make a partial upper storey, with a parlour in it. (Clive Hart)
Stretham Manor	Four farmsteads in Cowfold of Stretham manor were in the south-west corner, Godshill, Groveland, Mockford, and Swains, but others, including Hill Farm (formerly South Haines) and Potters, lay nearer Cowfold village. □□
Widows Bench	<p>Free bench" is a legal term relating to an ancient manorial custom in England whereby a widow could retain tenure of the land until she remarried.</p> <p>"Free Bench (Lat. <i>francus bancus</i>). The widow's right to a copyhold. It is not a dower or gift, but a free right independent of the will of the husband. Called bench because, upon acceding to the estate, she becomes a tenant of the manor, and one of the benchers, i.e. persons who sit on the bench occupied by the pares curiæ. (Peers of Court)"</p>

Listed Buildings

Source: Images of England (IoE) dated 10.1.2019, transferred to Historic England website

IoE No.	Grade	Date listed	Building name	Location
299158	II	28-Nov-80	ALLFREYS	Bolney Road, Cowfold
299182	II	22-Sep-59	BARRINGTON COTTAGE	Horsham Road, Cowfold
299183	II	28-Nov-80	BROOKHILL HOUSE	Horsham Road, Cowfold
			BROOK FARM HOUSE - see Littlebrook	
299172	II	22-Sep-59	BULLS BRIDGE COTTAGES	Henfield Road, Cowfold
299195	II	28-Nov-80	BULL'S COTTAGE	Perryfield Lane, Cowfold
299209	II	22-Sep-59	CAPON'S BARN (North of Capon's Farmhouse)	Station Road, Cowfold
299208	II	22-Sep-59	CAPON'S FARMHOUSE	Station Road, Cowfold
299186	II	22-Sep-59	CHATFIELD FARMHOUSE	Horsham Road, Cowfold
299187	II	28-Nov-80	CHATSFIELD FARM COTTAGES	1 & 2 Horsham Road, Cowfold
299169	II	28-Nov-80	CHURCH FARM HOUSE	Henfield Road, Cowfold
299207	II	28-Nov-80	CHURCH LODGE	Station Road, Cowfold
299204	II	28-Nov-80	CHURCH TERRACE	5 & 6 Station Road, Cowfold
481513	II	31-Jul-00	CLERKS, EASTLANDS FARM	Eastlands Lane, Cowfold
299211	II	04-Sep-75	CLOCK HOUSE, THE	West Grinstead Road, Cowfold
299185	II	22-Sep-59	COTLANDS	Horsham Road, Cowfold
438462	II	19-May-83	COTLANDS, WEST	Horsham Road, Cowfold
299166	II	28-Nov-80	COWFOLD ANTIQUES	Henfield Road, Cowfold
299173	II	28-Nov-80	CRATEMAN'S FARMHOUSE	Henfield Road, Cowfold
			EASTLANDS FARM - see Clerks	

299199	II	28-Nov-80	FRITHKNOWLE	Pict's Hill, Cowfold
299180	II	28-Nov-80	FURZEFIELD	Horsham Road, Cowfold
299194	II	22-Sep-59	GOODGER'S FARMHOUSE	Perryfield Lane, Cowfold
299193	II	22-Sep-59	GORSEDEAN	Mill Lane, Cowfold
299174	II	28-Nov-80	GRATWICKE	Henfield Road, Cowfold
299160	II	22-Sep-59	HOMELANDS	Bull's Lane, Cowfold
			HUNTSCROFT - see Viscount Hse	
299179	II	28-Nov-80	JERSEY COTTAGE	Horsham Road, Cowfold
299161	II	28-Nov-80	JOHN BULL'S HOUSE	Bull's Lane, Cowfold
299190	II	22-Sep-59	KINGS BARN	Bolney Road, Cowfold
299178	II	28-Nov-80	LITTLE PARKMINSTER	Henfield Road, Cowfold
299210	II	28-Nov-80	LITTLE PATCHES	Stonehouse Lane, Cowfold
299184	II*	22-Sep-59	LITTLEBROOK & Brooke Farm House	Horsham Road, Cowfold
299196	II	22-Sep-59	LONG HOUSE	off Perryfield Lane, Cowfold
299198	II	28-Nov-80	LONG HOUSE GRANARY South East side	off Perryfield Lane, Cowfold
299197	II	22-Sep-59	LONG HOUSE WALL & GATE East side	off Perryfield Lane, Cowfold
299191	II	22-Sep-59	LYDFORD FARMHOUSE	Kent Street Lane, Cowfold
299203	II	22-Sep-59	MARGARET'S COTTAGES	1-6 Station Road, Cowfold
299206	II	28-Nov-80	MASSETTS	Station Road, Cowfold
299177	II	28-Nov-80	MOCKFORD	1 & 2 Henfield Road, Cowfold
299163	II	28-Nov-80	NORTH FIELD FARMHOUSE	Burnthouse Lane, Cowfold
299159	II	28-Nov-80	OAKENDENE MANOR	Bolney Road, Cowfold
299166	II	28-Nov-80	OLD HOUSES (St Peter's Shop, Ye Olde Shop and St Peter's Cottage)	Henfield Road, Cowfold

299166	II	28-Nov-80	OLDE SHOP, YE	Henfield Road, Cowfold
299775	II	05-Aug-92	PICTS BARN W side of Picts Cott	Picts Lane, Cowfold
299774	II	05-Aug-92	PICTS COTTAGES	Picts Lane, Cowfold
299205	II	28-Nov-80	POST MASTER'S HOUSE, THE	Station Road, Cowfold
299200	II	28-Nov-80	POTTER'S COTTAGE	3 Potters Green, Cowfold
299181	II	22-Sep-59	RED HOUSE, THE	Horsham Road, Cowfold
299188	II	22-Sep-59	SOUTH COTTAGE	Horsham Road, Cowfold
299189	II	22-Sep-59	SOUTH COTTAGE BARN (adjacent to South Cottage)	Horsham Road, Cowfold
299176	II	28-Nov-80	ST HUGH'S - THE LODGE	Henfield Road, , Parkminster
299175	II*	04-Sep-80	ST HUGH'S MONASTERY	Henfield Road, Cowfold
299201	I	22-Sep-59	ST PETER, PARISH CHURCH OF	Station Road, Cowfold
299167	II	22-Sep-59	ST PETER'S COTTAGE	Henfield Road, Cowfold
299166	II	28-Nov-80	ST PETER'S SHOP	Henfield Road, Cowfold
299170	II	28-Nov-80	STEYNE HOUSE	Henfield Road, Cowfold
			STORES, THE - see Willows, The	
299202	II	28-Nov-80	SUSSEX HOUSE	Station Road, Cowfold
299192	II	22-Sep-59	SWAINS FARMHOUSE	Littleworth Lane, Cowfold
299162	II	22-Sep-59	TRENCHMORE	Burnthouse Lane, Cowfold
299165	II	28-Nov-80	VISCOUNT HOUSE	Henfield Road, Cowfold
299164	II	28-Nov-80	WHITE LINED HOUSE	Henfield Road, Cowfold
299168	II	28-Nov-80	WILLOWS, THE (Tobitts Stores)	Henfield Road, Cowfold
299171	II	28-Nov-80	WOOD GRANGE	Henfield Road, Cowfold

House Prices, 1972 to 1974

	1972			1973				1974	
	2 nd Qtr	3 rd Qtr	4 th Qtr	1 st Qtr	2 nd Qtr	3 rd Qtr	4 th Qtr	1 st Qtr	2 nd Qtr
Church Path									
House, period attached						£18,950	£15,750	£15,750	£15,750
House, semi-detached				£10,750					£9,950
Houses, modern attached						£22,500 to £23,400		£24,250 to £25,250	£19,950 to £20,950
Village Street									
House, semi-detached									
House, terraced	£9,500								
House, period attached			£32,500	£32,500	£28,000	£26,000			
Barley Croft									
Bungalow, semi-detached			£12,750						
House, semi-detached		£11,900							
House, semi-detached				£13,950					
House, semi-detached					£13,950				
Thornden									
Bungalow, detached						£24,000	£22,850		
Bungalow, detached						£27,500	£24,500	£22,000	
Bungalow, detached						£24,000	£22,850	£22,850	£21,000
Bungalow, detached						£22,500	£21,000		
Bungalow, detached									£21,000
Bungalow, detached									£18,750
House, semi-detached									£19,650
House, detached									£21,000
Elsewhere in Parish									
House, semi-detached				£12,000					