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Appendix to Chapter 2 Methodology and sources

2.1 Catalogue of all antiquarians’ manuscripts and published material

List of antiquarians published and unpublished material

Primary sources unpublished

Cresswell’s Church Notes
Cresswell, B. 1921c: ‘Notes on Devon Churches. The fabric and features of interest in the Churches of the Deanery of Okehampton’. Devon Heritage


**Davidson’s Commonplace books**


Davidson, J. 1850: Collection for Devon. Devon Heritage Centre. DAVCOL. 1850.

**Davidson’s Church Notes on Devon**

Davidson, J. 1843: ‘Church Notes on Devon, East Devon’ Vol. 1. Devon Heritage Centre. S726.5/Dev/Dav U.

Davidson, J. 1843: ‘Church Notes on Devon, South Devon’ Vol. 2. Devon Heritage Centre. S726.5/Dev/Dav U.

Davidson, J. 1843: ‘Church Notes on Devon, Exeter Cathedral Church’ Vol. 3. Devon Heritage Centre. S726.5/Dev/Dav U.
Davidson, J. 1843: ‘Church Notes on Devon, West Devon’ Vol. 4. Devon Heritage Centre. S726.5/Dev/Dav U.
Davidson, J. 1843: ‘Church Notes on Devon, North Devon’ Vol. 5. Devon Heritage Centre. S726.5/Dev/Dav U.

Hutchinson’s Diaries
Hutchinson, P.O. 1878-1894: ‘Diary’ vol. 5. Devon Heritage Centre. Z19/36/16e.

Hutchinson’s Sketch Books
Hutchinson, P.O. 1851: Sketch Books. Devon Heritage Centre. Z19/2/8a-8f.

Hutchinson 1860: History of the Restoration of Sidmouth Church
Hutchinson, P.O. 1860: ‘History of the Restoration of Sidmouth Church’. Devon Heritage Centre. DRO 4584.

Hutchinson’s History of Sidmouth
Hutchinson, P.O. 1880: ‘History of Sidmouth’ vol. 3. Devon Heritage Centre. SE/Sid500L Hut.

Hutchinson’s letters
Hutchinson, P.O. 1855: Letter to George Oliver in the Barnstaple Records Office.
Hutchinson, P.O. 1867: Letter to the Society of Antiquaries of London in Hutchinson’s file unreferenced.

Milles Questionnaire

Milles Parochial Collection
Milles, J. 1747-1762a: A Parochial History of Devonshire 1747-1762a, Devon Heritage Centre.
Oliver's Commonplace Book
Oliver, G. 1840: Commonplace Book Barnstaple Athenaeum. File H27.
Oliver, G. 1827: Barnstaple Athenaeum. File H43.

Swete's Journals

Swete, J. undated picture of Exminster quarry Devon Heritage Centre
564M/F16/137)

Woolcombe's manuscript
Woolcombe, H. 1839: 'Hillforts, some accounts of the Fortified Hills, in the County of Devon'. In The Devon and Exeter Institute.

Chanter's published material
Henry A. Fystor.
Chanter, J.F. 1906b: ‘The record of the exploration of three barrows near Brockenbarrow Lane, Challacombe, North Devon in the 25th report of the Barrow Committee’ RTDA XXXVIII, 57-66.
Chanter, J.F. 1913: 'Extracts from the Ledger Book and Other Ancient Documents of the Abbey of Buckfast' RTDA XLV, 152-168.
Chanter, J.F. 1914: 'St Urith of Chittlehampton' RTDA XLVI, 290-308.
Chanter, J.F. 1918: 'Devonshire Place-Names' RTDA L, 503-532.
Chanter, J.F. 1923: 'Fourteenth Report of the Committee on Church Plate' RTDA LV, 64-82.
Chanter, J.F. 1924: 'Fifteenth Report of the Committee on Church Plate' RTDA LVI, 124-152.
Chanter, J.F. 1913: ‘Extracts from the Ledger Book and Other Ancient Documents of the Abbey of Buckfast’ *RTDA* XLV, 152-168.
Chanter, J.F. 1914: ‘St Urith of Chittlehampton’ *RTDA* XLVI, 290-308.

Davidson’s published material
Davidson, J. The History of Axminster Church in the County of Devon. Exeter. Pollard.
Davidson, J. 1861: Notes on the Antiquities of Devonshire which Dates before the Norman Conquest. Exeter. Roberts.

Davidson transcribed material
No date: A document relating to a Domesday geldable Hide.
No date. A collection of letters about the collapse of Bideford Bridge.

Hooker’s published material

Hutchinson’s published material
1836: A Pedestrian Tour of One Thousand Three Hundred and Forty Seven Miles through Wales and England. (Published under the pseudonym of Pedestre and Sir Clavileno Woodenpeg, Knights of Snowdon).
Hutchinson, P.O. 1849: ‘A Dissertation on the Site of Moridunum on the South Coast of Devonshire’ Gentleman’s Magazine. 31, 137-146.
Hutchinson, P.O. 1861: ‘On the Hill Fortresses, Tumuli, and some Other
Antiquities of eastern Devon’ in *The Journal of the British Archaeological Association* XVIII, 53-66.


Hutchinson, P. O. 1868: ‘Hill, Fortresses, Sling-Stones, and Other Antiquities South-Eastern Devon’ in *RTDA* II part 2, 372-382.


Hutchinson, P.O. 1880: ‘2nd Report of the Barrow Committee’ *RTDA* XII, 120-151.

Hutchinson, P.O. 1880: ‘The cartulary of the Priory of Otterton and Sidmouth’ *Notes and Gleaning*.


Hutchinson, P.O. 1884: *Chronicles of Gretna Green*. I and II.

Hutchinson, P.O. 1886: *The Diary and Letters of His Excellency Thomas Hutchinson* 1886, vol. II.


**Kirwan’s published material**

Kirwan, R. 1867: ‘Sepulchral Barrows at Broad Down, near Honiton, and an Unique Cup of Bituminous Shale there Found’ *The Archaeological Journal* XXV, 290-311.


Kirwan, R. 1872: ‘Notes on the Pre-Historic Archaeology of East Devon’ *Archaeological Journal* 29, 34-44.

Moore’s published material

Oliver’s published material
Oliver, G. 1821: *Historic Collections relating to the Monasteries of Devon*. Exeter. Callum.
Oliver, G. 1828: *Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Devon, being Observations on many Churches in Devonshire*. Exeter: Woolmer.
Oliver, G. 1840-42: *Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Devon, being Observations on many Churches in Devonshire, with some memoranda for the History of Cornwall*. Exeter: Featherstone.
Oliver, G. 1854: *Ancient Churches within the Castle of Exeter*. Exeter.
Oliver, G. 1861: *The History of Exeter (published four months after Oliver died)*. Exeter. Roberts.
Oliver, G. 1877: Letters on ecclesiastical and parochial antiquities [200 letters extending over nine years published in the *Exeter Flying Post*, collected by Pitman Jones and pasted into two volumes and given the Devon and Exeter Intuition].

Pengelly’s published material
Pengelly, W. 1883: ‘Discoveries in the more recent Deposits of the Bovey Basin Devon’ *RTDA* VI, 368-95.
Only publications mentioned in the thesis have been included

Pole’s published material
Pole, W. 1617: *Collections towards a Description of the County of Devon*. Published in 1821. London. Nicholas.

Polwhele’s published material

Prince’s published material

Risdon’s published material
Risdon, T. c.1632: *The Chorographical Description or Survey of the County of

**Shortt’s published material**

**Spreat’s published material**

**Westcote’s published material**
Appendix 2.2 Original pro forma for collecting information from churches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Church</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Façade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North aisle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South aisle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedilia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rood loft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door to loft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altar screen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling chancel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulpit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Font</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stained glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal coat of arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandelier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor chancel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monuments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 2.3 Altered pro forma for collecting information from churches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Church</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Distance from main town</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antiquarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiquarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battlements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Façade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Font</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North aisle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South aisle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulpit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedilia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altar Screen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rood loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door to loft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling nave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling chancel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stained glass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stained glass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stained glass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandelier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pews church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pews choir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor chancel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal coat of Arms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix to Chapter 4
Travellers to Devon and their possible influence on later antiquarians
This appendix details the observations of Daniel Defoe and Celia Fiennes on Devon.

4 Major dates in the life of Daniel Defoe 1660-1731
1660  Born in London
1684  Married Mary Tuffley
1688  Became a secret agent for William II and questioned conformity within the Church of England
1703  Worked for the Government
1731  Died and buried in Bunhill Fields, a cemetery for Nonconformists
      (Mathew and Harrison 2004, 681-92)

4.1 Introduction
Daniel Defoe was born Daniel Foe in London in 1660, and changed his name to Defoe in 1695 (Fig.5.22). He was educated in Dorking (Surry) and attended a Dissenters academy in London, during a period when the English government did not tolerate those who worshipped outside the Church of England. He married Mary Tuffley, whose dowry of £3,700 allowed Defoe to purchase a country estate and a ship. In 1685 he was involved with the ill-fated Monmouth Rebellion, but managed to escape with a pardon. When William II was crowned King in 1688, Defoe worked for the political agent Robert Harvey and became the King’s secret agent, spying on his behalf (Mathew and Harrison 2004, 681-92).
Queen Anne came to the throne in 1702, and was opposed to Nonconformists ideals, and because of Defoe’s pamphlets against Church of England doctrine he was arrested in 1703. He was charged with libel, fined, pilloried and sent to Newgate Prison: his fine was paid for by Robert Harley in exchange for Defoe providing intelligence about the Tories. When Queen Anne died in 1714, Defoe was employed by the Whigs to write pamphlets undermining the Tories policy. During his lifetime Defoe witnessed the Great Plague of 1665 in which over 70000 people died, as well as the Great Fire of London in 1666 and the Great Storm of 1704. He used these events to form the backdrop to his novels, which are not discussed here (Mathew and Harrison 2004, 681-92).

**4.1.2 Background to Defoe’s tours of England**

Defoe stated that he considered it wrong to describe the country from other men’s accounts, and that if a writer did this, then the work should be considered a fraud. He thought that to carry out a full survey would require a public purse, and persons appointed by authority. This, he believed, was what had allowed William Camden (1551-1623) to carry out his survey: Camden had the means to do so, as well as access to every curiosity, both public and private (Cole 1966, 251).

Defoe thought that to describe a country by way of a journey in a private capacity would require a particular person, he reflected, who could learn from enquiry and conversations: in other words, himself. Defoe wrote that he did not dwell on the niceties of measured distances, the exact dimensions of a site, or all the historical facts; his aim was to give an account in essay form and in a familiar manner, of the present state of things (Cole 1966, 251).

The accounts, published between 1724 and 1726, are the result of 17 journeys Defoe took throughout England, Wales and Scotland, (Fig.5.21) (Cole 1927, viii). Defoe observed there was always something new to write about, such as new public buildings, repairs to churches, new trades, and the fortunes of families (Defoe 1724-26, 252). He stated that ‘great antiquity is not my work’; he left it to others to search into the depths of the past.
4.2 Defoe’s tour of Devon

During his coastal tour of Devon he mentioned the harbours and their attributes, the ships and the trade (Figs.5.23; 5.24). For example, at Exeter he recorded that trade was carried out with Holland, Portugal, Spain and Italy which was linked to the export of serge (Defoe 1724-26, 222). At Plymouth, Defoe remarked on the collapse of the Eddystone Lighthouse (possibly he was referring to the collapse in 1709); he described the docks, which had made Plymouth a prosperous town, and where ships of the Navy had been repaired during the war with France (Defoe 1724-26, 230). From Bideford ships went to Liverpool to fetch rocksalt to cure the fish, he noted, whilst Ilfracombe traded with Ireland (Defoe 1724-26, 261-3).

Defoe (1724-26, xv) wrote very little about the landscape, only that it was picturesque and should be included in the record for the benefit of fellow travellers so they would know what to look at. He remarked that 20,000 hogsheads of cider were produced around Ottery St Mary and sent to London,
where the merchants used it to water down their wine (Defoe 1724-26, 222). In Devon he noted there were 70 Dissenters’ Houses (Defoe 1724-26, 233).

Fig. 4.13: A map of Devon, with the coast outline to show Defoe’s journey through Devon (Cole 1927, opp.224).

4.2.1 Conclusions
Defoe’s assertion: ‘I studiously avoid meddling with antiquities in these accounts’, shows that he believed in giving the reader the present state of a town, rather than what it had been (Defoe 1724-26, 263). Defoe suggested he was content with the essays he had written, and had kept closely to his ideals of giving an entertaining description of the country to tempt the reader to travel. Defoe saw England as an improving trading nation that was constantly changing, and encouraged the reader to explore it for himself (Defoe 1724-26, 252). He saw England through the eyes of a tradesman, and produced a contemporary account of the state of economic and social affairs of the early 18th century, as well as a guidebook for the traveller (Cole 1927, vii-ix).

Cole (1927, viii-xv) makes the suggestion that although Defoe was a chronicler with an eye for significant detail, he was also a ‘fabricator’ of facts,
and not always a reliable source of information. Although Defoe did travel as a merchant between 1685 and 1690, Cole maintains it was not as set out in the Tour, which was fictional (Coles 1927, xv). However, it is certain that Defoe did record first-hand knowledge, for example at Bideford, where he saw that trade had increased at the expense of Barnstaple: this has been clarified from archival sources. Like other writers, Defoe used material from William Camden’s 1695 edition of Britannia to give a historical perspective to his Tour, and to which he added his own observations. Some passages Defoe acknowledged to be Camden’s, others he did not (Rogers 2008, 11-3). Defoe was a man of the world, immersed in early 18th century politics and economics; he was interested in everything and had strong opinions about everything (Richetti 2008, 2).

4.3 Major dates in the life of Celia Fiennes 1662 - 1712
1662 Born at Newton Tony near Salisbury (Wiltshire)
1682-1698 Undertook a series of Tours through England
1741 Died at Hackney (Morris 1982, 1-20)

5.3.1 Introduction
Celia Fiennes was born at Newton Tony (Wiltshire) in 1662, 16 years after the end of the English Civil War (1642-1646). Fiennes was born in the reign of Charles II, and experienced the social and political revolution of the 17th century, which included the introduction of the new Book of Common Prayer. Her journeys can be seen as a Familiae Minorum Gentium of visiting the counties’ gentry and obtaining overnight hospitality. Lacking an awareness of the reality of life in England, and demonstrating little sense of history, her journals are valuable in representing a microcosm of a picturesque traveller (Morris 1982, 10-30).

Fiennes had an omnivorous appetite for facts and unlike Defoe little time for preaching economic sermons. Her interests lay in describing the houses she stayed in, the towns she visited, and the manufacture of goods, as well as in taking the waters, making pilgrimages to holy wells, and consulting Camden’s Britannia (Morris 1982, 18-9). Yet in her accounts of visiting Devon no examples of visiting wells and consulting Britannia are given. Possibly she was unique in
her undertaking, or possibly she was fortunate in that her accounts survived to be transcribed and published by Mrs Griffiths in 1888 (Fig.5.25) (Morris 1982, 8).

5.3.2 Fiennes’ tour of Devon

Fiennes’ tour of Devon was undertaken in 1698, during the reign of William and Mary (1689-1702). She travelled from Bristol to Plymouth either on horseback or by equipage with servants. She noted that the altar was in the middle of the chancel in Plymouth’s Parish Church (Morris 1982, 196). The placing of the altar was a source of conflict in the 17th century, and only one altar surrounded by a rail was allowed, usually in the chancel (Addleshaw 1948, 127) (see Chapter Thirteen).

After what Fiennes called ‘very long miles’ she crossed the Blackdown Hills into Devon. The view revealed large tracts of enclosed fields, with good..
grass and corn, divided by quickset hedgerows and small hills, all of which she thought was typical of the Westcountry (Morris 1982, 196). The stony Devon lanes enclosed by hedges and trees rarely saw the light of day and as a consequence were in constant need of repair; Fiennes wondered how the loaded pack horses passed each other (Morris 1982, 200). At Topsham, she recorded that work was about to start on building the Exeter Canal (it was finished by 1701), which would allow ships to be loaded with serge in Exeter, instead of horses taking it by road to Topsham (Morris 1982, 197).

Fiennes recounted details of Exeter’s markets, which occupied three streets and she noted the produce sold and the large market house set on stone pillars, where packs of serge and other yarns were sold. The population around Exeter was employed in spinning, weaving, dressing, scouring, and drying the serge (Morris 1982, 197-198), Fiennes recounted. In Plymouth she observed that all the houses were built of marble, although there were no great houses, and the streets were clean (fig.4.15) (Morris 1982, 201). On her return to Exeter after visiting Cornwall Finnes stated she had just experienced the wettest period of all her travels that summer.

Fig.4.15: Plymouth Sound as described by Fiennes (Morris 1982, 202)
5.4 Conclusions
Unlike Defoe, Fiennes provided personal details of who she visited and where she stayed. She undertook the tours of England with the aim of restoring her health, and kept a journal to occupy her mind; the journal was intended for her family, and not for publication. She wrote that if others were to undertake such tours they would learn a lot about England and improve their minds. Morris (1982, 31) saw her as a plain-speaking, matter-of-fact person of ‘Puritan piety and a Whig enthusiasm’, with great curiosity.

Fiennes’ journeys of the 1680s throughout England could be seen as the first comprehensive survey of England since Camden’s journeys, undertaken during the reign of Elizabeth (Morris 1982, 29). Fiennes was recording first-hand the landscape, manufacturing processes, domestic architecture of great houses, cottages, gardens, agricultural practices and market produce (Morris 1989, 29-30). She liked the new style of architecture with water closets and sash windows, and made many suggestions about how her relations’ houses could be improved (Morris 1989, 14-5). She recorded visiting English country houses on her travels and is quoted today as a travel writer (Peill 2013, 19). It is difficult to know how Mrs Griffiths obtained Fiennes’ manuscripts and transcribed the original document for publication (Morris 1982, 24-5).

5.5 Overall conclusions
Defoe was collecting material for publication, and his research was biased towards investigating the rapid economic transformation of the country (Haycock 2002, 12). His work presents a general picture of England in the early 18th century, and reads like a guidebook, with instructions as to what the traveller should look at, but there are no references to the antiquities in the landscape. There are suggestions that Defoe was a fabricator of facts and not a reliable source of information. He was correct with regards to trade, however, as at Barnstaple. After Defoe’s death the passion for travel increased and there was a demand for successive reprints of the Tour thro’ the Whole Island of Great Britain. As the Georgian period progressed there became a clear separation between serious archaeological investigation and what could be termed ‘genteel tourism’ (Rogers 1962, 21).
Fiennes (1662-1741) was different; firstly, because she was possibly the only women to have recorded her journeys, and secondly, because she had no intention of publishing her observations as her work was for her family to read. Fiennes provides us with detailed accounts of manufacturing processes, of visits to country houses and staying with her family. Her journals are a microcosm of a picturesque traveller, and there are similarities with journals written 90 years later by John Swete (1751-1821), who described Devon’s landscape in picturesque terms (Chapter Six). Unlike Defoe before her, Fiennes recorded personal details and facts during her travels. Whilst Fiennes’ journal has been compared to Camden’s Britannia as a comprehensive survey of England, they do not record the same details (Morris 1982, 29). Fiennes recorded domestic details and manufacturing processes, whereas Camden focussed on historical and geographical facts. Fiennes was possibly biased towards Nonconformist ideals in the same way as Defoe was biased towards those of the Dissenters.
Appendix to Chapter 6
Devon’s Georgian antiquarians

In Appendix 6 we have further evidence of the Georgian antiquarians’ personal details and observations.

6 Jeremiah Milles

6.1 Milles’ Questionnaire

Below is the list of questions that Milles sent to all Devon’s parishes. There is no record of a covering letter, so it can only be assumed that they were sent to the rector as the majority of answers came either from the rector or a person of authority in the parish.

Queries for the County of Devon

What is the true modern name of your parish?
How do you find it spelt in ancient records?
The supposed etymology of it?
The length and breath of the parish according to points of the compass
By what parishes bounded?
The name of the towns, hamlets, villages and houses in it with their respective situations

The number of baptisms, burials, communibus Annis
Name and situation of the Manors and of their present and former Lords as high as you can trace them?
What mansion houses belonging to them?
Particular customs tenures and privileges of them?

In what manor or part of the parish is the church situated?
At what distance from Exeter and the next market town?
To what saint dedicated? The form and size of it?
With what material built and covered?
And about what time supposed to be have been erected?
What monuments or inscriptions in it is earlier than 1600?
Or of memorable person since that time?
What coats of arms, carved, or painted in the windows or elsewhere?
Tower, its height, shape and situation with respect to the church?
The number of bells in it? The name of the present patron?
Chapels of ease, if any, how situated, and endowed? And to what saint dedicated?
Names of ruined chapels, if any, and how situated

What wakes, parish feats or annual processions
Are there any Roman roads, walls, camps, forts, pavements, urns, stones lamps, coins, or weapons of war found in your parish and where now to be seen?
Any obelisks of rude single stones, or enclosures made of stone erect, in a circular any other form?
Any large single stones placed horizontally on others?
Any basins cut into the surface of your rocks?
Any rocking stones or caves made by art?

Any Danish or Saxon encampments, urns, bracelets, or weapons found in sepulchres?
Any ancient crosses standing with or without inscriptions?
Ancient castles, if any, and by whom built?
What parts of them now remaining?
To whom belonging?
Abbeys, and religious houses and their situation?
What parts of these remaining?
To what uses now converted?
And to who belonging?
Remarkable particularise concerning them?

What collages, hospitals, schools, and alms-houses in the parish?
By whom founded? And for what use?
Their ancient establishment? and present state

Are there any gentleman’s seats and remarkable improvements in the parish?
Any bridges, or roads, or other public works?
When made or erected?
What fairs or markets? On what days kept?
What is chiefly sold in them?
What ancient sayings or proverbs are there relating to the parish?
The names of remarkable woods, mountains, rocks, parks, commons, and warrens with their particular situation in the parish?

The face of the parish is in several parts? Whether hilly or level open or enclosed? Consisting of downs, heath or woodlands?
The colour and nature of the soil?
Is it chiefly chalk, sand, gravel, stone, clay or marle?
What proportion of arable land, meadow, pasture?
The usual value of each per acre?
How manured and improved? By lime, sand, dung, and in what proportions?
What grain is chiefly sown? Or agrees with best the soil?
What the greater produce per acre?
What quantity of acres under orchard?
What sort of apple chiefly planted or found to agree best with the soil?
What quantity of cider is generally made annually?
Is it remarkable for it goodness? Is it rough or sweet sort?
And what is the useful value of it per Hogshead? At the pound’s mouth?
What quantity of woodland is there in the parish?
Does it consist of chiefly of timber trees or Coppice?
What sorts of trees are most common and seem to thrive best?
What shrubs, plants, and vegetables are peculiar or grow most commonly in the parish?

What rare or uncommon plants?
What are their supposed virtues? And in what manner used?
What mineral or medicinal springs are there in the parish?
What are there qualities, virtues, weight and analysis?

For what disorder used, and in what measure?
Are there any well ascrib'd cures wrought by them?
Are there any periodical springs? Any springs that ebb and flow?
Or that bury themselves under ground?
Any that are petrify or incrusted other bodies with stony particles?
Of what depth are the wells in different parts of your parish?
What strata have been observed in digging them and in what order do these strata lye?

What rivers or rivulets rise or run through the parish?
Their course, breath, depth, the nature of their beds and banks?
Are they liable to inundation, and at what season?
What cascades or weirs on them?
With what fish do they abound?
How and at what season caught and in what quantities?
Are there any large pools or lakes in the parish?
What sorts of colour of marbles, moorstones, limestone, freestone, building stone, coal slate, pipe clay, brick clay, ochre, marl or chalk are found in the parish?
And in what manner are they used?
Or there any impressions of land or sea animals or shells found in your stone quarries?
Are there any transparent pebbles, or any other stones remarkable for their figure?

What sort of cattle are bred chiefly in the parish?
At what fairs or markets are they sold?
Are they remarkable for their shape, size, colour or breed?
Are there any birds, land or water insects remarkably common, or singular in their kind?

Have they any particular good or bad qualities?
Are they prejudice to the fruits of the earth, and at what season?
Is your air sharp and dry or mild and foggy?
Is it wholesome or reputed or unwholesome?
Are there any remarkable particulars relating to the make complexion, strength health, age, diet, temper, of the inhabitants/
Remarkable instances of long lived persons or of preternatural births?
Have you any trade or manufacture in the parish?
How is it carried on, and in what manner disposed of?
Are there any remarkable facts of history relating to the parish?
Any natural caves in the limestone or other quarries?
Have you any silver, lead, tin copper or iron ore?
How wide is the vein? Does it run north and south or east and west?
What is the annual profit made of it?
Are your mines subject to damp? How long have they been worked?
Have you any bitumen, naphtha, alum, calamine, black lead, bismuth, mercury or antimony found in your parish?

Is your coast steep, rocky or flat and sandy?
Of what nature and substance are the cliffs and in what order or direction to their strata lie?
What are the manes of several headlands, harbours, bays, creeks, sands and island (if any) on the coast?
What are the peculiarities of the tides near the coast and at a mile distance?
What sort of fish abound on the coast?
In what manner and at what season caught and to what market sent?
What sea animals, plates, corals, shells, sponges etc are found on or near the shore?

As every parish cannot furnish answers to every question, it is only requested that the gentlemen will be so kind as to answer such questions as they have any knowledge of, leaving those unanswered of which they are entirely uncertain, and writing NO OR NONE to such of them as furnished no other answer (Milles Questionnaire 1766).

6.2 John Swete

6.2 Swete’s fifteen tours of Devon with lists of the places he visited

Tour One
Swete left Oxton on the 4th September 1789 to visit North Devon and returned on the 13th of September. He visited Moretonhampstead, Okehampton, Frithelstock, Great Torrington, Bideford, Barnstaple, Ilfracombe, Combe Martin, Lynton, Castle Hill, South Molton, Tiverton and Exeter.

Tour Two
Swete’s left Oxton on the 1st June 1792 to visit the South Devon coast. He visited Dawlish, Teignmouth, Shaldon, Torquay, Brixham, Dartmouth, Totnes and Buckfastleigh.

Tour Three
The journals covering Swete’s visits to Buckfastleigh to Buckfast Abbey, Brent, Hole, Ashburton and Ugbrooke in 1792 were destroyed in WWII in the bombing of Newton Abbot.
Tour Four
The first part of Swete’s tour from Oxton to Dunsford, Great Fulford, South Zeal and Okehampton in 1792 were destroyed in the WWII bombing of Newton Abbot. The surviving section detailed the tour from Lydford to Sourton, Bridestowe, Lifton, Launceston, Dunterton, Mount Edgcumbe, Plymouth, Tavistock and Buckland Abbey.

Tour Five
The journals covering Swete’s fifth tour were destroyed in the WWII bombing of Newton Abbot. They covered the 1793 tour of Marystow, Budshead, Warleigh, Crabtree, Plympton, Ivybridge, Totnes, Dartington, Berry Pomeroy, Bradley, Teignbridge and Ugbrooke.

Tour Six
The first part of Swete’s sixth tour of 1793 to Torquay was destroyed in the WWII bombing of Newton Abbot. The surviving section detailed part of the tour from Torquay to Marldon, Paignton, Brixham, Dartmouth, Slapton, Salcombe, Malborough, Aveton Gifford, Modbury, Flete, Yealmpton, Kitley, Orestone, Saltram, Plympton, Radford, Brixton, Moreleigh, Totnes, Berry Pomeroy, Torquay, Forde House and Newton Bushel.

Tour Seven
Swete left Oxton in September 1793 to visit the Teign Valley. He visited Ashton, Christow, Bridford, Dunsford and Clifford Bridge, returning over Haldon Hill. Swete completed this tour in the February of 1794, when he returned to Clifford Bridge, then went on to Crockernwell, Medland, Cheriton, Blackinstone, Canonteign, Crocombe Bridge, Chudleigh Bridge, Lawell, Chudleigh, Upcot and Mamhead.

Tour Eight
Swete left Oxton in July 1794 to visit Exminster, Topsham, Woodbury, Harpford and Ottery St Mary, where he arrived in November 1794. He then travelled to Fairmile, Escot, Payhembury, Dunkeswell, Honiton, Gittisham, Farway, Colyton, Axminster, Ford Abbey, Newnham Abbey, Uplyme, Lyme Regis, Colyford, Seaton, Beer, Branscombe and Sidbury, where he arrived in February 1795.
He continued his travels from Sidbury in March 1795 to Sidmouth, Otterton, Bicton, East Budleigh, Budleigh Salterton, Exmouth, Dawlish Warren, Mamhead, Oxton, Dawlish, Teignmouth, Shaldon, Ringmore, Combe Cellars, Haccombe, Forde House, Newton Bushel, Bradley, Kingsteignton, Whiteway, Old Walls ruins, Combe, Venn and Ashcombe.

Tour Nine
Swete left Oxton in September 1795 to visit Kenn and Kenton.

Tour Ten
Swete left Oxton in May 1796 to visit Exeter, Stoke Canon, Bickleigh, Tiverton, Bampton, Dulverton, Dunster, Minehead, Lynton, Combe Martin, Ilfracombe, Barnstaple, Bishop’s Tawton, Bideford, Clovelly, Hartland, Milton Damerel, Buckland Filleigh, Petrockstowe, Eggesford, Crediton and Newton St Cyres.

Tour Eleven
Swete left Oxton in the summer of 1795 for Dartmoor, to visit Bridford Bridge, Moretonhampstead, Fingle Bridge, Chagford, Postbridge, Prince Hall, Wistman’s Wood, Two Bridges, Tavistock, Sampford Spiney and Ashburton. In 1797 Swete visited the Exe estuary, travelling to Exton, Powderham and Dawlish Warren.

Tour Twelve
Swete left Oxton on the 19th September 1796 to visit Newton Abbot, Totnes, Ivybridge, Cornwood, Shaugh Prior, Plymouth, Yealmpton, Puslinch, Wembury, Newton Ferrers, Cann Quarry, Newnham Mills, Cornwood, Ivybridge and Ashburton, returning to Oxton on 3rd October 1796.

Tour Thirteen
Swete left Oxton on the 14th August 1797 to visit Fordland, Kenn, Alphington and Ide.

Tour Fourteen
Swete left Oxton in 1799 to visit places along the Exe estuary, including Powderham, Nutwell, Lympstone, Topsham, Exminster and Countess Wear.
Tour Fifteen

Swete left Oxton on 12\textsuperscript{th} June 1800 to visit the north-eastern part of Devon. He visited Exminster, Topsham, Clyst St Mary, Sowton, Aylesbeare, Talaton, The Grange, Cullompton, Bradfield, Uffculme, Holcombe Rogus, Hockworthy, Huntsham, Bampton, Tiverton, Bickleigh, Killerton, Poltimore and Polsloe.

6.3 Further descriptions of Devon by Richard Polwhele

Fulford House (Dunsford) was approached through lodge gates with a quarter-mile of drive to the house, situated on rising ground, near a sheet of water. The house was entered through a quadrangle into the private chapel. A description is given of the rooms, bed-chambers and their furnishing, the oratory with its polished marble floors, alongside the gardens, fishponds and parkland, all of which Polwhele thought were exceptional (Polwhele 1793, 78). Today it is a venue for corporate entertaining. This is similar to the descriptions that Celia Fiennes wrote in her journals when she undertook her travels around Devon in the late 1600s (see Appendix 4.3).
Appendix to Chapter 7

Devon’s Victorian antiquarians

In Appendix 7 we look at the questions asked by the Society of Antiquaries of London of Hutchinson as the local secretary, Hutchinson’s documentation of archaeological sites and further details of Chanter’s recording of inscribed stones.

7.1 Questions asked by the Society of Antiquaries of London

The list of questions suggested by the Society of Antiquaries of London that the local Secretaries were required to answer:

1. List any important discoveries which illustrate the history of your district, including inscriptions, monuments, monastic cartularies, coins, and Celtic, Roman and Saxon antiquities

2. Are there any archaeological researches or excavations progressing in your district, and, if so, by what Society or individual? Have any objects been exhumed or discovered and are they available for exhibition by the Society of Antiquaries?

3. Can you suggest any sites where excavations would be desirable?

4. Who are the principal collectors of antiquities in your district, and what is the focus of their collections?

5. What books or periodicals are in the process, or have been published on antiquarian subjects relating to your County or District?

6. Are there any ancient monuments in danger of destruction from neglect or from so-called restoration? Do you see any way in which the Society of Antiquaries could intervene with advantage?

7. Do you know of any objects suitable for exhibition at a Society of Antiquaries meeting and would the owner lend them? Such as seals, rings, illustrated manuscripts, charters, ancient weapons, heraldic rolls, pottery and ancient plate

8. Could you forward rubbings of any inscribed stones or give account of any crosses or monuments which have been incorrectly described? Hutchinson 1865, Diary vol.3, June).
7.2 List of sites Hutchinson recorded
### Table 8.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Grid ref</th>
<th>Dates visited</th>
<th>Hutchinson’s observations on sites he visited</th>
<th>Where published</th>
<th>Modern research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stockland Great Castle</td>
<td>ST 226 026</td>
<td>1862, 1863</td>
<td>Hutchinson surveyed and made a plan of the site. The south-west section of this camp is nearly obliterated and a length of road runs through the middle-east to west. Both halves of the camp were in wheat and Hutchinson returned to measure the site, which is 810ft [246.84m] in diameter. The north side of the camp is perfect and consisted of two large fields. Davidson suggested the camp covered 12 acres, which made Hutchinson think that it had been enlarged; and he could not find the elevated spot where the commandant’s tent would have stood. On the plan he marked the spot where he found sling-stones from Seaton beach.</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1868, 374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockland Little Castle</td>
<td>ST 230 036</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Hutchinson surveyed and measured the oval camp and made a plan: 371ft [113.04m] NW and 331ft [100.84m] SE. A small section of the north bank is perfect, made of earth and stones and 7ft [2.43m] to 10ft [3.04m] high. Inside the bank is a dry stone wall, possibly ancient or made when land was cleared for cultivation 30 years ago. The camp is not on the Ordnance Survey maps. There is possibly a road connecting the camp to Stockland Great Castle.</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1868, 377</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widworthy Castle</td>
<td>SY 215 987</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>A place of antiquity with a platform on the hilltop, 225ft [68.52m] in diameter, but with no trace of any earthworks.</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1868, 373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Wood</td>
<td>SY 212 995</td>
<td></td>
<td>Traces of earthworks, an irregular triangle, but their nature is only conjecture. Some think it is an outpost of Widworthy Castle or a Roman castellum.</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1868, 373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Grid ref</td>
<td>Dates visited</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Where published</td>
<td>Modern research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musbury Castle</td>
<td>SY 281 940</td>
<td>1855, 1872, 1876</td>
<td>Hutchinson verified Davidson’s plan of 1833 but in later years corrected it as some parts had been altered or obliterated. Men were ploughing the interior and Hutchinson found sling-stones</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1872, Diary vol.4, July</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesdown Camp</td>
<td>SY 263 914</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hutchinson examined the site and made a plan. The interior is 852ft [259.64m] long 466ft [142.01m] across the east end and 417ft [127.09m] across the west end. A chasm on the north side acted as an immense ditch. At the east end were two perfect banks with a ditch between. The original entrance was on the NW side with the suggestions of outworks. Hutchinson found sling-stones (from Seaton beach) in the recently ploughed interior. The camp commands extensive views over the River Axe.</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1868, 378</td>
<td>DAS 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaton Down</td>
<td>SY 231 918</td>
<td></td>
<td>On the crown of the hill on a west-facing spur with bank and ditches running EW 768ft [234.63m] in length. Ditch on the south side which Hutchinson suggested was the side from which the enemy would attack. Other earthworks could be seen in the vicinity.</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1868, 379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackbury Castle</td>
<td>SY 187 924</td>
<td>1849, 1858, 1859, 1869, 1873, 1875</td>
<td>Hutchinson examined and surveyed the oval camp 643ft [196.16m] E to W and 326ft [99.32m] N to S and made a plan. It is situated on a ridge, with a strong bank surrounding it. The most interesting area is the grand entrance on the south side. The entrance road 180ft [54.78m] long is flanked by banks from two large triangles which are attached to the oval at the apex points. A modern road runs along the north side of the camp. Hutchinson examined the banks and suggested they had been repaired and heightened by calcined flints.</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1862, 56</td>
<td>DAS 1954-55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 1825 men removed 70 cart-loads of flint and half a cart-load of charcoal for use as mortar to build Long Chimney. Examined area for sling-stones but found none, and queried whether there had been a beacon here or the site was used to cremate the dead.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Grid ref</th>
<th>Dates visited</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Where published</th>
<th>Modern research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berry Camp</td>
<td>SY 183 881</td>
<td>1851, 1858, 1871, 1873</td>
<td>Hutchinson examined earthworks, which are 952ft [290.14m] long and 350ft [106.69m] wide and made a plan. This camp had no name so Hutchinson named it after the farm on whose land it was situated. It was an irregular parallelogram, but not sufficiently regular to be considered of Roman construction. There were ramparts inside the ditch and the ground was level all around the three sides. It was impossible to say if the camp had been larger because of the cliff falls. There were traces of double banks 150ft [45.69m] to the west of the camp. Hutchinson dug in the ditch to try to find pottery or metal but only found beach pebbles. Noted visibility of High Peak Hill, Blackbury Castle, Membury Castle, Musbury Castle</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1862, 54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farway Castle</td>
<td>SY 157 960</td>
<td>1852, 1871</td>
<td>Hutchinson examined the earthwork circle in the plantation, and made a plan: 210ft [63.94m] by 200ft [60.90m] Noted the width of the ditch was irregular. Could see Sidbury Castle, Musbury Castle, Membury Castle Dumpdon, Hembury and camps in Dorset.</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1862, 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidbury Castle</td>
<td>SY 128 913</td>
<td>1838, 1851, 1852, 1864, 1865, 1872</td>
<td>Hutchinson surveyed the site, (447ft [441m] by 430ft [131.04m]) and made a plan. Did not know if it was British, Saxon or Danish, but it could be Exeter and Plymouth Gazette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Roman because of all the Roman coins found in the area. Noted the two springs in the middle [later Hutchinson called them ponds]. The camp was encircled by two banks with a ditch in between, and traces of two semicircular platforms on the north and south flank, but their purpose was unknown. At the eastern end there was a small sunken road 200ft [60.90m] long entering the camp. Hutchinson found a cache of sling-stones on the south-west flank of the banks on the south side of the camp when workmen were levelling the area to take it into cultivation. They looked like Sidmouth beach pebbles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Grid ref</th>
<th>Dates visited</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Where published</th>
<th>Modern research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Peak Hillfort</td>
<td>SY 103 859</td>
<td>1838, 1845, 1849, 1851, 1858, 1867, 1871, 1873,</td>
<td>Hutchinson surveyed the site which was 250ft [76.14m] long and made a plan. Recorded the remaining earthworks and the banks at the northern end and the bone beds on the cliff face. Found horse’s teeth, femur, horn core, worked flints and cores. Made drawings of the cliff face showing bones, pottery sherds and the charcoal layers. Documented in his Diary the dates of cliff falls. There were still traces of an entrance at the northern end and a track that went down to the beach, in the 1840s.</td>
<td>Gentleman’s Magazine 1849 Hutchinson 1862, 61</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1868, 376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumpdon Hillfort</td>
<td>ST 175 041</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Hutchinson surveyed the site (it was 825ft [251.29m] long and 3330ft [109.98m wide]) and made a plan. There was a plantation at the southern end, and in the middle of the camp there is a mound thrown up by the Ordnance surveyors as a point to take angles from; it is not a barrow. Two banks with a ditch in between run across the</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1868, 371</td>
<td>DAS 1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
northern end. The crudely-constructed entrance is in the NE corner; the banks are inflected 100ft [30.40m] back into the camp, forming a passage, so the enemy was open to attack. The camp is shaped like Hembury but does not have its views.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Grid ref</th>
<th>Dates visited</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Where published</th>
<th>Modern research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hembury Hillfort</td>
<td>ST 113 030</td>
<td>1858, 1859, 1873, 1874</td>
<td>Hutchinson surveyed the site (it was 1085ft [330.60m] long, 330ft [100.54m] at the northern end, 285ft [86.80m] across the middle and 67ft [20.42m] at the southern end) and made a plan. A long square with rounded corners, surrounded by three banks and ditches. The camp was probably constructed by the British, but Roman remains had been found on the site. Across the northern end are two parallel banks and other earthworks. He looked for sling stones but the interior was usually under cultivation when Hutchinson visited the site. The camp has commanding views. Hutchinson questioned what had become of the iron figure of Mars which had been found here.</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1862, 63</td>
<td>DAS 1929, 1930, 1932, 1935, 1986 and 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckerell Knap and Bushy Knapp</td>
<td>ST 127 014</td>
<td>1859, 1871</td>
<td>Hutchinson surveyed the two sites and made a plan. Buckerell has a 200ft [60.90m] mound surrounded by earthworks. There are three ditches cut across the narrow ridge of the hills. Suggestion is of a promontory fort in advance of Hembury, where they could retreat if attacked.</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1862, 62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belbury Castle</td>
<td>SY 075 940</td>
<td>1855, 1861, 1873, 1874</td>
<td>Hutchinson surveyed the site and made a plan. The camp had been flattened in the 1790s by removing the banks and placing the soil inside. The area had previously been open heath, was now cultivated A</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1880, History of Sidmouth Vol. I, 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sunken road now ran in the ditch of the former hillfort. It once ran from the site to Straightway Head. Hutchinson found worked flints and a core.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Grid ref</th>
<th>Dates visited</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Where published</th>
<th>Modern research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woodbury Castle</td>
<td>SY 032 873</td>
<td>1858, 1872, 1873</td>
<td>Hutchinson surveyed the site and made a plan. The site is of irregular form and Hutchinson believed it was enlarged at some time after its original construction. It is defined on its west side by two banks and a ditch. A public road ran through the centre of the site.</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1862, 62</td>
<td>DAS 1971 and 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danes Castle</td>
<td>SX 919 930</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>In a field below Exeter’s County goal once stood an interesting work, but it has been destroyed by improvements to the water reservoir. Hutchinson thought it was an outpost of Rougemount Castle. It measured 105ft [31.92m] in diameter.</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1862, 63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Haldon</td>
<td>1853, 1873</td>
<td></td>
<td>The camp is not remarkable for its size or position. There are modern openings at the four cardinal points. The interior had not been ploughed and Hutchinson found no worked flints.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dawlish Directory 1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugbrook Park Camp</td>
<td>1849, 1853</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hutchinson measured and made a plan of the elliptically-shaped camp, 780ft [237.68m] by 580ft [176.78m]. The outworks on the south side form a large concentric curve 274.3m distant from the camp. At the southern end a ditch and bank zigzag towards the opening. The south-west section of the camp has the boldest features. The earthworks on the east and south sides of the camp were built for security purposes, but hard to say what period, possibly during the Civil War.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dawlish Directory 1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Grid ref</td>
<td>Dates visited</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Where published</td>
<td>Modern research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milber Down Camp</td>
<td>SX 883 698</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Hutchinson surveyed and made a plan of the camp. A road runs through the centre of the camp, which consists of a small square interior 150ft [45.64m] by 135ft [40.76m]. A small rectangular plot 150ft [45.64m] was found outside the circular camp which measured 402ft [122.50m] by 462ft [140.79m], and this Hutchinson thought was Roman. There are three banks and ditches each roughly 150ft [45.64m] apart and outside these extensive circular banks. The large outer circle was supposed to have been built during the Civil War of 1688.</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1862, 64-65</td>
<td>DAS 1949-50, 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denbury Hillfort</td>
<td>SX 816 685</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Hutchinson surveyed and made a plan of the elliptically-shaped hillfort, 700ft [213.3m] by 500ft [152.4m], that followed the hill’s contours. The land surrounding the hillfort is cultivated, as was the interior area 40 years ago, but now covered in large trees, which make it difficult to fully examine the site. There is a track-way running NE to SW across the site. Possibly there was a barrow near the middle of the interior and at the west end in the brambles. A perfect ditch with a small bank outside formed the west and south sides of the camp. There were extensive views to Haldon and the sea.</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1862, 65</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1862, 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranmore Castle</td>
<td></td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Hutchinson traced the outworks of the camp, which had a central mound that overlooked the camp. Hutchinson noted it was too big to undertake a survey. He observed that the surrounding land ws under cultivation.</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1880, History of Sidmouth</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1880, History of Sidmouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pin Beacon</td>
<td></td>
<td>1869, 1873</td>
<td>Hutchinson surveyed the site and made a plan. He found worked flints in the area.</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1862, 65</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1880, History of Sidmouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Grid ref</td>
<td>Dates visited</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Where published</td>
<td>Modern research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthworks at Three Horseshoes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1859, 1861, 1870</td>
<td>An earth bank 560ft [182.8m] and a second section 900ft [274.3m] long in the field behind The Three Horseshoes runs in a straight line, turning east at a right angle and then into the hedge. There is a ditch on the inside, but Hutchinson could not find a bank along the east and south sides. Hutchinson thought the bank looked like the west side of a Roman camp with rounded corners.</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1868, 381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hutchinson 1862, 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey Ditches and Little Coochill</td>
<td></td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Made a plan. Hutchinson visited Coochill and found traces of earthworks that could possibly be the site of a Roman station. In 1860 the site of Hennaditches [Honeyditches] was excavated and evidence was found of wall foundations and red pattern tiles. Hutchinson found Roman flanged roof tiles, medieval tiles and slate with holes for use as roof tiles within the excavated area.</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1862, 379-380</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1885, 276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branscombe Quarry</td>
<td></td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>A chalk quarry near Branscombe was being worked in the 1840s; the remains of two trenches were found in the cliff face. They contained bones and sherds of black-and stone-coloured pottery.</td>
<td>History of Sidmouth Vol.1 unpublished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone coffin, found near Branscombe</td>
<td></td>
<td>1855, 1875</td>
<td>A stone coffin 7ft [2.13m] long was found under a hedge in 1790. The coffin lid had been broken by a horse and cart, and the skull and long bones were buried in Branscombe churchyard. Hutchinson excavated the coffing, and he found human and animal bones and a bronze fibula which he gave to the Royal Albert Memorial Museum Exeter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Grid ref</td>
<td>Dates visited</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Where published</td>
<td>Modern research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemyock Castle</td>
<td></td>
<td>1851, 1865</td>
<td>Hutchinson recorded the castle ruins as having two round towers covered in ivy. The principal gateway into the castle was on the east side, opposite the west door into the church with a stream in between. A modern farm had been built in the gateway reusing the stone from the ruins. The sides and archway were built of granite but Hutchinson queried where it had come from as the nearest source was Dartmoor. Hutchinson wrote 'none of the country historians mention this castle'.</td>
<td><em>History of Sidmouth Vol. 1</em> unpublished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pixie Garden Uffculme</td>
<td></td>
<td>1851, 1853, 1854</td>
<td>This area of Uffculme Down had been enclosed and under cultivation since about the 1800s. Hutchinson describes the Garden as a quadrangular enclosed space with a 0.60m high grass bank divided into four compartments by hedges with a mound in each. It was marked on the OS map.</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1862, 63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okehampton Castle</td>
<td></td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>An abandoned ruin in a state of utter neglect, covered in weeds, bushes and overgrown trees, whose roots coupled with the weather were loosening the walls. In several places the walls had been repaired.</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1880 Diary Unpublished</td>
<td><em>DAS</em> 1977, 1980, 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydford Castle</td>
<td></td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Hutchinson observed the castle ruins. He saw a massive keep 54ft [16.5m] square, with 6ft [1.9m] thick walls, the masonry was rough slate and granite but not laid in courses. The entrance faced NW, there were three chambers, the smallest being the dungeon. When Hutchinson visited there were ducks swimming in the large chamber. There were no floors or roof, but it was possible to climb the walls using a ladder to see the destruction.</td>
<td>Hutchinson</td>
<td><em>RTDA</em> 1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Grid ref</td>
<td>Dates visited</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Where published</td>
<td>Modern research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totnes Castle</td>
<td></td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>The remains of the castle were covered with trees and surrounded with houses. The circular keep was topped with battlements and had a decaying parapet walk. The interior was grassed over.</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1880 Diary unpublished</td>
<td>DAS 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3 John Chanter

*Further details on the recording of inscribed stones*

**Bowden (Totnes) (18)**
Chanter (1910, 481) gave the inscription of the stone at Bowden as *Valci fili Vaius*, although Okasha does not mention a stone at this location.

**Fardel (Ivybridge) (61)**
The Fardel Stone was found in 1861 lying across Fardel Brook; it was then removed to Fardel farmhouse and later, in 1861, presented to the British Museum. The stone is inscribed in ogham with *Shshahvl and Fanoni Maquirni* (Chanter 1910, 481; Okasha 1993, 103-6).

**Lundy (1,2,3,4)**
Chanter (1910, 482) recorded that an inscribed pillar-stone had been found on Lundy when workmen were digging St Anne’s Oratory; the inscription read *IGERN ITIGERN* and is dated to the 6th century. Okasha (1993, 154-66) recorded four stones on Lundy as being discovered in 1905 and between 1961 and 1962, which were moved to the enclosing bank of Beacon Hill Cemetery in 1981. The stone found in 1905 had the same inscription as Chanter recorded: the conclusion must be that nobody recognised it as the same stone Chanter.

**Parracombe (36)**
Polwhele (1797, 151) documented the lost inscribed stone that had been used as a foundation stone for Holwell Bridge in 1775. The stone was probably washed away in the 1952 Lynmouth floods, so any queries about its inscriptions cannot be answered (Grinsell 1970a, 104-5).

**Stowford (Lifton)**
The inscribed pillar stone was first recorded in 1838, when it was removed from the roadside and placed in the churchyard, which Baring-Gould identified as the ‘Long Stone’ mentioned in 1628. The inscription reads *Gurgles* (Okasha 1993, 269).
Appendix to Chapter 8
How Devon antiquarians observed, recorded and excavated barrows and other prehistoric ritual monuments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Place and date examined</th>
<th>Hutchinson’s descriptions</th>
<th>Hutchinson’s observations in 1880</th>
<th>OS No.</th>
<th>Grinsell’s 1983 interpretations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SW point of High Peak Hill</td>
<td>Low mound</td>
<td>Doubtful if a barrow</td>
<td>Otterton 3</td>
<td>Stone-heap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southern point of Pin Beacon Hill</td>
<td>Possibly a barrow, then used as a beacon</td>
<td>Otterton 2</td>
<td>Mound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A mound called New Beacon</td>
<td>Never examined, now classed as a beacon</td>
<td>Otterton 1</td>
<td>Mound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low mound</td>
<td>Awaiting inspection</td>
<td>O.S.M 5</td>
<td>Not located</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Medium size</td>
<td></td>
<td>OSM 4</td>
<td>Spread of flints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>A cairn of dry flints, concealed by bushes</td>
<td>Sidmouth 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bulverton Hill</td>
<td>10m in diameter, 0.4m deep</td>
<td>Formally a cairn of dry flints, removed in early 1800’s. Possibly contained central cist</td>
<td>Sidmouth 13</td>
<td>Circular depression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>20m diameter</td>
<td>Cairn of dry flint, reduced over Hutchinson’s lifetime. Blocks of conglomerate might indicate a cist burial</td>
<td>Sidmouth 14</td>
<td>Scattered heap of flints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>200 paces south of the fork at cross roads, and 75 paces W of the road</td>
<td>Low barrow 4.5m diameter</td>
<td>Constructed from local soil</td>
<td>OSM 9</td>
<td>Not located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Close to No. 9</td>
<td>7.3m diameter</td>
<td>Constructed of local soil</td>
<td>OSM 8</td>
<td>Not located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Third in this group, 23 paces NW from No. 10</td>
<td>2.7m diameter</td>
<td>Visible after heath fire</td>
<td>OSM 7</td>
<td>Not located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>On west hill slope</td>
<td></td>
<td>Formally dry flint cairns, some have been removed</td>
<td>OSM 6</td>
<td>Not located, possibly destroyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>On west hill slope</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remains of cairn, but most of the flint had been removed</td>
<td>OSM 5</td>
<td>Not located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>710.9m north of Sidbury Castle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cairn on Sidbury Castle called ‘The Treasury’, made of flints, slightly dug on the hedge side</td>
<td>Sidmouth 8</td>
<td>Not located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Place and date examined</td>
<td>Size (Hutchinson)</td>
<td>Hutchinson's observations in 1880</td>
<td>OS No.</td>
<td>Grinsell's 1983 interpretations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>East of the road visited 1869 &amp; 1871</td>
<td>11m diameter, 0.8m high</td>
<td>Cairn</td>
<td>Sidmouth 7</td>
<td>Cairn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>41m on the west side of the road</td>
<td></td>
<td>The western side of the barrow had been dug and removed</td>
<td>OSM 4</td>
<td>Spread of flints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>At the base of the hedge</td>
<td>17m diameter</td>
<td>A cairn of dry white flints with the central portion removed, some stones remain on the south side which probably formed part of the cist burial</td>
<td>Sidmouth 6</td>
<td>Not located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>East Hill Ottery St Mary</td>
<td>30m diameter 1.6m high</td>
<td>A six pointed barrow</td>
<td>OSM 3</td>
<td>Probably a barrow re-cut into a six pointed star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>East Hill Ottery St Mary</td>
<td>21m diameter 1.4m high</td>
<td>A four pointed barrow. A fir planted on top is 15.84m high, almost on the Sidmouth boundary</td>
<td>OSM 2</td>
<td>Probably a barrow re-cut into a concave-sided square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A circular patch as if a barrow had been removed</td>
<td>OSM 1</td>
<td>Barrow adapted for tree clump enclosure. Inaccurately placed on Hutchinson's map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.5m diameter 1.4m high</td>
<td>Barrow by roadside</td>
<td>OSM 1</td>
<td>Barrow adapted for tree clump enclosure. Inaccurately placed on Hutchinson's map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>182.8m south of Chineway Head on the east side of the road in the plantation</td>
<td>7m diameter</td>
<td>A barrow</td>
<td>Sidmouth 3</td>
<td>Flinty area may be site of a barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>In the plantation</td>
<td>29 paces diameter [24m] 1.0m high</td>
<td>A cairn of dry flints, disturbed and lowered. Possibly used to build the cottages to the west</td>
<td>Gittisham 7</td>
<td>Cairn partly removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Place and date examined</td>
<td>Size (Hutchinson)</td>
<td>Hutchinson’s observations in 1880</td>
<td>OS No.</td>
<td>Grinsell’s 1983 interpretations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>In the plantation, 1867</td>
<td>23m diameter 1.3m high</td>
<td>Barrow examined by Rev. Kirwan, but not thoroughly Hutchinson thought</td>
<td>Sidmouth 1</td>
<td>Now covered with grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Barrow on the open moor</td>
<td>32m diameter 2.1m high</td>
<td>Large tumulus planted with beech and fir trees of great age. Possibly a look-out station. A ditch on the eastern side is always full of water. It has not been disturbed</td>
<td>Gittisham 10</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Barrow open in 1869</td>
<td>25m diameter 1.3m high</td>
<td>A wide trench cut from the south to the centre, which contained an unopened stone cist</td>
<td>Gittisham 9</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
<td>11m diameter 1.0m high</td>
<td>Still intact</td>
<td>Gittisham 8</td>
<td>Barrow on south edge of ring ditch or enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Barrow 227.27m from the 6 mile stone from Sidmouth</td>
<td>18.2m diameter 1.52m high</td>
<td>Barrow covered with soil, then layer of flint 0.30m thick, inside a mound of peaty earth. Worked flint flakes, sling stone, red ochre, stone hammer, Queen Anne shilling, pottery sherds. Hutchinson thought it had not been disturbed but Rev. Kirwan did</td>
<td>Gittisham 2</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Barrow 45.4m to 90.9m from barrow 27</td>
<td>Circle of flints 0.0m to 0.6m around barrow</td>
<td>Inside the flints was a mound of earth, covered with a layer of flints then a layer of earth. Four shapeless pieces of bronze were found</td>
<td>Gittisham 3</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>21m diameter 0.1m high</td>
<td>No barrow but a circular patch of ferns, suggesting a barrow had been removed from here</td>
<td>Gittisham 4</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>25m diameter 1.7m high</td>
<td>A barrow on the open heath</td>
<td>Gittisham 11?</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>A barrow on the open heath</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gittisham 11 or 12a</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Place and date examined</td>
<td>Size (Hutchinson)</td>
<td>Hutchinson’s observations in 1880</td>
<td>OS No.</td>
<td>Grinsell’s 1983 interpretations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Barrow examined</td>
<td>3.96m high 39.54m diameter</td>
<td>Barrow planted with fir trees, and an old ditch surrounds the barrow</td>
<td>Gittisham 12</td>
<td>Barrow planted with firs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 July 1854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Barrow examined</td>
<td>32m diameter 0.08m high</td>
<td>Examined by Hutchinson, but three quarters had already been removed for the soil, only the NE side remained. There was no cist burial. A pit was dug centrally and radiating trenches but nothing was found. On a previous excavation a rusty piece of iron was discovered but since lost. Ring In The Mire is situated 91.40m to 182.8m N, or NW of the Mire and the mile stone is 15 from Exeter and 14 from Lyme</td>
<td>Sid 2</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>272m from Farway Castle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Barrow examined</td>
<td>23m diameter 1.5m high</td>
<td>Barrow planted with old fir trees. The ordnance surveyors fixed a pole on it in 1851 to assists in the triangulation of the county. A deep ditch surrounds the barrow, possibly, Hutchinson thought, to protect the trees when they were first planted. The barrow has not been opened</td>
<td>Farway 7</td>
<td>Barrow planted with firs with outer ditch possibly a re-dug barrow ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Barrow on open heath</td>
<td>19m diameter 1.2m high</td>
<td>A low barrow</td>
<td>Farway 16</td>
<td>Barrow in bracken covered clearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Barrow on north side of the road</td>
<td>27m diameter 1.2m high</td>
<td></td>
<td>Farway 15</td>
<td>Barrow in dense scrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Barrow on the south side of the road</td>
<td>14m diameter 0.06m high</td>
<td></td>
<td>Farway 11</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>15m diameter 1.0m high</td>
<td>Low barrow not well defined, not examined, Hutchinson thought it was not possible to decide if a barrow</td>
<td>Farway 12</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>13m diameter 1.5m high</td>
<td>Low barrow</td>
<td>Farway 13</td>
<td>Flinty mound covered with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Place and date examined</td>
<td>Size (Hutchinson)</td>
<td>Hutchinson’s observations in 1880</td>
<td>OS No.</td>
<td>Grinsell’s 1983 interpretations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Three barrows in a line, 38, 39, 40</td>
<td>14m diameter 1.2m high</td>
<td>Low barrow</td>
<td>Farway 14</td>
<td>Mound covered with bracken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>300 paces SE from 40</td>
<td>27m diameter 2.5m high</td>
<td></td>
<td>Farway 17</td>
<td>Barrow covered with bracken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Track cut through the barrow in 1759, later widened to become a road</td>
<td>11.5m diameter 1.0m high</td>
<td>Only the north and south sides were left of the barrow, when it was cut through they found pottery sherds, bones and portions of weapons</td>
<td>Farway 14a</td>
<td>Barrow cut through by a road, with remains still visible on west side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>60 paces from the road and 200 paces from barrow 42</td>
<td>0.91m high, 8.53m diameter</td>
<td>Untouched</td>
<td>Farway 18</td>
<td>Barrow in dense scrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>30.40m SE of barrow 43</td>
<td>29.87m diameter 2.13m high</td>
<td>The barrow has a boundary stone on top</td>
<td>Farway 19</td>
<td>On Sidmouth boundary under dense scrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>SE of barrow 44</td>
<td>9.14m diameter 0.91m high</td>
<td></td>
<td>Farway 20</td>
<td>On Sidmouth boundary under dense scrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>32.83m N of the hedge</td>
<td>7.01m diameter 0.80m high</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sid 4</td>
<td>Flinty mound covered with bracken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Same as 46</td>
<td>9.14m diameter 0.91m high</td>
<td>The central area has been excavated with a square excavation</td>
<td>Sid 5</td>
<td>Mound covered with bracken and remains of old trench cut W-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Seven Barrow Field</td>
<td>11m diameter 0.5m high</td>
<td>Seven barrows in one field. No. 48 is hardly visible as it has been so ploughed out</td>
<td>Farway 21a</td>
<td>Flinty patch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Seven Barrow Field</td>
<td>14m diameter 0.2m high</td>
<td></td>
<td>Farway 21b</td>
<td>Part of south hedge remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Seven Barrow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flint cairn</td>
<td>Farway 21c</td>
<td>Not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Place and date examined</td>
<td>Size (Hutchinson)</td>
<td>Hutchinson’s observations in 1880</td>
<td>OS No.</td>
<td>Grinsell’s 1983 interpretations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Seven Barrow Field</td>
<td>24m diameter 0.6m high</td>
<td>No. 51 is hardly visible as it has been so ploughed out</td>
<td>Farway 22</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Seven Barrow Field, opened in 1868</td>
<td>21.5m diameter 0.6m high</td>
<td>Opened at the Annual meeting of the Devonshire Association on 31st July 1868. Trench cut east and west but found nothing</td>
<td>Farway 23</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Seven barrow Field</td>
<td>32m diameter 2.0m high</td>
<td>A central trench was cut and the barrow consisted of irregular stratified dark soil and blue clay. The Kimmeridge coal cup was found, decomposed calcined bones and a flint floor</td>
<td>Farway 24</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Seven Barrow Field</td>
<td>27.43m diameter 1.8m high</td>
<td>Trench cut 2.13m wide SE to NW. The section showed patches of charcoal, reddish clay and yellow earth but no floor. A chevron decorated clay vessel [incenses cup] packed with calcined bones and fragments of dried grass. Hutchinson thought that has the vessel was so clean that it had been contained in an outer vessel, but none was found</td>
<td>Farway 21</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>North of Seven Barrow Field</td>
<td>12m diameter 1m high</td>
<td></td>
<td>Farway 26</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Dug in 1870</td>
<td>10.97m diameter 0.5m high</td>
<td>Barrow contained burnt bones and ashes</td>
<td>Farway 27</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Place and date examined</td>
<td>Size (Hutchinson)</td>
<td>Hutchinson’s observations in 1880</td>
<td>OS No.</td>
<td>Grinsell’s 1983 interpretations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Examined 1868</td>
<td>26m diameter 0.6m high</td>
<td>The barrow had a kerb of flint conglomerate boulders placed at 0.91m intervals. Under the gorse was a yellow and red sandy earth mound inside this was a cairn of smaller flints. Fragments of an urn were found and burnt bones, but not mixed with the ashes and charcoal. Hutchinson thought the red colouring was caused through the iron oxide being the soil, as wood ash is black or grey and coal ash grey; possibly the term burnt earth has been used too freely, he thought. The Rev. Kirwan restored the urn which had been decorated with cord design around the body of the urn and a zigzag pattern round the inside splay of the rim. The colour was reddish brown with a blackened interior, handmade he thought. Other sherds of a finer pottery were found decorated with incised horizontal lines encircling the body of the vessel and near the rim a band of perpendicular indentation. A domed cairn of flints containing traces of burnt bones but no ash was found.</td>
<td>Farway 28</td>
<td>Barrow flat topped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Southerly barrow</td>
<td>36m diameter 1.2m high</td>
<td></td>
<td>Farway 35</td>
<td>Almost destroyed in 1948, now a rim of flints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Second barrow from the south</td>
<td>18m diameter 0.15m high</td>
<td>Unopened</td>
<td>Farway 34</td>
<td>Encroached by the road on the south side of the mound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Place and date examined</td>
<td>Size (Hutchinson)</td>
<td>Hutchinson’s observations in 1880</td>
<td>OS No.</td>
<td>Grinsell’s 1983 interpretations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Opened in 1870</td>
<td>27.43m diameter 1.82m high</td>
<td>A mound of flint covered with peat and clay, with a trench cut 1.52m S to the centre. Centrally the barrow contained burnt bones and traces of decayed bronze</td>
<td>Farway 33</td>
<td>Barrow on arable land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Opened in 1870</td>
<td>2.13m high 36.49m diameter</td>
<td>A trench from the south was cut. The barrow was surrounded by a shallow ditch and a ring of stones it contained a cairn of flints covered with 0.91m of earth. The cairn contained burnt bones, bronze spear head and a rivet resting on tree bark, 0.91m and another Kimmeridge coal cup, similar to the one found in barrow 53</td>
<td>Farway 32</td>
<td>Barrow on arable land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>North side of the hedge, opened in 1870 and 1871</td>
<td>17.5m diameter 1.8m high</td>
<td>Barrow consisted of a mound of earth containing traces of charcoal, with a central cairn. The trench cut SE to NW was left open and Hutchinson found when he visited the site in 1871 a socked axe; the cist contained the calcined bones of an adult and infant and a bone bead</td>
<td>Farway 31</td>
<td>Flinty cairn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>16m diameter 1.2m high</td>
<td>Unopened, the barrow had a stone kerb, which during the winter of 1871/2 were removed</td>
<td>Farway 30</td>
<td>Barrow with flints exposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.3m diameter 1m high</td>
<td>Unopened</td>
<td>Farway 29</td>
<td>Flinty cairn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5m diameter 0.3m high</td>
<td>Long heap, but doubtful if a barrow</td>
<td>Farway 36</td>
<td>Flattish mound of earthy flints, possibly a barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>South side has been opened</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small barrow of flints</td>
<td>Farway 36-37c</td>
<td>Possibly site of a barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5m diameter 0.5m high</td>
<td>Small mound of flints</td>
<td>Farway 38</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Place and date examined</td>
<td>Size (Hutchinson)</td>
<td>Hutchinson’s observations in 1880</td>
<td>OS No.</td>
<td>Grinsell’s 1983 interpretations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Barrow’s south side was dug in 1870</td>
<td>8m diameter 0.6m high</td>
<td></td>
<td>Farway 39</td>
<td>Barrow, possibly ‘attacked by Kirwan 1870’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td>20m diameter</td>
<td>Barrow had been destroyed and all that remained was a ring [but does not say what of] to show its diameter</td>
<td>Farway 40</td>
<td>A gutted flint cairn, doubtfully a ring-cairn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>On the south side of the hedge at north end Broad down</td>
<td>12.5m diameter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Farway 41 or 41a</td>
<td>How only site of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Large barrow west side of the road. On the OS map</td>
<td>42.59m diameter</td>
<td>Disturbed but no proper examination. Found a beach pebble and a worked flint scraper</td>
<td>Farway 43</td>
<td>Barrow now divided by a hedge and not a bell barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Bowl shaped barrow</td>
<td>39.54 diameter</td>
<td>No traces of a surrounding ditch</td>
<td>Farway 44</td>
<td>On Southleigh boundary, possibly a bowl barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>On eastern side of the Down</td>
<td>7.6m diameter 0.6m high</td>
<td>A group of small barrows</td>
<td>Southleigh 3</td>
<td>Cairn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Barrow few meters from 74</td>
<td>12.5m diameter 0.4m high</td>
<td></td>
<td>Southleigh 4</td>
<td>Now only the site of a barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Barrow a few meters from 74</td>
<td>10m diameter 0.15m high</td>
<td></td>
<td>Southleigh 2</td>
<td>Cairn now only seen as a slight rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Barrow in the plantation</td>
<td>14m diameter 0.9m high</td>
<td></td>
<td>Southleigh 1</td>
<td>Now only site of a barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doubtful barrow</td>
<td>Southleigh 1a</td>
<td>Doubtful barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Place and date examined</td>
<td>Size (Hutchinson)</td>
<td>Hutchinson’s observations in 1880</td>
<td>OS No.</td>
<td>Grinsell’s 1983 interpretations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Barrow in Stone Barrow plot on Lovenhayne Farm, first disturbed in 1763 then in 1861 and 1871</td>
<td>21.33m diameter 2.3m high</td>
<td>The first exploration trench could still be seen, when a large deposit of Bronze Age axes was found, but not in their original interment. The barrow consisted of a 1.52m thick earth mound covering a flint cairn 1.31m high which covered an upturned urn containing calcined bones, on a ground surface which had been lowered by 0.60m. The cairn contained calcined bones, including a skull and jaw bones of an adult and child; crude pottery sherds, doubtful worked flints. 1.21m south of the centre were fragments of a better clay urn and 2.43m south of the centre pieces of a third urn of fine clay with a flattened top and green glaze as if it had been inverted or covered with a flat stone. Hutchinson thought this indicated three separate internments at different periods. The bronze celts were seen as a hoard and not connected to the burials. Hutchinson found worked flints in the vicinity on several occasions</td>
<td>Southleigh 5</td>
<td>Still slight rise in the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Eastern edge of the are of Blackberry castle</td>
<td>Low mounds can be seen in the bushes, but until examined it cannot be stated if they are barrows</td>
<td>Southleigh 8a</td>
<td>Probably parts of defences of hillfort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Barrow recorded, so its position is noted</td>
<td></td>
<td>Southleigh 8b</td>
<td>Probably parts of defences of hillfort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>A barrow near No. 65</td>
<td>11m diameter</td>
<td>The land was cultivated in 1840, then returned to heath and then cultivated in 1870. It is unopened</td>
<td>Southleigh 6</td>
<td>Now no trace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>A barrow near No. 65</td>
<td>Larger barrow</td>
<td>The crown had been flattened</td>
<td>Southleigh 7</td>
<td>Now no trace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Place and date examined</td>
<td>Size (Hutchinson)</td>
<td>Hutchinson’s observations in 1880</td>
<td>OS No.</td>
<td>Grinsell’s 1983 interpretations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Crossway Close</td>
<td></td>
<td>Whilst ploughing the field the plough shattered an urn, containing calcined bones. Hutchinson made a cast of a sherd, which was decorated with parallel and concentric lines, inter-dispersed with twisted cord decoration, the suggestion was that the urn was 0.45m high</td>
<td>Branscombe 7</td>
<td>In field called Crossway Close, slight mound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1850 near Hangman’s Stone, 30.40m from the cross roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>West of Berry Camp</td>
<td></td>
<td>A number of stone heaps, some round others of irregular shape, possibly built by collecting flint when the land was brought into cultivation. Some of the heaps were covered with earth which Hutchinson thought farmers would not take the trouble to do. He excavated one heap but the flint was difficult to remove although they found animal bones mixed in with the flint</td>
<td>Branscombe 1-4 or 4c</td>
<td>South of Higher Bulstone. Possible ring barrow, but with no visible ditch on either side of bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Excavated 1857</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Stone Coffin Found 1790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Lower Bulstone</td>
<td></td>
<td>A cairn full of bones, but its whereabouts now lost</td>
<td>Branscombe 8</td>
<td>Slightly south of Higher Bulstone on the Branscombe side of the lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W of Branscombe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Dunscombe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not a barrow, but the discovery of a skeleton, 60.90 m E of the ruins of the house. The skeleton laid in a constricted position covered with a large block of stone. The skull was buried in Hill’s Cottage; Hutchinson’s kept the remaining bones. Hutchinson thought it was not a true burial because of the position of the body and the stone covering, which could have been part of a fallen cairn and therefore not of this period</td>
<td>Sidmouth 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Place and date examined</td>
<td>Hutchinson’s descriptions</td>
<td>Hutchinson’s observations in 1880</td>
<td>OS No.</td>
<td>Grinsell’s 1983 interpretations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>A flint cairn which was removed before Hutchinson could record it</td>
<td>Sid 17</td>
<td>Location not known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Examined 1873, 1874 and 1875</td>
<td>A white flint cairn, where a trench was cut north towards the centre, but Hutchinson thought it had already been excavated and the central deposit removed. Under the flint mound there was flint pavement and resting on this was a Budleigh Salterton pebble: underneath this was a 0.121m thick charcoal deposit with a diameter of 0.60m diameter, but no evidence of bones or ash. Two quartz pebbles were found but they are foreign to the area, a stone hammer, worked flint flakes and sling stones</td>
<td>Sid 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Field enclosed after 1851</td>
<td>A flint cairn that was removed and Hutchinson thought the original deposit had not been destroyed</td>
<td>Sid 19</td>
<td>Not visible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>A slight elevation that was more stony than the rest of the cultivated field but Hutchinson never found anything here</td>
<td>Sid 20</td>
<td>Now a flinty patch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Near the road</td>
<td>A heap of flints from the collection of flints when the field was taken into cultivation or a cairn with a cone</td>
<td>Sid 21</td>
<td>Not visible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Until the year 1878 a heap of flints, 4.57m from a cottage on Salcombe Hill</td>
<td>The site of a former racecourse until the land was enclosed in 1851, although Hutchinson remembered the barrow from 1825. A flint cairn, which had been disturbed to mend the road and then removed in 1878 to make the road into the new Sidmouth cemetery</td>
<td>Sid 22</td>
<td>Spoils from flint quarrying?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix to Chapter 9
How Devon antiquarians documented hillforts

The following hillforts were documented by the Devon antiquarians and provide further examples of their attention to detail, and shows what has been lost from the archaeological record.

9.1 List of all Devon hillforts (source: Wikipedia .org)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hillfort Name</th>
<th>Hillfort Name</th>
<th>Hillfort Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Castle</td>
<td>Belbury castle</td>
<td>Berry Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry Castle Black Dog</td>
<td>Berry castle Weare Giffard</td>
<td>Berry Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry's Wood</td>
<td>Blackbury Castle</td>
<td>Blackdown Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolt Tail</td>
<td>Boringdon Camp</td>
<td>Bremridge Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent Hill</td>
<td>Burley Wood</td>
<td>Burridge Fort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadbury Castle Devon</td>
<td>Capton</td>
<td>Castle Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Dyke</td>
<td>Castle Head Devon</td>
<td>Cotley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Hill Torrington</td>
<td>Clovelly Dykes</td>
<td>Cunnilear Camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranbrook Castle</td>
<td>Cranmore Castle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denbury Hill</td>
<td>Drewerstone</td>
<td>Dolbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumpdon Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embury Beacon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halwell Camp</td>
<td>Hawkesdown Hill</td>
<td>Hembury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hembury Castle Tythecott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Peak Devon</td>
<td>Hillsborough Devon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holburry Holberton</td>
<td>Holne Chase Castle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntsham Castle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentisbury Devon</td>
<td>Killerton</td>
<td>Knowle Hill Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membury</td>
<td>Milber Down</td>
<td>Mockham Down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musbury</td>
<td>Myrtlebury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newberry Castle</td>
<td>Noss Dartmouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peppercombe Camp</td>
<td>Posbury</td>
<td>Prestonbury Camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raddon Top</td>
<td>Roborough Castle</td>
<td>Sidbury Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaton Down</td>
<td>Sholsbury castle</td>
<td>Stanborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slapton Castle</td>
<td>Smythapark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockland Castles</td>
<td>Stoke Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voley Castle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasteberry Castle</td>
<td>Wind Hill</td>
<td>Windbury Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbury Castle</td>
<td>Yarrowberry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.2 Further example of Devon hillforts
The following hillforts were documented by the Devon antiquarians and provide further examples of their attention to detail, and show what has been lost from the archaeological record.

9.2.1 Dumpdon
Polwhele (1797, 187) described Dumpdon (Luppitt) as being almost inaccessible, situated on a promontory with two banks and a ditch, and Woollcombe (1839, 20) produced a sketch of the hillfort (Fig.9.56), whilst Hutchinson (1868, 371-3) saw Dumpdon as resembling Hembury Fort in shape, with banks and ditch across the northern end, and like Sidbury Castle surrounded with double banks and ditches. Hutchinson described the entrance passage leading into the hillfort as unlike any other found on the surrounding hillforts. On his plan Hutchinson indicated a mound which he thought could be mistaken for a barrow, but he stated it was built by officers carrying out the Ordnance Survey in the 1850s, during the triangulation of the county (Fig.9.57). The VCH questioned where the soil came from to build the mound, but agreed it was built by the Ordnance Survey (Fig.9.58) (Page 1906, 583). Although Hutchinson compared Dumpdon to Hembury, he did not suggest that Dumpdon had possibly been abandoned and superseded by Hembury, as Todd (1992, 52) later suggested (Fig.9.59). Todd (1992, 49) proposed that the OS trigonometrical point was 6m wider than needed, as the Ordnance Survey officers had reused a barrow, whereas Hutchinson stated they built the mound (Hutchinson 1868, 373).

Fig.9.56: Woollcombe’s sketch of Dumpdon Hillfort (Woollcombe 1839, 20).
Fig. 9.57: Hutchinson’s plan of Dumpdon, and the wooded southern end still there today (Hutchinson 1868, opp. 371).

Fig. 9.58: The VCH plan of Dumpdon Page 1906, 583).

Fig. 9.59: Todd’s plan of Dumpdon showing a bank across the forested area and the position of the mound (Todd 1992, 48).
9.2.2 Hawkesdown

Woollcombe (1839, 11) in the 18th century considered Hawkesdown (Axmouth) to be unfinished with only three banks and ditches, and he knew of no previous drawing of the site (Fig.9.60). Hutchinson (1868, 378) documented Hawkesdown as a promontory hillfort with extensive views, and stated that those who described the site as having triple banks and ditches were 'labouring under a false impression', because the site was enclosed by two banks with a ditch in-between. He was possibly referring to Woollcombe and Kirwan, who both saw Hawkesdown as having triple banks and ditches. Hutchinson’s measured plan shows Hawkesdown as 952ft [290m] by 90ft [27m] (Figs.9.61-9.61), whereas Kirwan (1872, 158) stated the enclosed area measured as 280 paces [256m] by 140 [128m] paces, which is incorrect, and he could have quoted Hutchinson’s measurements which were published in 1868. The antiquarians did not suggest Hawkesdown was an Iron Age hillfort, or Roman, whilst evidence has been found of Roman lead slingshot of the Gyeeps type, dated to the middle of the first century AD, and an aureas dated to Nero (AD 59), found 300m south of the southern rampart. These testify to Roman activity in the vicinity (Holbrook 1989, 117-8). No present day archaeological work has been carried out on the Iron Age hillfort of Hawkesdown.

Fig.9.60: Woollcombe’s sketch of Hawkesdown (Woollcombe 1839, 11).
9.2.3 Hembury Fort

Broadhembury Fort (Hembury), Milles (1766, 123) thought, was the site of Moridunum, because it was near the Roman road that went from Axminster to Honiton. He surmised that although the shape of the camp was not square it was its location that made him think it could have been used by the Romans. Swete (1795, Journal vol.9, 16) in the 18th century produced what he called a ‘slight sketch’ of Hembury (Fig.9.63), and stated that without documentation antiquaries could not know to which people to attribute the site. He implied that
the Romans did not convert the oval-shaped hillfort, which was dictated by the shape of the eminence, to a square. He suggested that if it could be proved that the road below the hillfort was Roman, then he would agree it was a Roman site. He recorded that the hillfort had triple banks and ditches, with double banks and ditches across the centre, which he had not seen anywhere else. Polwhele (1797, 183) saw Hembury as having commanding views over the Vale of the River Otter, with double banks and ditches, which divided the interior into two: one area for the horses and one for the men. Woolcombe (1839, 25) thought it had been occupied by the Romans, and remarked about the problem women would have had collecting water, a point that nobody else made (Fig.9.64). By the 19th century Shortt (1841, 159) saw a hillfort shaped like a longitudinal cone, a design favoured by the Romans, but this was his supposition. Kirwan (1872, 159) saw the site as having triple banks and ditches with the interior divided into two by double banks and a ditch. Hutchinson (1862, 59) noted the relationship between Hembury and the outworks at Buckerell Knap and Bushy Knap, and provided a map (Fig.9.65) to reinforce the point he made. He wrote that as so much had already been written about the site he did not intend to add any more. What all the antiquarians were doing was reflecting on the shape of the hillfort that was dictated by local topography.

The year before Dorothy Liddell carried out her excavation of Hembury (1930), Gertrude MacAlpine Woods wrote that Hembury was ‘the grandest monument of military skill and strategy of the Britons’ in Devon’. MacAlpine Woods (1929, 4) described the site, and noted that a Neolithic arrowhead and bronze implements had been found [but not where], and that Hembury was an Iron Age hillfort: she quoted early records saying Roman remains had been found in the ramparts and that certain antiquarians [but did not specify who] claimed it was Moridunum of the Antonine Itinerary (see Chapter Ten). Her conclusion about Hembury was that there were ‘untold possibilities for exploration’ to identify different periods of occupation; but although interior plough damage had obliterated surface indentations, the silted ditches may hold the clue to the problems of defining the early pre-history of Devon. Milles’ and Swete’s suggestions of Hembury as a Roman site was proved correct with the discovery of a Arretine terra sigillata platter rim found in a Roman deposit within a military building, suggestive of a high-status residential quarter (Todd 1993,
When Liddell wrote her excavation reports the concept of the Mesolithic period was just beginning to gain acceptance in this country, with the publication of J.G.D. Clark’s *The Mesolithic Age in Britain* (1932): Mesolithic activity at Hembury was not specifically mentioned until Whittle (1977) noted microburins in the Hembury assemblage (Berridge 1986, 163-5). The site, Liddell (1930, 40) stated, was ‘solely Early Iron Age occupation’; but by 1931 had changed due to evidence of Neolithic occupation (Figs.9.66-9.67) (Liddell 1931, 90). The antiquarians’ comments about the site having three banks and ditches were correct.

![Swete’s illustration of Hembury Fort, showing one entrance and ramparts](Swete 1795, Journal vol.9, 16).

![Woolcombe’s sketch of Hembury Fort, showing how he saw the interior and two entrances](Woolcombe 1839, 24).
Fig. 9.65: The VCH plan of Hembury Fort, which Liddell considered to be incorrect, and the southern entrance which she thought was impossible to identify (Liddell 1930, 42).

Fig. 9.66: Liddell’s final plan of Hembury Fort showing the excavation trenches on which she based her findings (Liddell 1931, 90).

Fig. 9.67: Hutchinson’s map showing the position of Hembury Fort, within the heavily shaded area (Hutchinson 1880, vol. 1, 50).
9.2.4 Milber Down

Milber Down (Newton Abbot) was ellipse-shaped with triple ditches covering some six acres, according to Polwhele (1797, 188) in the 18th century. Woollcombe (1839, 103) indicated that its origins and use were unknown, but it was unlike any other fortification and he thought the Romans had altered the ancient British camp (Fig.9.68), whereas Hutchinson (1862, 65) stated Milber Down had a square interior and a rectangular plot outside the earthworks to the south-east, which had been ascribed to the Romans. Outside the square interior were two circumvallations 50yds [46m] apart, and then a further one 150yds [137m] away on the south side, near to the rectangle which Hutchinson thought had been added by William III when his artillery were stationed here in 1688. He quoted Gough’s translation of Camden’s *Britannia* (1789), who ascribed the square interior to the Romans and the circular earthwork to the Danes, which Hutchinson found difficult to accept, but as he did not have a better suggestion he agreed to it (Fig.9.69-9.70).

The hillfort is located on a hill-slope that offers no natural defensive advantage, and is dissected by the St Marychurch Road, which Hutchinson recorded. The closest analogy that can be made with the Milber Down complex is Clovelly Dykes (Fox *et al* 1949-50, 60), but whereas Milber Down could be seen as a defended homestead (Cunliffe 1975, 104), Clovelly Dykes was associated with a pastoral economy (Cunliffe 1975, 233). Milber Down had four concentric enclosures each defined by a rampart and ditch, but ploughing has lowered, and in some places obliterated, the two outermost enclosures. A Roman camp was identified to the south-east of the site (Figs.9.71-9.72) (Fox *et al* 1949-50, 29). Hutchinson’s description of the site was correct, but not his dating.
Fig. 9.68: Woollcombe’s plan of Milber Down (Woollcombe 1839, 102).

Fig. 9.69: Hutchinson’s coloured sketch of the camp at Milber Down, showing the road and wooded area (Hutchinson’s Sketch Book, undated).

Fig. 9.70: Hutchinson’s plan of Milber Down (Hutchinson’s Sketch Book, undated).

Fig. 9.71: The VCH plan of Milber Down showing the banks and ditches (Page 1906, 594).
9.2.5 Woodbury Castle

William Worcester (1415-1482) mentioned the site of Woodbury Castle (Woodbury) but nothing else (Harvey 1969, 19). Westcote (c.1632, 199) recorded a few hillforts, which he called castles, making the observation that they could be seen from a distance and were generally situated on hilltops. Woodbury Castle, he described as situated on a heath, fortified with plain ditches, which he suggested, was Saxon. In the 17th century Risdon (c.1600, 55-6) described Woodbury Castle as the ruins of a fortress, encircled with great ditches and banks of earth. In the 18th century Swete (1794 Journal vol.8, 175) recorded Woodbury Castle as being highly-visible in the landscape, commanding 360-degree views (Fig.9.73), and stated there were the ruins of a Gentleman's Club-House in the interior. Swete inferred it was the site of a Roman encampment, because it was near the Roman road that goes from Seaton to Exeter, and implied that the Danes changed the square format favoured by the Romans to circular at the northern end. His conclusion was that as there were no documents to prove this, then his hypothesis must rest on conjecture, but he thought the road through the hillfort was original.
Polwhele (1797, 187) identified a single bank and ditch with a second one on the northern side, possibly, he thought, to defend the principal entrance, but as there were several entrances it was not possible to tell which was the original. Woollcombe’s (1839, 27) plan was copied from Mudge’s map, which he queried if it was correct (Fig.9.74). Short (1841, xi) described the trees covering the five-acre site that Lord Rolle had planted (1836), and produced a plan showing the outworks and a cross-section of the site (Fig.9.75).

Hutchinson (1862, 62), on the other hand, believed that Woodbury’s irregular form had been enlarged subsequent to its initial construction, and that the northern part was the original enclosure. His site plan is basic because Woodbury was outside his ‘prescribed limits’ of Sidmouth, he wrote (Fig.9.76). He saw the hillfort as having two substantial banks on the west side with a public road dissecting the site, and straight outworks (shown on his plan as ‘F’ and ‘G’) unlike the curved surrounding banks, which he thought could possibly have been thrown up during the Prayer Book Rebellion (1549).

The commanding views that were noted by the antiquarians are now blocked by trees. Fletcher (1998, 165) suggested that the earliest known detailed plan was by Shortt (1841), and his accompanying text discussed the unique form of the earthworks. Possibly, as Shortt suggested, the camp was altered and enlarged, which would account for the unusual shape we see today (Fletcher 1998, 170). The northern and southern entrances are shown on Donn’s map (1765), and the building which Swete mentioned was shown on the Ordnance Survey (OS) (1st series 1:2500, 1889) and the 1839 tithe maps. The northern outworks, mentioned by Swete, Polwhele and Shortt as a cross-ridge dyke, had been refashioned and possibly re-cut, but their purpose is unknown (Fletcher 1998, 169). The VCH recorded that the hillfort was occupied by a military camp between 1798 and 1803 (Fig.9.77) (Page 1906, 590), and slit trenches in the outworks could possibly be associated with 20th century military training (Fletcher 1998, 170). The conclusion drawn by Fletcher (1998, 170) (Fig.9.78) is that the significance of Woodbury lies in its location, with its panoramic vistas towards Dartmoor, Exmoor, the Quantocks, Raddon Hills and the coast towards Torquay.
Fig. 9.72: Swete’s sketch of Woodbury Castle (Swete 1794, Journal vol. 8, 175).

Fig. 9.73: Woollcombe’s sketch which gives the impression of two separate sites (Woollcombe 1839, 26).

Fig. 9.74: Shortt’s plan of Woodbury Castle, with section drawings (Shortt 1841, opp. 36).
Fig. 9.75: Hutchinson’s annotated plan of Woodbury Castle (Hutchinson 1880, History of Sidmouth vol.1, 41).
Fig. 9.76: The VCH plan of Woodbury Castle, which is not dissimilar to Hutchinson's (Page 1906, 590).

Fig. 9.77: Fletcher’s plan of Woodbury, showing the details of a surveyed site (Fletcher 1998, 167).
Appendix to Chapter 11
How Devon antiquarians documented Devon’s castles

Appendix 11.1 Worcestr’s recording of castles

Table 11.1 Worcestr’s documentation of Devon’s castles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lydford</td>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>Harvey 1969, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okehampton</td>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>Harvey 1969, 29;39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 11.2

Table 11.2 Leland’s documentation of Devon’s castles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnstaple</td>
<td>Toulmin Smith 1907, 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry Pomeroy</td>
<td>Toulmin Smith 1907, 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>Toulmin Smith 1907, 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemyock</td>
<td>Toulmin Smith 1907, 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plympton</td>
<td>Toulmin Smith 1907, 216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powderham</td>
<td>Toulmin Smith 1907, 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rougemont</td>
<td>Toulmin Smith 1907, 227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totnes</td>
<td>Toulmin Smith 1907, 218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 11.3 Devon’s castles and fortified houses (source: Higham 1999, 139)

Devon’s castles

Axminster Castle
Bampton Castle
Bratton Fleming
Castle Dyke
Durpley
Eggesford
Great Torrington
Hartland
Holwell
Langford, Millsome
North Tawton
Okehampton
Plympton
Roborough
Totnes
Winkleigh

Devon’s fortified houses

Bampton
Bickleigh
Chudleigh
Dartmouth
Bere Ferrers
Buckland Abbey
Compton
Berry Pomeroy
Lydford (enclosure, keep)
Woodford
Appendix 11.4

Table 11.3 Swete’s documentation of Devon’s castles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Castle</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Journal vol.</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnstaple Castle</td>
<td>Swete</td>
<td>1796,</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bampton Castle</td>
<td>Swete</td>
<td>1880,</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry Pomeroy</td>
<td>Swete</td>
<td>1793,</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bickleigh Castle</td>
<td>Swete</td>
<td>1796,</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colecombe Castle</td>
<td>Swete</td>
<td>1793,</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton Castle</td>
<td>Swete</td>
<td>1793,</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydford Castle</td>
<td>Swete</td>
<td>1792,</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okehampton Castle</td>
<td>Swete</td>
<td>1789,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powderham Castle</td>
<td>Swete</td>
<td>1799,</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plympton Castle</td>
<td>Swete</td>
<td>1796,</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiverton Castle</td>
<td>Swete</td>
<td>1789,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totnes Castle</td>
<td>Swete</td>
<td>1792,</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 11.5

Table 11.4 Hutchinson’s documentation of Devon’s castles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Castle</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Diary vol.</th>
<th>Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hemyock Castle</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>1,</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth Castle</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>5,</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rougemont Castle</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>1,</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totnes Castle</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>5,</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 11.6

Other examples of castles and fortified houses

11.6 Devon's castles

11.6.1 Bampton Castle

Swete visited Bampton Castle in 1800. He described and illustrated the conical motte as being tree-covered with a clump of firs on the crest (Fig.11.38), which he recognised as a motte-and-bailey castle (Swete 1800, Journal vol.20, 183). He did not appreciate its importance in the landscape, as the castle was sited at a regional crossing point of routes in mid-Devon, and may have originated as the fortified caput (head) of Walter’s Devon estates in 1086, although it may not
have necessarily been maintained as a defensive structure. Documentary records mention the castle being used during the reign of King Stephen, who laid siege to it (Renn 1973, 100; Higham et al. 1990, 101-5).

Fig.11.38: Bampton Castle as Swete painted it in 1800, with a clump of firs on the top (Swete 1800, Journal vol. 20, opp.183). It is not possible to recreate this view because of Swete taking artistic licence.

11.6.2 Bushy Knap and Buckerell Knap
Hutchinson thought that because Bushy Knap and adjoining Buckerell Knap (Figs.11.39-11.40) were situated on a ridge they had been regularly fortified with surrounding ditches, and could be either the outworks of Hembury Fort (see Chapter Eleven), or the site of beacons (Hutchinson 1880, History of Sidmouth vol.1. 51; Hutchinson 1871, Diary vol.3, May). A survey of the site in 2002 concluded that Buckerell Knap had been scarped and artificial platforms created, and that it was possibly the site of an early timber motte. The working hypothesis was for an early motte-and-bailey linked to King Stephen (Hawken 2002, 8-14). The survey proved Hutchinson’s theory – that the site was artificially landscaped – to be correct.
Fig. 11.39: Bushy Knap and Buckerell Knap as drawn by Hutchinson (1871, Diary vol.3, May), suggesting they were outworks of Hembury Fort.

Fig. 11.40: An enlarged plan of Bushy Knap and Buckerell Knap as drawn by Hutchinson, suggesting there were outworks of Hembury Fort (Hutchinson 1880, History of Sidmouth vol.1, 51).
11.6.3 Dartmouth Castle
Leland recorded seeing Dartmouth Castle at the harbour mouth of the River Dart, with two towers and a chain across the river Dart (Fig.11.41) (Toulmin Smith 1907, 221). It was one of Henry VIII’s chains of Henrician Castles, although there is evidence of the site having first been fortified in 1388 in response to the threatened invasion by the French. The castle was a municipal authority castle, as opposed to a private castle, because it was built by the Mayor of Dartmouth. Two towers were added between 1481 and 1489, along with the openings on the ground floor for the boom chains which ran across the River Dart to Kingswear (Pettifer 1995, 56). The scenario of two castles being built to support each other in a tactical sense can be seen both at Dartmouth and Portland (Higham 1988, 145; Creighton 2002, 59).

Fig.11.41: The Dart estuary and a plan of the coastal defences that Lysons copied from a 1530 harbour chart, which was possibly before Leland visited the area, showing the site of Dartmouth Castle opposite Kingswear Castle (Chandler 1993, 114.).

11.6.4 Exmouth Castle
Westcote (c.1630, 223) suggested that a castle had been built at Exmouth, at the gun point on Beacon Terrace, to repel the Danes. The same suggestion
was made by Risdon (c.1632, 123). It is implied that there was a castle there during the Civil War, in 1646, although the evidence for a castle was disputed by Davidson (1883, 144-62). The ‘site of castle’ can be seen on older OS maps, and was described as a Civil War fort of the 1640s (Higham 1988, 147).

11.6.5 Gidleigh Castle
Pole (1617, 245) documented evidence of a ruined castle at Gidleigh, as did Polwhele (1797, 70); it comprised a fortified manor house contemporary with the later work of Okehampton Castle (Higham 1988, 145; Pettifer 1995, 58; Hoskins 2003, 400).

11.6.6 Lundy Castle
Worcester mentioned a castle on Lundy, where the Earl of Cornwall used to live (Harvey 1969, 21). The ruined 13th century Lundy Castle was mentioned by Westcote (c.1630, 343) and Risdon (c.1632, 239). The castle, with a tower and bailey-wall was built by Henry III between 1243 and 1244 to control the piracy in the Bristol Channel. It was burned by the Scots in 1321 (Dunmore 1982, 159; Higham 1988, 145). The castle was refortified in 1645 during the Civil War, and throughout 1748 it was used to house convicts when improvements were being carried out on Lundy. By 1775 the castle was in a poor state of repair (Dunmore 1982, 160).

Fortified Houses
11.6.7 Powderham Castle
Leland saw Powderham Castle situated on the shore of the River Exe (Toulmin Smith 1907, 232), the same as Polwhele (1797, 169), who thought the castle had undergone numerous alterations, although it retained four towers and had a quadrangular court. In 1717 a chapel was added to the north wing, which by 1797 had been converted into a drawing room. Swete (1797, Journal vol.18, 76) documented a ‘Gothic pile’ (Fig.11.42) of irregular form; he thought it was regrettable that a religious building [the chapel] would soon be forgotten. He also noted the many additions that had been made to the castle (Fig.11.43). There is the suggestion that Powderham Castle was originally of quadrangular form, with a square tower in the north-west corner; the west range was then replaced to create an ‘E’ shaped mansion with a central porch. During the Civil
War the castle was damaged, but in the 18th century it was converted into an elegant Georgian house; later a Victorian gatehouse was added (Higham 1988, 145; Pettifer 1995, 62). As an aside Powderham had not inconsiderable military significance, and it was built without any authorisation (Pounds 1990, 104).

Fig. 11.42: The east front of Powderham Castle as depicted by Swete (1799 Journal vol.17 opp.161).

Fig. 11.43: With slight alterations to the façade as Swete saw Powderham Castle (Source: author).

11.6.8 Tiverton Castle
Risdon (c.1632, 73) mentioned the 14th century Tiverton Castle. Swete (1789, Journal vol.1, 187-96) suggested the castle had been built in 1106, and that it had an air of Roman antiquity about it. He noted the castle had the remains of a
square tower and a round ivy-clad tower. The gatehouse he thought was original and he noted the moat had been converted into a garden (Figs. 11.44-11.46). There is the possibility of a castle dating to 1106, although nothing remains of the earlier castle. The quadrangular castle, dated to 1300, was surrounded by a curtain wall on three sides, with towers at each corner, two of which survive. An Elizabethan house was built in the north-eastern corner backing onto the old curtain wall (Higham 1988, 145; Pettifer 1995, 62-3).

![Fig. 11.44: The round south tower of Tiverton Castle (Swete 1781, Journal vol. 1, opp. 188).](image)

![Fig. 11.45: The south tower of Tiverton Castle with a pointed roof and new buildings to the west (Source: author).](image)
Fig. 11.46: The gatehouse of Tiverton Castle (Swete 1789, Journal vol. 1, opp. 192). It is not possible to recreate this picture.
Appendix for Chapter 12
How antiquarians recorded Devon’s religious houses

12.1 Swete’s documentation of religious houses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Swete</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barlynch Priory</td>
<td>1796, Journal 12, 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckland Abbey</td>
<td>1792, Journal 4, 180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canonsleigh Priory</td>
<td>1800, Journal 20, 90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunkeswell Abbey</td>
<td>1794, Journal 9, 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Abbey</td>
<td>1794, Journal 9, 113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frithelstock Priory</td>
<td>1792, Journal 1, 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartland Abbey</td>
<td>1796, Journal 13, 58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newenham Abbey</td>
<td>1795, Journal 9, 120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polsloe Priory</td>
<td>1801, Journal 20, 188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavistock Abbey</td>
<td>1793, Journal 4, 160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torre Abbey</td>
<td>1793, Journal 6, 86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.2 List of Devon’s religious houses (source: Holdworth 1999, 208)

- Barnstaple Priory
- Buckfast Abbey
- Canonsleigh Priory
- Dunkeswell Abbey
- Ford Abbey
- Hartland Abbey
- Kerswell Priory
- Modbury Priory
- Newenham Abbey
- Otterton Priory
- Pilton
- Plympton Priory
- St Nicholas (Exeter) Priory
- St James (Exeter) Priory
- Tavistock Abbey
- Torre Abbey
- Totnes Priory

- Bodmiscombe
- Buckland Abbey
- Cornworthy Priory
- Cowick Priory
- Frithelstock Priory
- Polsloe Priory
- Plymouth Priory
### 12.3 Religious houses documented by Leland

**Table 12.2: John Leland’s documentation of Devon’s religious houses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnstaple and Cornworthy 1536</td>
<td>Priories suppressed</td>
<td>Toulmin Smith 1907, 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frithelstock</td>
<td>Suppressed</td>
<td>Toulmin Smith 1907, 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modbury</td>
<td>House belonging to French monks still standing</td>
<td>Toulmin Smith 1907, 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilton 1536</td>
<td>Suppressed</td>
<td>Toulmin Smith 1907, 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plympton 1536</td>
<td>Suppressed</td>
<td>Toulmin Smith 1907, 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totnes 1536</td>
<td>Suppressed</td>
<td>Toulmin Smith 1907, 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Nicholas 1536</td>
<td>Suppressed</td>
<td>Toulmin Smith 1907, 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newenham Abbey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Toulmin Smith 1907, 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torre Abbey</td>
<td>Had three ‘fair gates’</td>
<td>Toulmin Smith 1907, 223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12.4: Polwhele’s documentation of Devon’s Religious houses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnstaple Priory</td>
<td>Suppressed</td>
<td>Polwhele 1797, 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canonsleigh Priory</td>
<td>Suppressed</td>
<td>Polwhele 1797, 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polsloe Priory</td>
<td>Suppressed</td>
<td>Polwhele 1797, 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckland Abbey</td>
<td>Suppressed</td>
<td>Polwhele 1797, 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckfastleigh Abbey</td>
<td>Suppressed</td>
<td>Polwhele 1797, 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Abbey</td>
<td>Suppressed</td>
<td>Polwhele 1797, 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartland Abbey</td>
<td>Suppressed</td>
<td>Polwhele 1797, 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newenham Abbey</td>
<td>Suppressed</td>
<td>Polwhele 1797, 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavistock Abbey</td>
<td>Suppressed</td>
<td>Polwhele 1797, 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torre Abbey</td>
<td>Suppressed</td>
<td>Polwhele 1797, 230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>