An Archaeological Resource Assessment of post-medieval Northamptonshire

David Hall

Note: For copyright reasons the figures are currently omitted from the web version of this paper. It is hoped to include them in future versions.

Contents

1 Introduction

1.1 This paper is one of the Northamptonshire series of period-based essays that form part of the East Midlands Archaeological Research Frameworks Project. It should be read in conjunction with the essays for the Middle Ages and the Industrial period, with which it necessarily overlaps. Each section outlines the nature of the data-base and discusses what further research would be useful, or in many cases is essential. A final section briefly re-iterates the main research themes for the county.

1.2 *Chronological scope*
The date-range of the term 'post-medieval' used here is from 1500 to about 1750 with many caveats. It excludes the monastic period and deserted villages, except insofar as they impinge on the sites of great country houses. It also excludes the main industrial period, which is dealt with in a separate paper. For early post-medieval industrial activity, the most useful source of data is a county militia list of 1777 that gives occupations (Hatley 1973). Agriculture, both open-field and enclosed is included, although many open-field townships lasted until the 1840s.

2. The Countryside

2-1 Open fields

This topic has been fully studied in terms of its survival and preservation by Northamptonshire Heritage and English Heritage during 1993-9.

Open-field was the predominant form of agriculture at the beginning of the period. There was still 97 percent of the county open in 1500, falling to 54 percent by 1800. Nearly all of the remainder was thereafter rapidly enclosed, only one place being open in 1850 (Hall 1997). The open-fields, manifest as physical remains in the form of ridge and furrow, have been described (Hall 1995a).

The operation, management and social structure of open-field holdings are necessarily the prescript of historical studies. Records are copious, but not fully worked out in detail in social terms. Within a village there were always the farmers, their status varying from place to place. In the north-east they were tenants of the landed gentry who owned estates comprising one or more parishes. Elsewhere tenure was variable, in the north-west many farms were freehold by the mid 18th century. Practical aspects of farming organisation are available from the open-field orders made by manorial courts. One good source of the daily details of farming work, such as yields, stock- breeding etc, are recorded in 17th and 18th -century glebe books and tithe books of clerics who farmed in hand, and from churchwardens and vestry accounts (Hall 1995a, under Aynho, Byfield, Crick and Flore. There are several other villages with similar detail).

The physical remains of the open-fields, ridge and furrow, have been fast disappearing over the last 50 years. In response to the apparent rapid loss of open-field ridge and furrow, Northamptonshire Heritage commissioned a report that highlighted destruction rates, caused mainly by ploughing. It was found that the amount of ridge and furrow surviving in 1940 had been reduced to 12 percent by 1992, irrespective of whether there was a lot or little in 1940 (Hall 1993, 24). A list was prepared, based on a rapid assessment and professional judgement, of those parts of the county where the best preserved examples of ridge and furrow with good research potential survive.

Following on from the Northamptonshire Heritage report, English Heritage commissioned a pilot study of Northamptonshire for its Monuments Protection Programme. The county was chosen because its historical records are good and detailed mapping of field systems is well advanced. The study was used

to determine parameters suitable for the Monuments Protection Programme monument classification in the Midland region of the Central Province. Methodologies have been explained and the parameters useful for classification discussed (Hall 1995b). A Monument Class Description for Midland open-fields was prepared as a result of this study.

The whole of the (south) Midlands east of Birmingham had its ridge and furrow mapped and assessed within the context of each township, the extent of survival, and the quality of historical documentation. A Gazetteer lists 43 priority sites in lying in 40 civil parishes, defined by the criteria of field-system (township) completeness, compactness of sample, association with village earthworks, and the quality of the historical documentation. Each example is accompanied by maps and recommendations are discussed for preservation by scheduling or by other methods, and for the detailed recording of significant examples that may be destroyed. A full report will be published in 2000 (jointly by Northamptonshire County Council and English Heritage). In January 1999, new photography at 1:10,000 scale was commissioned for the 43 townships to assess their current survival. Winter flying ensured that good-quality photographs were obtained and the results were plotted at the 1:10,000 scale and digitised.

Some townships survived unchanged from their previous record, many had loss of ridge and furrow and two of those formerly among the best (Lilbourne and Lower Tysoe (Warws)) had serious loss. Overall the total amount of recorded ridge and furrow in the 43 townships fell from 18,879 acres (7,640 ha) in c.1990 to 16,707 (6,761 ha) in 1999. This loss (11.5%) highlights the vulnerability of the monument class.

The work has therefore provided a good data base, with a GIS record of all ridge and furrow in 1992, and a 1999 updated record of the nine Northamptonshire townships that occur on the English Heritage national list. These English Heritage national sample-townships are included in planning control, as well as the list of important places compiled in the 1993 Northamptonshire Heritage report. The problem remains how to ensure that they are protected, since very few will be scheduled.

2.2 *Enclosed landscapes*.

Enclosed landscapes of hedges fields were the result of enclosure over many centuries. Of the 390 townships in the historic county (pre-1964, including Peterborough) 65 percent were parliamentary (1733-1901) and 35 percent were non-parliamentary. The term 'parliamentary' refers to enclosure processes that included commissioners, which differ from places where Parliament ratified a private agreement between a few parties.

The non-parliamentary enclosure profiles are;
15th century	3% (of 390)	
16th	13%	
17th	15%	
1700-32	2%	
A further	2%	were enclosed privately after 1732 (Hall 1997, 398; fig 4).

The early enclosures lie in a patchy north-western swathe from Banbury to Rockingham Forest. Many small and deserted townships are included, some that had late monastic enclosure. They lie in the part of the county that had up to 90 percent arable. This is the region most likely to be converted from arable to pasture because of its great shortage of grazing. Lack of pasture had partly been accommodated before enclosure by introducing a high percentage of leys, often more than 35 percent, within the fields (Hall 1995a, 22-27).

The details of each enclosure and the subsequent infilling of plots are very varied. In summary, early enclosure was usually for sheep farming and had large fields. These were further subdivided, mainly 1750-1850 as the economy changed to mixed farming and farmers wished to rotate sowings in the enclosed fields but still have some closes under permanent pasture. The differences between freehold farming techniques and those of the tenants of large estates after 1750 were probably not great.

The physical preservation of hedges is covered by the Hedgerows Regulations 1997.

The categories of hedges preserved are:

1. All township boundaries older than 1850.
This will include by default the boundaries of extra-parochial forests.
2. Hedgerows incorporated in scheduled archaeological sites.
Which will include hedges around monastic sites & Desert Medieval Villages (DMV), even if not scheduled, as long as they were on the SMR before March 1997.
3. Hedgerows within and associated with such sites.
Examples would be partial or total enclosure relating to a manor, DMV or monastic site, before or after 1600, provided the site is scheduled or marked on the SMR before March 1997.
4. Boundaries of pre-1600 estates recorded on the SMR or at a County Record Office.
This would be a township normally.
5. Hedgerows recorded at the County Record Office predating enclosure acts.

At the time of publication, the Regulations were interpreted to apply mainly to pre-parliamentary hedges. It has subsequently been discovered that interpretation of the footnotes means that all hedges planted before the General Enclosure Act of 1845 are protected. This implies that all hedges in the county except for one parish (Lutton, 1866) are preserved! The NFU does not yet seem to be aware of the implications of this ruling; Local Planning Authorities have recently been informed. In future the hedgerow discussion will mostly be concerned with the legal interpretation of what is a 'substantially complete system', a term used in the Regulations.

In preparation for difficult decisions as to which townships should be recommended for preservation, Northamptonshire Heritage made an appraisal of hedgerows in 1994 (Hall 1994, unpublished). Lists were prepared of places that had good hedge preservation, selecting samples from each century. For the early 19th century there are good examples east of Market Harborough. There is no very satisfactory mechanism to preserve a whole parish, in spite of the Hedgerows Regulations, and perhaps the National Trust should be persuaded to acquire a few townships.

The mechanics of Parliamentary enclosure have been fully described by Tate (1967) and several Northamptonshire details are available (Hall 1997-8, f.n. 17, p.354). The social aspects of enclosure are the subject of ongoing research. Recent work by Neeson (1993) is by no means the final, or an accurate, account. In the early 16th century most places were still under seignurial control, which, where the lord was not resident, or lordship was split, often changed to yeoman-farmer freehold by 1750. The farmers were often instrumental in initiating parliamentary enclosure, even where they were only tenants in the case of Duchy of Lancaster villages. Enclosure was the beginning of a change from small to larger farms that has gone on to the present day. The fate of the small landowner in Corby area after enclosure has been studied by Moore-Colyer (1997, 1999; see also L. S. Taylor). Many opted out of farming, probably often by choice. The option of selling a small piece of allotted land was a more valuable asset than having low-value grazing rights for say a couple of sheep in the open-field.

A *research item* is to discover from the records of enclosed estates whether there was a change from sheep to cattle after about 1650, to provide for the growing boot and shoe industry.

2.3 *Forests*

Forests are a much underrated part of the Northamptonshire landscape. Many thousands of acres of woodland survive, much of it under the management of the Forestry Commission. There was much more woodland in the 18th century than now, when it had not changed a great deal since the late Middle Ages, except for some disparking during the Civil War. Most of that removed since 1825 was pulled up in the 1860s, after formal enclosure which took place from 1798-1856. There were further inroads during the 20th century with wartime aerodromes and clearance for agriculture.

There is now a need to identify the historic remains of the woods, that is the coppices, plains, ridings, lawns and lodges, all of which have medieval origins. The many medieval oaks still surviving in lawns and other open spaces are in need of urgent protection by tree-preservation orders. Salcey Forest has been surveyed for archaeological remains and recommendations made to the owners, Forest Enterprise, for sympathetic management. The Forestry Commission is currently promoting a bid to provide funds to replant woodland in the royal hunting forests of Oxon, Bucks and Northants. Whittlewood Forest is the subject of a current project by Northamptonshire Heritage and South Northamptonshire District

Council, where the whole historic landscape is being mapped. It will be possible to recommend a management policy for the area with suggestions for restoration of woodland to its former location, should this be required. All other woodland in the county needs the same kind of detailed study for its future management and preservation.

The management of the crown woods is very fully recorded from the 16th century.
Each time a coppice was cut down there are details of various costs, such as those made to forest officers for the cutting and woodsales. A major expense was to make a ditched fence around the coppice, left for seven years to protect young shoots against cattle and deer. Details (amounts paid and personal names) are recorded for people in towns and villages up to about 15 miles away. At the end of the 17th century accounts show that apart from wood sales to neighbouring villages, much wood was used for repair of buildings in Hazleborough walk (PRO LR4 1/49) and to pay salaries. During 1727-34 rough timber from Whittlewood was used for the repair of the Great Lodge and outhouses at Wakefield (PRO LR4 3/37).

Some timber went farther afield. Long distance sales were for bridge repairs at Henley on Thames during 1697-1716. In 1710 timber was provided for Blenheim and Woodstock parks (PRO LR4 1/91). In the late 18th century, Whittlewood was surveyed for timber suitable for the navy, it then being possible to get it to navigable rivers or canals via the improved roads (G   ). At about the same date the Mercury & Herald advertised the selling of wood that was not to be used for naval timber, presumably being the residual material after good timber had been removed.

A few details can be found for coppice sales in private woods, eg Farthingstone in the 16th and 18th centuries (NRO Th 2047 end;). Very little other historical evidence exists about industrial activity, such as charcoal burning. A moderate amount of new woodland was planted on some of the great estates (e.g. Althorp and Easton Maudit), where ridge and furrow is visible beneath the trees. Modern woodland records are held by the Forestry Commission, and include woodland diaries.

Research items are to complete the mapping of all woodlands from historic sources and relate this to current survival of earthworks, especially the coppice banks. A management policy is needed to ensure survival of these earthworks and to make recommendations about tree-planting schemes - it is undesirable to have trees planted on earthwork ridge and furrow or any other archaeological site, especially village earthworks. The medieval oaks in Whittlewood can be used to work a local dendrochronological sequence.

3. Parks & gardens

3. 1 *The resource and data base*

The gardens of Northamptonshire cover a wide range of types. In scale they vary from the extensive works of the great houses to smaller gentry seats (eg the manor-houses of one-parish estates) and the gardens of yeoman farm-houses. As well as private gardens, there are those of public institutions, 19th century and later, such as work-houses, hospitals and asylums, municipal parks and cemeteries, although these have had little study so far.

English Heritage has recently funded a project to enhance the Register of Parks and Gardens. About 300 potential sites were listed and placed on the SMR and given identifying names and numbers. The source was Ordnance Survey mapping of the 1950s at the 1:25,000 scale. Small gardens such as those of rectories and Edwardian houses are not very identifiable at the scale used and would have been missed. A few modern gardens such as Horton Menagerie and Sudborough Old Vicarage would not then have been created. The data collected included information from the archives of the Gardens Trust. The final list supplied to English Heritage contained 36 gardens. Gardens not on the Register have a fairly basic SMR archive, about half an A4 page each; those on the register are much fuller (eg Apethorpe has about 3 pages). Paul Stamper is currently providing more detail on the historical archive of those parks included in the Register.

Additionally, the Gardens Trust has files prepared from the works of the county historians Bridges (data of c.1720), Baker (1822-36), and from county maps by Eyre, Bryant, and Greenwood. About 150 gardens were identified.

3.2 *Preservation and management.*

Gardens have little or no protection, since the English Heritage Register is non-statutory. Local Planning Authorities are aware of the garden sites and they have been entered in the Local Plan. Northamptonshire Heritage is alerted to planning applications that may threaten any registered garden.

A few earthwork gardens where the great house is no longer extant, such as Wakerley and Harrington, are scheduled monuments. Sometimes monuments are protected because they are were monastic, or are the sites of medieval manor-houses with fishponds etc. Scheduled sites are the only ones that are preserved. More difficult to manage are gardens currently in use (the majority); these are likely to change or be put to a different landuse. Since there is no protection, gardens can be destroyed by horticulture or agriculture without notice.

A selection of gardens of all types and dates needs preservation. English Heritage have given limited funds to improve some large gardens, initially for replacement trees after the wind damage of a few years ago (Task Force Trees).

3.3 *Research themes*

Documentary work is in progress, but much more input is required. The surviving documents are varied; e.g. the extraordinary scheduled terraced gardens at Harrington have no known record. Urgently needed is a modern fieldwork survey, to record what survives on the ground, enhanced by reference to APs. Proformas for work of this type have been prepared. The most serious items missing from the database are records of small private gardens.

There is a need to understand the history of gardens so as to place them in a regional context by comparative work with other counties. It is said, for instance, that Northamptonshire has more surviving formal gardens than neighbouring counties, not much changed by 18th century landscaping, and this needs verifying.

There are many items needing further study, such as the relation of the great house gardens to deer parks, to monastic sites, to forests, and to DMVs. A grant has been obtained, from the Awards for All Scheme, to defray travelling costs, for a survey of Northamptonshire deer parks to assess their current survival as monuments. The survey will adapt current gardens' survey forms. Many great houses and their gardens lie at deserted village sites.

Gardens have research value because they relate to the wealth of the owners and their social status, and reveal changing fashions. Historical work is required on the evolution of gardens in relation to the social structure of the county. The archaeology of gardens should be aimed at those with good historical records, as well as the physical remains. In some cases, archaeology is the only source of information about gardens, eg at Paulerspury.

4   Settlement

4.1 *Rural settlement*

Settlement in Northamptonshire was mostly nucleated. Medieval dispersed settlement in the Whittlewood and Salcey Forest regions had shrunken so much by the 18th century that it is no longer possible to distinguish it from dispersed farmsteads in the enclosed landscapes, other then by fieldwork.

The population in the post-medieval period was predominantly rural and did not change much before 1800. There is no evidence of any major change in population. Small changes took place in connection with early enclosure; some gentry families were accused of depopulation and conversion of arable to pasture in 1517 (Deene, NRO Bru A.iv.19). Bridges notes that Easton Maudit had a reduced population due to enclosure (in c.1639). Abington was depopulated in the 18th century because of enclosure and emparkment.

Population estimates for c.1720 (from Bridges, excluding Northampton) show the major towns clearly. Other data-bases are available from the 1524 Lay Subsidy and the 1676 Compton Census.

4.2 Urban population and markets

The urban population can be studied in terms of markets as well as population statistics. The illustrations show the relative sizes of market settlements in 1524 and 1676 (with Rothwell and Northampton missing from the last example). More detail is available from the county hearth tax returns (which will be available in a forthcoming publication by the Northamptonshire Record Society). A detailed report on all Northamptonshire towns is also to be published (Foard, forthcoming). This will enable the chronology of the changes to be studied in detail.

There was major urban development in the form of infilling within the medieval framework in key towns, notably Kettering. Northampton saw growth but it was still smaller than it had been in the 13th century town, with large areas remaining undeveloped in the peripheries of the walled area.

Ten towns survived the 14th-century recessions while several other places either survived as market villages or were revived in the 15th century. There were also several new market village foundations, notably Brigstock, and two re-foundations in the early 16th-century (Kings Cliffe and Aynho) and one in the late 16th century (Weldon). Welford market was moved to West Haddon in the 17th century. The village markets were generally established in the least-populated and least-wealthy areas of the county, and which were most distant from the main towns, so filling minor marketing niches. None ever grew to significant size and most failed fairly quickly. The one possible exception is Rockingham which, though small, had a high population for its acreage suggesting that it had important non-agricultural functions. It remained the least important of the towns but is highly significant for the archaeological study of lesser market settlements due to the demolition and clearance of all the buildings and tenements on and around the market place in 1645. Extensive earthworks remain, and thus it represents a major archaeological resource for the investigation of the market village in the 16th and early 17th century (as well as of the medieval period).

The dominant towns were those that had been important in the 13th and 14th centuries. However Kettering continued to eclipse Rothwell, and Wellingborough to eclipse Higham Ferrers. This was based both on the transfer of general commercial functions but also, during the 17th and 18th centuries, upon the first stages of large-scale specialisation in the textile and shoemaking industries.

The economic base of urbanism
Wool trade existed in the early post-medieval period, but was probably in significant decline, possibly with a transition, during the 16th century, from wool to leather. The wool market at Oundle for example was infilled before 1565 while the first leather searchers were appointed to Higham market in the mid 16th century, by the later 17th century there was a significant leather fair at Rothwell. There is the need for comparative archaeological evidence from the better-documented post-medieval period to contrast with the character of economic activity and wealth in the market towns during the Middle Ages.

Kettering and Wellingborough saw major development in the later 17th and 18th centuries with the specialisation and intensification of the worsted and shoemaking industries respectively. Other small towns, particularly Oundle, Daventry, Brackley, Thrapston and Towcester, remained merely as the main commercial and service centres for their district, as witnessed in 1777 by the range of specialist services provided, such as attorneys, surgeons etc. While Thrapston, like Rockingham, seems to have served almost solely marketing functions and the ubiquitous agricultural component, the other towns had a broad but relatively limited industrial base, with no concentration on a major industry or major trade.

Hence in Oundle, for example, there was a 16th century glove-producing trade, which continued to at least 1777, but it never provided the basis for major industrial development to compare to the 17th and 18th century specialisation in worsteds in Kettering and shoemaking in Wellingborough. Northampton retained a broad and deep industrial and commercial base; the 1524 subsidy reveals the importance of the broadcloth and the leather trades, the last a specialisation that intensified by 1777, moving increasingly towards shoemaking. The service, distributive and food trades comprised 40% of the occupations of Northampton in 1524, showing the importance of basic marketing for the county and

particularly Northampton's immediate hinterland. In contrast the textile and leather trades were producing for a far wider market, representing 17% and 25% of trades respectively. Farming comprised just 6% of the occupations.

By the later 17th century, several towns, and some other settlements along the major routes, saw substantial specialisation based on the servicing of major through traffic, notably Towcester and Daventry. Various other towns, including Northampton, Wellingborough, Kettering and Brackley did have significant trade from important through routes, as can be seen from the numbers of guest beds and stabling for horses in 1686. The scale of commerce at towns can be best gauged from the number of alehouses and inns, which represent accommodation provision for visitors, though the impact of servicing through traffic needs to be taken into account also.

Morphology
The small towns saw the continuation of market-place layout, with rows of shops and stalls. There was development of permanent structures in the main towns with shops in tenements fronting market places. There was also a continuation of market place infilling.

With the exception of the tannery in Northampton, no significant excavations have examined the development of Northampton or of any other town in post medieval Northamptonshire.

Research items for urban sites are to investigate the nature of shops to discover if they continued from the Middle Ages. Identification of the origins and development of the inns and alehouses is needed.

This seems, from limited documentary evidence in Brackley and Oundle, to be a 15th and 16th century expansion; the nature of this service industry may tell about the changing nature of transport and travel.

Recovery of ceramic assemblages can provide evidence of the wealth of tenements.

The range of goods used could be explored if waterlogged deposits, such as that found from the 17th-century fishpond on the edge of Towcester, were recovered from those towns specialising in particular industries.

4.3 Communications and associated services for travellers

Communications and the scale of transport activity on particular roads can be mapped from the records of ale-houses (1630), guest beds and stabling (1686 and 1800). The last two are related to major roads recorded on the maps of Ogilby & Morden, and the later turnpikes.

There were substantial changes in the road network in the 18th century as a result of turnpiking which have distorted the early post-medieval road network. The mapping of the pre-turnpike road pattern is important to understand both urban development and the potential of through traffic for the support of service industries. The impact of the development of coaching in the later 17th and 18th century and its effect on the development of some towns such as Towcester and Daventry needs to be studied. **Communication research** items needed are a detailed documentary research based on estate maps and open-field reconstruction to enhance the mapping provided by national and countywide mapping of the 17th and 18th centuries. The distribution and dating of bridges is also relevant and should also be explored archaeologically.

There is the need to identify surviving examples of the range of inn and alehouses, from major inns, such as the Globe in Dodford, down to the minor alehouses. The character and chronology of their development needs to be examined and related to their replacement of services provided in the Middle Ages by hospitals and other monastic houses. Detailed documentary and historic building study may

need to be enhanced by excavated evidence to understand the changing nature of travel in the 16th century. All this will improve the knowledge of regional market structure.

4.4 The English Civil War

Garrisons & Sieges
Northampton, a major parliamentarian garrison of national importance, was defended during 1642-1647. Major defensive works were made around the town and the castle was refortified. Fortification of the south and west bridges occurred, but archaeological evidence is unlikely to survive for bridge

works. There is no earthwork survival of the town defences but they are extensively documented. Areas outside walls near St Andrews and St Edmunds were cleared. Reconstruction of the likely circuit of defences from documentary evidence has been completed and needs testing archaeologically. Earthworks surviving at the castle probably include some Civil War works. There is limited, but important, potential for refortification evidence on the castle barbican and inner bailey, and possible outworks to the castle lie on the east side of the barbican.

Rockingham was an important parliamentarian garrison 1643-1647 and has potentially surviving Civil War earthworks. Buried archaeology is likely, and there are some documentary sources including a plan of the defences of the motte, but no detailed study has yet been made on the earthworks or the historical record. Clearance was made of market and surrounds lying south-west of the settlement; this area is scheduled.

Towcester was a major royalist garrison for the main army during October 1643 to January 1644. Refortification occurred mainly along the Roman defences with the castle-motte earthwork re-used as an artillery platform. Two sections have been made over the Civil War ditch but no good archaeological evidence was recognised.

Grafton Regis was the site of a minor royalist garrison during October - December 1643, fortifying a country house. The defences have not yet been identified, but there is high potential for well preserved buried archaeology. The documentary record of the defences is poor, but that of the siege is good. The house was subject to major siege over three days and extensive artefacts are scattered on the surrounding land, where there is absence of modern development. There is a high potential for recovery and analysis of details of the military engagement (by metal detecting, see Naseby). Archaeology can significantly contribute to understanding the siege of the site when the whole area has been surveyed.

Thorpe Mandeville. A minor parliamentary garrison was located here in 1646, at a fortified small manor-house, that probably used as a base for the siege of Banbury. The site partially survives as an earthwork but no defences are identifiable. There is a high potential for archaeological remains, but poor documentary detail.

At *Fawsley* there was a very brief attempt to establish parliamentary garrison. It was not fortified so little archaeological potential is likely.

Battles
Naseby. Here was a major battle of the highest national importance. It has exceptionally good documentation and a high archaeological potential. Extensive artefact scatters (musket balls found by metal detecting) have been recovered but without rigorous recording. Burial sites known and others are likely to exist. Extensive action and possible subsidiary skirmish sites have been located.

Naseby can be used to study the nature of actual deployments relative to the ideal of the military manuals. It also represents one of the best testing-grounds for the development of the archaeological study of Civil War battles because of the excellent documentary and historical topographical record, and the lack of modern development. Evidence has been lost by uncontrolled metal-detecting, and the site should be protected by scheduling.

Middleton Cheney was the site of a minor battle involving several thousand troops. It is poorly documented and the exact location is uncertain, but there may be potential for archaeological metal-detecting survey.

5. Industry

5.1 *Leather and footwear*

Northampton had a significant production of leather and shoes in 15th and 16th centuries. Tanners were recorded at Rushden in 1462 for fouling the brook with lime and tanning bark (the use of lime showing that hides were being dehaired before tanning). Higham had an officer who checked leather quality, the leather searcher, by 1539 and thereafter until the 17th century. Butchers were to bring hides as well as meat to the market or meat could not be sold, showing that hides and leather were considered important (Hall & Harding 1985, 229-32). The leather trade comprised 25% of the occupations in Northampton in

1524 compared to 17% for the textile industry. In 1712 Morton noted that 'mighty numbers' [of shoes] had been sent to foreign plantations and to the army in Flanders.

Tanners, Curriers & Whittawers

These occupations have a distribution that is not entirely urban, with many practitioners in rural villages, as had been the case in the medieval period. No systematic study of the distribution exists and only the 1777 Militia List trades provides a guide, when there was a concentration in the urban centres. In 1524 there were 15 tanners in Northampton and just 5 curriers and whittawers.
Curriers and Whittawers cured skins to give a supple product, the whitawed skins being especially important for glove production. Tanners presumably mainly supplied the shoemaking and other leather trades.

Research items are to determine how important the leather industry was at the beginning of the post medieval period. Was it already concentrating on shoes or did this develop in the 17th century? Was it primarily urban based? What was the relationship between the development of the shoe production and the production of leather from the pastures in the county. Was there a significant shift from wool to leather?

5.2 *Wool, weaving & fulling mills.*

Broadcloth

The broadcloth industry was well established in Northamptonshire in the Middle Ages. It required fulling of cloth and then its subsequent stretching or tentering. The location of the industry can be approximately identified from the distribution of fulling mills and of tentering areas. An incomplete collection of tentering and fulling references suggests a concentration of the industry in the Nene between Northampton and Fotheringhay and in various tributaries, especially the Ise. This distribution relates fairly closely to the pattern of watermills in Domesday and only really reflects the availability of water-power. The industry represents a continuation of medieval fulling in the same area; it continued in the Nene valley as late as the mid 18th century, on the evidence of the mills, but had ceased by 1777.

The pattern is supported by the distribution of dyers, with dyeworks known at Brigstock before 1725, Wellingborough in 1767 and with Northampton having at least seven dyers in 1524 and two in 1777. In 1524 the textile industry in Northampton was second only to the leather industries. It appears to have been supplanted before 1777 by the Worsted industry, although much of the Nene Valley area where it may have been strongest, or survived longest, there was only limited replacement by the Worsted industry.

Worsteds

This industry is said to have been introduced into Kettering in the mid 17th century (Randall 1970, 1971). Certainly there were no woolcombers recorded in Northampton in 1524 even though it then had a significant textile industry, and by 1777 it had 19 woolcombers with 59 weavers. It comprised two main components: woolcombing, the processing of the wool to produce yarn, and weaving to produce finished cloth. The process did not require fulling and tentering. In 1777 the industry was concentrated in the north west of the county, with an exceptional concentration of woolcombing at Long Buckby, and nearby, with weaving being concentrated in Kettering. In most villages the proportions were more balanced. This might suggest that the primary production of the wool was in the west of the county but it is not known what proportion of the wool was imported from elsewhere.

Other textile industries are to be dealt with in the next period paper (flaxdressers, lace, serge makers, and framework knitters).

Research questions are to discover whether the worsted industry developed in the north west of the county where the broadcloth industry was not practicable because of lack of watermills for fulling. The work of Dobson on Northamptonshire watermills may be relevant. The origins of the textile industry may be related to the early enclosure in the north-west.

5.3 *Building materials*

Wood

Wood was used as a building material from local sources; a supply was available from the forests for places not too far away from them and early enclosures provided timber. There were many wooden

buildings in Northampton before the fire of 1675, the nearest substantial timber source was woodland near Roade, no longer extant. As has been mentioned, the royal forests also supplied long distant needs, such as Henley on Thames bridge.

Stone quarries and slates
There were local stone quarries in most parts of the county except the north-west. They supplied local needs and have been mapped as part of the parish ridge and furrow survey. Better quality stone was needed for jambs and corners. The famous quarries were by no means the only suppliers. King's Cliffe was used for Burghley in the 1580s and stone from monastic buildings was also used (Till 1997).

In the 18th century, Raunds marble was much esteemed (Morton 1712), and quarries at Maidwell are described in 1806 referring to the quality of stone and lime produced from them (NRO IL 2892). One of the quarries, dale stone pits, still visible on the ground, was called *standelvis* in 1316 (NRO FH 3021; Hall 1976).

Slates likewise have many local sources as well as the large and well known ones. Many parts of the county have laminated limestone beds suitable for making roofing slates. At Higham Ferrers a *slatt pit furlong* is recorded in 1567 and 1789; on the ground there is a depression in the field surface with small pieces of thin flatstone scattered about. Tiles from Newbottle and Charlton are frequently referred to in 15th-century manorial building-accounts at Preston Capes. The industry presumably continued, although none is mentioned in there in 1777. Parry (1987) has discussed Helmdon stone.

1437   [paid for] 400 laths for stone tiles 20d; 1,500 stonenails 18d; 13/4d to William Sclater for 2,000 tiles bought at Newbotell, to repair the manor.
1438   5d for carting tiles bought of Thomas Sclatur to repair the great chamber at the end of the hall; brought from Charlton to the manor-house which is 10 miles; 2s for 400 latches bought from Coventry for the same (NRO Knightley court rolls A iv, 24 & 8).

The distribution of stone slates on extant buildings reveals three regions. The main one is in the north east of the county, centred on Collyweston and Easton on the Hill but there are other lesser foci in the north east of the county picked out by the 1777 list. Two other regions seen in surviving buildings correlate with minor slate production in 1777, at Northampton and at Brackley.

Collyweston and Easton on the Hill have quarry pits with associated working areas surviving as earthworks. The historical record of this subject has not been assessed, and work is needed to identify quarries and working areas in all the production centres.

Brick
Brick was not used extensively in the county until late because of the shortage of fuel. High status buildings, such as the manor-house at Edgcote had brick in the 15th century (imported from Calais, Driver 1997, 320), and at Easton Neston, in 1511, brick was used for chimneys. In the last case the bricks were probably made on site; there was a brick-making family called West in the Cleyley Hundred during the 17th century. They were possibly itinerant brickmakers, but their activities leave little trace on the ground or in documents. Yardley Hastings rectory is a Queen Anne structure.

Towcester had brick buildings in the 18th century, and there was a kiln of the same date at Brigstock, probably using fuel from the nearby forest.

Brick-making did not occur on the large-scale until coal was available via canals. In the north-west of the county, brick buildings of early 19th-century date can be found in villages near canals. After the arrival of railways, brick rapidly superseded stone as a building material.

Cob
The current distribution of cob buildings is very much at the north-west of the county where there is not much stone suitable as building material. There may have been such buildings elsewhere, but they have long been replaced by stone or brick. The past use of his material could by determined by excavation.

6   Buildings

Buildings demonstrate many aspects of the past. As well as their intended functional structures, they throw light on commercial and industrial activity, the wealth of the builders, building-patterns of vernacular architecture, and the use of building materials.

6.1 *Great houses*

Many existing great houses are described by the RCHM, Northants,Vol. 6. However the RCHM historical research is limited, and the principals of selection are not stated; the view point is more of art-history than social history. Great houses now demolished, both anciently and more recently (eg Wakerley and Horton), are on the SMR and most are described in the archaeological RCHM volumes; they should be adequately protected by PPG16 procedures where any development occurs.

The spatial organisation of great houses and their relationship to the surrounding landscape needs study. Economic aspects of running a large house are also of interest, since the staff often formed a community separate from nearby villages.

6.2 *Rural buildings*

English Heritage have undertaken work on planned ('model') farms, but this was limited to those that are currently listed. Such farms are often well documented in the records of great house estates. Farm buildings on estates need comparing those with those in freehold parishes. A study of the size of the structures in relation to the scale of agriculture associated with a farm would help characterise the character of the agricultural landscape. A chronology of farm buildings is required along with an assessment of the status of farms and isolated barns out in the fields.

Most substantial farm-houses are listed. Lesser farm buildings are not listed and many are not subject to planning regulations; so their preserved presents difficulties. Some are ruined buildings, and likely to be demolished or 'converted'; these need recording. Some rural buildings can be identified by because they were used for very specific purposes, e.g. granaries might have very hard, smooth lime-ash floors. The large number of surviving buildings offers a high potential for further study and it is necessary to decide how to choose a sample for further study. Other rural buildings, such as those belonging to butchers or blacksmiths, have not been examined.

6.3 *Urban buildings*

Towns need ranking according to the quality of their documentation, especially those that have surveys, provided there are sufficient structures to study. Oundle has a particularly good buildings survival, most of them listed. Some villages also have surveys, such as Mears Ashby (1577), many in the Huxloe-Raunds area (1730s) and much of the Grafton Estate.

Only a few early shops survive; an early 18th example in the Drapery, Northampton, is listed, and there was one until recently at Kings Sutton. A possible 15th shop occurs in Towcester. Inns measure the wealth of towns in terms of visiting commercial activity. Some towns have records of bedsit areas in 18th and 19th centuries, but these would be difficult to identify. The buildings of tradesmen such as butchers and bakers probably can be identified if not too much altered.

Research items. The survival of historic building stock will significantly contribute to the understanding of some towns in the period, with Oundle, Brackley and Higham Ferrers having many buildings, not yet much studied. All three have excellent documentation. Early shops are a rare item, and Higham Ferrers offers potential because shop sites have not been cleared away to widen a highway.

6.4 *Labourers dwellings.*

Rows of purpose-built labourers' cottages are mostly of country estate origin. A late 18th century example survives at Achurch. Many estate villages have a high proportion of labourers' cottages of 19th-century date, e.g. at Strixton and Sywell.

Squatters cottages are referred to at Abthorpe and King's Cliffe in documentary records, but it is doubtful if any survive. Cattle End, Silverstone, seems to have been built as encroachment in a forest riding.

It is doubtful if any dwellings specifically used for labourers can be identified in towns.

6.5 *Institutional buildings*
There are no hospitals or purpose-built workhouses before 1750. Some later hospitals have been recorded by English Heritage. Almshouses have been discussed by xxxx (NPP article). A more detailed survey is needed; many of the buildings are listed.

There are some school buildings before 1750 (Abthorpe, Clipston, Guilsborough etc) and most are listed. There is no corpus of school buildings dating from the 16th century to the 1870 Act, and survey and research is needed, using the work on the history of schools provided by the VCH.

6.6 *Churches & chapels*
Medieval churches are well recorded and their archaeology is controlled via the faculty system needed for any structural alterations. There is, however, currently a problem with redundant chapel conversions, some of which have buildings dating before 1750.

6.7 *Industrial and modern buildings*
These are the discussed in the paper on the Industrial Period. There are a very few pre-1750 industrial buildings, such as the pin factory at Long Buckby. This was a small scale activity that used an existing barn. Likewise whip-making at Daventry and the work-shops of the woollen industry in the north-west are unlikely to have had many purpose-built structures.

For modern new development, it is worth recording completion dates and architects' names of housing estates and major buildings.

6.8 *Research items for buildings*
We need to be clear what buildings tell us about economy and industry, what social aspects are visible in a building, what to record, and how to engage planning consents to determine research objectives. The following items are needed to improve the buildings' record.

a. Revision of the statutory Lists.
Although many buildings have a measure of protection through Listing, there are problems because some have been de-listed and others were never listed because the original structure had received too many alterations. There are important buildings in these groups that need attention; they still have structural items of interest as well as associated archaeology. All village ancient cores should be marked on the SMR for planning control to monitor such buildings.

b. Recording of all significant buildings.
Recording of unlisted buildings and important ones not in a conservation area is necessary. There should also be statutory recording of listed buildings that are being altered with consent. Before a recording programme can be undertaken, decisions are needed to decide what to survey and what to record. Presumably as a minimum, the plan, architectural features, and building usage should be noted. Specialist advice will often be required, and methodologies need to be established.

c. Finance.
If sites are to be destroyed or disturbed, then the correct amount of funding must be provided as part of the planning process, to allow adequate recording and historical back-up. This should apply to any alterations taking place at private houses as well as
listed buildings. Developers need to be obliged to record all significant structures that they demolish, i.e. to follow archaeology and apply PPG16.

d. Dating.
From the 16th century onwards many buildings survive, and they fall naturally into two groups, those dated and those undated. Documents such as glebe terriers, deeds and court rolls will sometimes reveal dates.

The physical method of dendro-chronology for Northamptonshire is more difficult than in other regions such as Banbury where it is now operational. A sample needs 80-100 rings because timber that grew on claylands has less annual ring variation than material from elsewhere, so necessitating the development of local sequences.

e. Historical appraisal.

Historical appraisal and assessment using the quality of documentation are urgently needed to identify the potential building resource. This will help to target staff-time and funding within local government. The priorities are to make a historical record survey immediately and then place the information into planning control. The same documents will provide social history, e.g. to determine how individuals became entrepreneurs and built up the capital required to invest in large buildings or industrial complexes.

7 Research themes and objectives

In the post-medieval period there are two major sources of evidence, archaeology and the written record. Each can provide complimentary information about any particular item. The present discussions need to resolve how archaeology can contribute to a better understanding of a period that has good documentation.

7.1 *Summary of research themes*

Many of the preceding sections conclude with items that need further research, where details can be consulted. In summary, the main requirements are as follow.

For the countryside, good examples of hedges and of ridge and furrow, have been identified. Forest earthworks need protection, and the areas of medieval woods require mapping on the SMR so that informed advice can be provided about tree-planting schemes.
Parks and gardens need both historical and ground survey work, and comparative assessment with neighbouring counties.
Urban settlements need study to ascertain why and how they developed in terms
of commerce and industry. The significance of inns, alehouses and stabling requires further work.
Northamptonshire has several important Civil War sites that need analysis and protection.
The early industries of cloth and leather still have several unknowns about their respective decline and growth.
Building materials and buildings require considerable input to make the most of the important information that they can reveal.

7.2 *The historical record*

The post-medieval period has an enormous wealth of documentary evidence relating to all its physical and social aspects. In the past, the known existence of written records has encouraged an unwarranted neglect of later archaeological remains, by medievalists, on the premise that 'everything was known'. For all the selected topics, except field systems, the extent and importance of the archaeological resource is not fully known because of lack of a full assessment of the historical record.

It is a task of the current Research Framework discussions to identify areas where specific historical work is required urgently, and to ensure that suitable landscapes and monuments are preserved to enable future archaeological and historical researches to be fruitful. Local groups need to be to encouraged to undertake specific tasks that are essential to progress the research frameworks currently being devised. For instance, many topics are suitable for a mature degree or post-graduate study, or for publication in county archaeological and historical journals. In all cases there should be some clearly defined (academic) end-product for the authors, so they do not feel they are doing unpaid work for Local Government (even though they are). There are many suitable topics, and, above all, many types of building survey are required. In some cases a particular need is clear enough to be presented as a short-term project worthy of an application for funding from English Heritage or other bodies.

In the absence of supporting historical studies, it will be impossible to be aware of all the many categories of physical remains likely to survive, and they will not be adequately dealt with before they disappear. If action is not taken, the post-medieval period will be not be properly recorded or preserved because of failure to generate interest because it is 'too recent'.

8 Bibliography

NRO   Northamptonshire Record Office, Wootton Hall, Northampton.

where documents referred to in the text can be found.
NRS   Northamptonshire Record Society, Wootton Hall, Northampton.

Baker, G. 1836. *The History and Antiquities of the County of Northampton,* London (1822-36), 2 vols.
Bridges, J., (ed Whalley) 1791. *The History and Antiquities of Northamptonshire* (from data collected c.1720)
Dobson, Steve, Northamptonshire watermills, (Sheffield).
Driver, J. T., 1997. 'The Career of Richard Buckland, Knight of the Shire for Northamptonshire', *Northamptonshire Past and Present* 9, 309-323.
Dyer, A, 1979, 'Northampton in 1524', *Northamptonshire Past and Present* 6, 73-80
Foard, G, 1994, 'The Civil War Defences of Northampton', *Northamptonshire Past and Present* 9, 4-44;
Foard, G., 1995, Naseby: *The Decisive Campaign*.
Foard, G., in preparation, *Northamptonshire Towns*, Northamptonshire Record Society.
Hall, D., 1976. 'Maidwell', Council for British Archaeology Group 9, *Newsletter* 6, 29-31).
Hall, D., 1993. *The Open Fields of Northamptonshire; the case for preservation* (Northamptonshire County Council).
Hall, D., 1994. Study for Northamptonshire Heritage of enclosed field systems.
Hall, D., 1995a, *The Open Fields of Northamptonshire*, Northamptonshire Record Society, vol. 38.
Hall, D., 1995b. Report for English Heritage, Monument Class Description of open fields.
Hall, D., 1997, 'Enclosure in Northamptonshire', *Northamptonshire Past and Present* 9, 350-367.
Hatley, V. A., 1973. *Northamptonshire Militia Lists 1777,* Northamptonshire Record Society, vol. 25.
Hudson, J. D. and Sutherland D. S., 1990. The Geological Description and Identification of Building Stones: Examples from Northamptonshire' *Quarrying and Building in England AD 43-1525.*
Moore-Colyer, R., 1997. 'Land and people in Northamptonshire: the case of Great Oakley c.1700-1850', *Ag. Hist. Rev*., 45(2), 149-64.
Idem 1999. 'The Small Landholder in Northamptonshire: Corby *c*.1700-1850' *Northamptonshire Past and Present*, 52, 57-68.
Morton, J., 1712. *The Natural History of Northamptonshire*.
Neeson, J. M., 1993. *Commoners: Common Right, Enclosure and Social Change in England, 1700-1820.*
Parry, E. G. 1987. 'Helmdon Stone', *Northamptonshire Past and Present* VII (4), 158-70.
Randall, A. L., 1970. 'The Kettering Worsted Industry in the Eighteenth Century 1' *Northamptonshire Past and Present* 4 (5), 312-20
Randall, A. L.,1971-2. 'The Kettering Worsted Industry in the Eighteenth Century 2' *Northamptonshire Past and Present* 5 (6), 349-56.
Royal Commission for Historical Monuments of England, 1986. *Non-conformist Chapels and Meeting Houses; Northamptonshire and Oxfordshire.*
Tate, W. E., 1967. *The English Village Community*.
Taylor, L. S.,
Till, Eric, 1997. 'Fact and Conjecture – the building of Burghley House 1555-1587', *Northamptonshire Past and Present*, 9, 232-32.
VCH Volume 2 1906 (Reprint 1970) [for early industries]

Other Sources
The information and analysis on post medieval taxation, communications, alehouses, industry and post-medieval settlement in 1777 is taken from Hatley 1973. Northampton data in 1524 are from Dyer 1979. Information on specific towns is also drawn from the individual town reports in:
Foard, G, in preparation, 'Northamptonshire Extensive Urban Survey: Medieval and Post medieval'.
Historic buildings data is all from the Listed Buildings database produced by Clews Associates of which there is a copy in the Northamptonshire SMR.
Landscape parks mapping is from Northamptonshire SMR based on a desk-based assessment by Christine Addison for English Heritage & Northamptonshire Heritage.