

**Mapping the Late Medieval and  
Post Medieval Landscape of  
Cumbria**

**Two Volumes**

**Volume 1: Text**

**Caron Egerton Newman**

**Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

**School of History, Classics and Archaeology**

**Newcastle University**

**Submitted: June 2014**

## **Abstract**

This study is an analysis of the development of rural settlement patterns and field systems in Cumbria from the later medieval period through to the late eighteenth century. It uses documentary, cartographic and archaeological evidence. This evidence is interpreted utilising the techniques of historic landscape characterisation (HLC), map regression and maps created by the author, summarising and synthesising historical and archaeological data. The mapped settlement data, in particular, has been manipulated using tools of graphic analysis available within a Graphical Information System (GIS). The initial product is a digital map of Cumbria in the late eighteenth century, based on the county-scale maps of that period, enhanced with information taken from enclosure maps and awards, and other post medieval cartographic sources. From this baseline, an interpretation of the late medieval landscape was developed by adding information from other data sources, such as place names and documentary evidence.

The approach was necessarily top-down and broad brush, in order to provide a landscape-scale, sub-regional view. This both addresses the deficiencies within the standard historical approach to landscape development, and complements such approaches. Standard historical approaches are strong on detail, but can be weak when conclusions based on localised examples are extrapolated and attributed to the wider landscape. The methodology adopted by this study allows those local analyses to be set within a broader landscape context, providing another tool to use alongside more traditional approaches to historic landscape studies.

The Introduction sets out in detail the broad philosophical approaches taken by this study. It then describes the methodological approach of developing a digitised eighteenth century map and using this as a baseline for analysing and partially reconstructing the late medieval landscape. Chapter 2 discusses in detail the historical cartographic background and the technical aspects of eighteenth century map making, with particular reference to Cumbria. Chapter 3 examines the eighteenth century landscape, and the processes of change which led to its development out of the medieval landscape. A characterisation of the late eighteenth century landscape is presented. Chapters 4, 5 and 6 present an interpretation of the late medieval landscape of Cumbria, examining it through its lordship and structure and with a concentration on those aspects which are mappable attributes. Finally, a characterisation of the late medieval landscape is presented in Chapter 6. The conclusion, in Chapter 7 provides a comparison of the late eighteenth century and medieval landscape characterisations, an explanation of

difference, and an evaluation of the research approach to understanding landscape development.

There are two major products resulting from this study. The first is a digitised and enhanced county-scale map of the late eighteenth century landscape. The second is an interpretation of the late medieval landscape, based on the late eighteenth century composite map. Together, these provide a greater appreciation of the viability and value of post medieval map resources as an indicator of the later medieval landscape.

## Contents

### Volume 1. Text

Abstract.....	i
Contents .....	iii
List of Figures	
Abbreviations	
Acknowledgements	
1. Introduction .....	1
Cumbria: Location, Geology and Topography .....	2
Historical Context .....	4
Aims and Objectives .....	6
Justification of Approach .....	7
Methodology .....	9
The GIS Mapping .....	9
Data Capture .....	10
Strengths and Weaknesses of Specific Data Sources .....	12
Mapping the Late-Eighteenth Century Landscape .....	14
Mapping the Late Medieval Landscape .....	18
Data Manipulation .....	20
Ground Truthing .....	21
Summary of Thesis Approach .....	21
Summary of Thesis Structure .....	23
2. Mapping the Late-Eighteenth Century Landscape of Cumbria.....	24
Late-Eighteenth Century County Maps .....	24
The Late-Eighteenth Century County Maps of Cumbria .....	26
The Late-Eighteenth Century Map-Makers .....	29
Thomas Jefferys.....	29
William Yates .....	30
Thomas Donald.....	31

Other Key Figures.....	31
Comparing the Late-Eighteenth Century County Maps.....	32
Reviewing the Accuracy and Limitations of the Late-Eighteenth Century County Maps...	33
Mapping Eighteenth Century Cumbria.....	38
3. Mapping the Late-Eighteenth Century Landscape: Snapshot of a Rapidly Evolving Environment.....	40
The Late-Eighteenth Century Landscape.....	41
Unenclosed Land.....	41
The Progress of Enclosure: Waste.....	43
Woodland.....	47
Parks.....	49
The Progress of Enclosure: Cultivable Land.....	51
Settlement.....	55
The Character of the Late-Eighteenth Century Landscape.....	60
1. Nichol Forest and Bewcastle.....	61
2. Gilsland.....	62
3. Anthorn and Wedholme Mosses.....	62
4. Carlisle and Burgh.....	63
5. Holm Cultram and Westnewton.....	64
6. Westward and Inglewood.....	64
7. Eden Valley.....	66
8. The Pennines.....	69
9. Alston.....	69
10. Workington and Broughton Moor.....	70
11. West Cumberland Coastal Plain.....	71
12. Lake District Fells and Valleys.....	72
13. Upper Eden.....	74
14. Stainmore.....	74
15. Upper Lune Valley and Fells.....	75

16. Mallerstang .....	76
17. High Furness .....	76
18. Crosthwaite and Windermere .....	77
19. North Kent Valley .....	78
20. Low Furness .....	78
21. Cartmel Peninsula .....	79
22. Kendale .....	79
Characterisation Conclusions .....	80
4. Landscapes of Power: Secular Lordship and Land-Use in Late Medieval Cumbria .....	83
Lordships .....	85
Forests and Chases .....	87
The Cumbria Forests and Chases .....	88
The Forest of Inglewood .....	89
Baronial Forests or Chases .....	91
Extensions to the Forest .....	99
The Forest Landscape .....	99
Deer Parks .....	106
Baronial Parks .....	108
Forest Parks .....	110
Manorial Parks .....	112
Monastic Parks .....	114
Extensive Stock Farming .....	116
Lordship and Land-Use .....	124
5. Landscapes of Power: Religious Lordship and Land-Use in Late Medieval Cumbria .....	126
Monastic Institutions .....	126
Westmorland .....	127
Cumberland .....	130
Lancashire-over-Sands .....	135
Cumbria's monasteries .....	136

Granges .....	137
The Granges of Cockersands Abbey.....	140
The Grange of St Peter and St Hilda of Whitby in Crosby Ravensworth.....	142
The Granges of St Leonard’s Hospital in York and of Byland Abbey .....	142
The Granges of Shap Abbey .....	145
The Granges of Carlisle Priory and Wetheral Priory.....	146
The Granges of Lanercost Priory .....	146
The Granges of Calder Abbey .....	147
The Granges of St Bees.....	149
The Granges of Holm Cultram.....	151
The Granges of Cartmel Priory and Conishead Priory .....	154
The Granges of Furness Abbey.....	156
Cumbria’s Granges .....	159
6. Settlement and Field Pattern in Late Medieval Cumbria .....	163
Introduction.....	163
Settlement.....	168
Landscapes of Dispersion.....	171
Stock Farming.....	174
Enclosures.....	175
Landscapes of Nucleated Settlement .....	176
Common Arable Fields.....	177
Infield Outfield System.....	180
Settlement Formation and Expansion.....	183
Nucleated Settlement .....	183
Newbiggin, Hutton Roof, Westmorland: Evidence for New Settlement Formation..	186
New Settlement: Assarts .....	187
Sadgill, Longsleddale, Westmorland: Sixteenth Century Expansion .....	190
Character Areas .....	191
1. Bewcastle and Nichol Forest.....	192

2.	Gilsland.....	195
3.	Anthorn and Wedholme Mosses.....	196
4.	Carlisle and the Solway Plain.....	197
5.	Holm Cultram and Westnewton.....	198
6.	The Ellen and Derwent Valleys.....	198
7.	Westward.....	199
8.	Inglewood and the Lower Eden Valley.....	200
9.	The Pennines.....	201
10.	Alston Moor.....	201
11.	West Cumbrian Coastal Plain.....	202
12.	The Fells.....	203
13.	Eden Valley.....	204
14.	Furness Peninsula.....	205
15.	High Furness.....	205
16.	Cartmel.....	206
17.	Kendale.....	206
18.	South Kendale.....	207
	Late Medieval Landscape Character.....	208
7.	Discussion and Conclusions.....	210
	Introduction.....	210
	The Medieval Landscape of Cumbria.....	211
	The Eighteenth Century Landscape of Cumbria.....	216
	Discussion.....	219
Volume 2. Appendices, Tables, Bibliography and Figures		
	Appendices.....	222
	Appendix 1. Attribute Table Structures.....	223
	Appendix 2. Attributes of HLC Landscape Types Used in This Study.....	227
	Appendix 3. List of Manuscript Maps by Modern Civil Parish.....	231
	Tables.....	253



Table 3.1. The extent of unenclosed land in Cumbria around 1770.....	253
Table 3.2. Late eighteenth century parks.....	253
Table 4.1. Forests.....	254
Table 4.2. Medieval deer parks.....	255
Table 4.3. Vaccaries.....	258
Table 5.1. Monastic houses in Cumbria.....	259
Table 5.2. Size of monastic core estates.....	260
Table 5.3. Monastic houses and numbers of granges held in Cumbria.....	260
Table 5.4. Monastic granges.....	261
Bibliography.....	264
Primary Sources.....	264
Enclosure Maps and Awards.....	264
Estate, Tithe and Other Maps.....	273
Published Maps.....	277
Other Documents.....	278
Published Primary Sources.....	279
Secondary Sources.....	279
Figures.....	296

## List of Figures

1.1	The modern county of Cumbria .....	297
1.2	The historic counties .....	298
1.3	A simplified geological map of Cumbria.....	299
1.4	A detail from Donald's 1774 map of Cumberland .....	300
2.1	Detail from Donald's map of Cumberland 1774 .....	301
2.2	Detail from Jeffery's map of Westmorland 1770 .....	302
2.3	The title cartouche from Jeffery's map of Westmorland 1770 .....	303
2.4	The title cartouche from Donald's map of Cumberland 1774 .....	304
2.5	The legend from Donald's map of Cumberland 1774 .....	305
2.6	The legend from Jeffery's map of Westmorland 1770 .....	306
2.7	The transposed villages of Reagill and Sleagill on Jeffery's map of Westmorland .....	307
2.8	The general settlement pattern around Glenridding.....	308
2.9	Unenclosed roads on moorland in Westmorland .....	309
3.1	Unenclosed and recently enclosed land in 1770 .....	310
3.2	Unenclosed land in Westmorland in the late eighteenth century.....	311
3.3	Unenclosed land in Cumberland in the late eighteenth century .....	312
3.4	Unenclosed land in Lancashire-over-Sands in the late eighteenth century ....	313
3.5	The common shared between Crackenthorpe and Longmarton .....	314
3.6	Minskough Moor .....	314
3.7	The commons of Skelton enclosed 1769 .....	315
3.8	The common wastes of Solport and Nichol Forest.....	316
3.9	Common wastes in Hayton .....	317
3.10	Lowland commons around Workington .....	318
3.11	Solway Moss bog burst on Donald's map of Cumberland .....	319
3.12	Woodland cover in the late eighteenth century.....	320
3.13	The Debateable Land, 1552 .....	321
3.14	Nichol Forest in 1607.....	321
3.15	Woodland along the Scottish border in 1774.....	322
3.16	Late eighteenth century woodland cover at Castle Sowerby .....	323
3.17	Plantation and ancient woodland in High Furness.....	324
3.18	Parks in the late eighteenth century .....	325
3.19	Parks at Troutbeck, Greystoke, Levens and Ulpha.....	326
3.20	Parks at Hutton-in-the-Forest, Lowther, Dalemmain and Holker.....	327
3.21	Brougham Hall from Donald's map of Cumberland, 1774 .....	328

3.22	Dalemain Park from Donald's map of Cumberland .....	328
3.23	Surviving common arable fields in the late eighteenth century.....	329
3.24	The former common arable fields of Milburn and Milburn Grange.....	330
3.25	The common arable fields of Torpenhow and Kentmere .....	331
3.26	The common arable fields of Castle Carrock .....	332
3.27	The common arable fields of Stainton and Newbiggin .....	333
3.28	The former outfield at Aspatria.....	334
3.29	The Colby enclosure map .....	335
3.30	Enclosure map showing landholdings in the former common arable fields at Newbiggin.....	336
3.31	The enclosed common arable fields at Great Asby .....	337
3.32	Lynchets at Dalton .....	338
3.33	The former common arable fields at Dalton .....	339
3.34	Distribution of settlement in the late eighteenth century .....	340
3.35	Distribution of settlement which cannot be dated earlier than 175 .....	341
3.36	Lowther Castle and park .....	342
3.37	Lowther new village .....	343
3.38	View of Whitehaven .....	343
3.39	Post medieval settlement earthworks at Dalton .....	344
3.40	Farms and cottages on Donald's map of Cumberland .....	344
3.41	New settlement formation on the edge of Stainmore.....	345
3.42	Settlements north of Kendal.....	345
3.43	Settlements to the north of the Lake District .....	346
3.44	Kernal density map of nucleated settlement .....	347
3.45	Kernal density map of dispersed settlement .....	348
3.46	Late eighteenth century character areas.....	349
3.47	Bewcastle and Nichol Forest character area .....	350
3.48	Gilsland character area.....	351
3.49	Anthorn and Wedholme Mosses character area.....	352
3.50	Carlisle and Burgh character area .....	353
3.51	Holm Cultram and Westnewton character area .....	353
3.52	Westward and Inglewood character area .....	354
3.53	Eden Valley character area .....	355
3.54	The Pennines character area.....	356
3.55	Alston character area.....	357
3.56	Workington and Broughton Moor character area .....	357
3.57	West Coastal Plain character area.....	358

3.58	Lake District Valleys and Fells character area .....	359
3.59	Upper Eden character area .....	360
3.60	Stainmore character area .....	360
3.61	Upper Lune Valley and Fells character area .....	361
3.62	Mallerstang character area .....	361
3.63	High Furness character area .....	362
3.64	Crosthwaite and Windermere character area .....	363
3.65	North Kent Valley character area .....	364
3.66	Low Furness character area .....	365
3.67	Cartmel Peninsula character area .....	366
3.68	Kendal character area .....	366
4.1	Medieval forests of Cumbria .....	367
4.2	Inglewood and Allerdale Forests .....	368
4.3	Kendal Forest .....	369
4.4	Nichol Forest .....	370
4.5	Whinell Forest .....	371
4.6	Furness Forest .....	372
4.7	The forests and unenclosed land in Cumbria .....	373
4.8	Woodland and the forests of Cumbria .....	374
4.9	Woodland in Inglewood Forest and Westward .....	375
4.10	Woodland and the island of Holm Cultram .....	376
4.11	Medieval deer parks .....	377
4.12	Cunswick Hall deer park .....	378
4.13	The park at Brigwood, Brampton .....	379
4.14	Cockermouth deer park .....	379
4.15	Cockermouth Park in 1638 .....	380
4.16	Cockermouth Park in 1721 .....	380
4.17	Plumpton Park .....	381
4.18	Rydal Park .....	382
4.19	Rydal Park wall .....	383
4.20	Deer parks in the Kent Valley .....	384
4.21	Arnside and the possible park at Arnside Knot .....	385
4.22	Reconstruction of the medieval landscape of Dalton .....	385
4.23	Lanercost Abbey's park .....	386
4.24	Claife deer park .....	386
4.25	Hawkshead Hall Park .....	387
4.26	Vaccary centres in Cumbria .....	388

4.27	The vaccaries of Gatescarth, Buttermere, and Islekirk in Westward.....	389
4.28	The vaccaries at Gillerthwaite .....	390
4.29	Vaccaries in Wasdale.....	390
4.30	Mallerstang Forest vaccaries.....	391
4.31	Vaccaries of Stainmore Forest.....	392
4.32	Modern roads and outgangs in Stainmore Forest .....	393
5.1	Cumbrian monasteries and their core estates.....	394
5.2	Shap Abbey.....	395
5.3	Preston Patrick and its core estate.....	396
5.4	St Leonard’s Hospital or Tearnside .....	397
5.5	Wetheral Priory and its core estate .....	398
5.6	St Bees and its core estates .....	399
5.7	Calder Abbey .....	400
5.8	Holm Cultram Abbey.....	400
5.9	Lanercost Priory and its core estate .....	401
5.10	Cartmel Priory and its core estate .....	402
5.11	Conishead Priory and its core estate .....	403
5.12	Furness Abbey’s estates in Low and High Furness .....	404
5.13	Monastic granges .....	405
5.14	Templegarth.....	406
5.16	Field barn called Templegarth .....	406
5.16	Nunclose .....	407
5.17	The granges of Cockersands Abbey in Cumbria .....	408
5.18	The grange of Whitby Abbey in Crosby Ravensworth.....	409
5.19	The granges of St Leonard’s Hospital, York .....	409
5.20	Byland Abbey’s grange of Hardendale.....	410
5.21	Shap Abbey’s grange of Milburn.....	410
5.22	Shap Abbey’s granges of Bampton, Reagill and Sleddale .....	411
5.23	Lanercost Priory’s granges .....	411
5.24	Haresceugh Castle.....	412
5.25	Calder Abbey’s granges.....	412
5.26	Thornholme, Moughton and Scalderskew .....	413
5.27	The granges of St Bees Priory .....	414
5.28	Holm Cultram’s granges .....	415
5.29	Holm Cultram Abbey’s grange at Gilcrux.....	416
5.30	The sea dyke at Skinburness .....	416
5.31	Newton Arlosh.....	417

5.32	Mawbray .....	417
5.33	The granges of Conishead Priory.....	418
5.34	The granges of Cartmel Priory.....	418
5.35	Frith Hall .....	419
5.36	The granges of Furness Abbey .....	420
5.37	Marsh Grange at Dunnerholme.....	421
5.38	The Grange of Angerton .....	421
6.1	Earthworks around the village green, Ousby.....	422
6.2	Evidence for settlement shrinkage at Reagill.....	422
6.3	Medieval settlement distribution.....	423
6.4	Kernal density analysis of the distribution of all medieval settlement types..	424
6.5	Weighted kernal density analysis of the distribution of medieval settlement	425
6.6	Kernal density analysis of the distribution of dispersed medieval settlement	426
6.7	Dispersed settlement, Stainmore.....	427
6.8	Alston Moor .....	428
6.9	Dispersed settlement along the Scottish border .....	429
6.10	Dispersed settlement pattern on the lands of Holm Cultram Abbey .....	429
6.11	Dispersed settlement pattern across High and Low Furness .....	430
6.12	The medieval settlement pattern of the west coastal plain .....	431
6.13	Dispersed settlement between Gosforth and Wasdale .....	432
6.14	Map of Bolton Fell 1567.....	432
6.15	Distribution of enclosures in the late medieval period .....	433
6.16	Kernal density analysis of the distribution of nucleated settlement .....	434
6.17	Nucleated settlement pattern on the Solway Plain.....	435
6.18	Distribution of common arable fields and nucleated settlement.....	436
6.19	Common arable fields in Low Furness .....	437
6.20	Newbiggin, Westmorland .....	438
6.21	Distribution of known outfields in the later medieval period .....	439
6.22	Fingland, infield and outfield.....	440
6.23	Edderside.....	440
6.24	Gilcruix .....	441
6.25	Croft compartments in the Eden Valley.....	441
6.26	New settlement formation at Newbiggin, Hutton Roof.....	442
6.27	Medieval settlement associated with assart names .....	443
6.28	Late medieval Longsleddale .....	444
6.29	Longsleddale, 1578 .....	445
6.30	The medieval character areas.....	446

6.31	The Bewcastle and Nichol Forest character area.....	447
6.32	Gilsland character area.....	447
6.33	Anthorn and Wedholme Mosses character area.....	448
6.34	Carlisle and the Solway Plain character area.....	448
6.35	Holm Cultram and Westnewton character area.....	449
6.36	Ellen and Derwent Valleys character area.....	449
6.37	Westward character area.....	450
6.38	Inglewood and Lower Eden Valley character area.....	451
6.39	The Pennine character area.....	452
6.40	Alston Moor character area.....	453
6.41	West Cumbria Coastal Plain character area.....	454
6.42	The Fells character area.....	455
6.43	Eden Valley character area.....	455
6.44	Furness Peninsula character area.....	456
6.45	High Furness.....	457
6.46	Cartmel character area.....	458
6.47	Kendale character area.....	458
6.48	South Kendale character area.....	459

## Abbreviations

BCA	Cumbria Archives, Barrow
CBA	Council for British Archaeology
CCA	Cumbria Archives, Carlisle
CHER	Cumbria Historic Environment Record
CNWRS	Centre for North-West Regional Studies
CWAAS	Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society
HER	Historic Environment Record
HLC	Historic Landscape Characterisation
KCA	Cumbria Archives, Kendal
LA	Lancashire Archives, Preston
OD	Ordnance Datum
TNA	The National Archives, Kew
WCA	Cumbria Archives, Whitehaven



## **Acknowledgements**

This thesis could not have been completed without the help and support of many people, who generously gave of their time and knowledge. The staff in the Cumbria archive offices in Barrow, Carlisle, Kendal and Whitehaven were extremely helpful in providing me with a constant supply of maps, and showing such enthusiasm and kindness throughout my time in all the offices. In particular, I would like to thank the staff in the Cumbria Archives Centre in Carlisle, where my demands for huge quantities of maps, day after day, were dealt with patiently and with enthusiasm, often suggesting other documents which would help my research. Thanks are also due to the staff in the Lancashire archives in Preston, and in the National Archives in Kew.

There have been a number of individuals who have been very generous with their time, even providing me with access to their own research allowing me to include their results in the compilation of the digital maps. I must thank Harry Hawkins for access to his work into the deer parks of Cumbria, and Professor Ian Whyte for access to his research on enclosure in Westmorland, both of which were invaluable. Thanks are also due to Bill Shannon and Peter Messenger for pointing out particular manuscript maps which have proved useful in my research, to Michael Dewey of Cumbria Geoconservation for use of the geological map, and also to John Robinson of Cumbria County Council, who allowed me to use his scanned version of Jeffery's Map of Westmorland. Access to archaeological data on Ennerdale was kindly supplied by Gareth Browning of the Forestry Commission, and I am very grateful to Jamie Lund of the National Trust who provided digital copies of the Trust's landscape surveys in the Lake District. Cumbria County Council and the Lake District National Park provided the Historic Landscape Characterisation Project data set which is the baseline for this research, and Jo MacIntosh, former Historic Environment Officer at Cumbria County Council, supplied other digital data sets for this research.

I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Sam Turner for his advice and guidance throughout the course of this research, and especially for his patience when the production of text took longer than it perhaps should. Thanks are also due to Dr Jane Webster, Barbara Cochrane and many fellow students, researchers and friends who supplied much needed moral support. Finally, the greatest debt of thanks must go to my husband, Richard, who has been unfailingly helpful and supportive with discussions, advice, countless cups of coffee and generally just being there whenever he was needed.

## Chapter 1. Introduction

*The making of maps must be as ancient and ubiquitous a practice as is our three-part conception of time. Both reduce the infinitely complex to a finite, manageable, frame of reference. ... Both provide a way of reversing divisibility, of retrieving unity, of recapturing a sense of the whole, even though it can never be the whole.*<sup>1</sup>

Historic landscape research has developed rapidly in the 60 years since W.G. Hoskins' landmark book.<sup>2</sup> Hoskins' multi-disciplinary approach was developed within a milieu of contemporary work undertaken by historians,<sup>3</sup> geographers<sup>4</sup> and archaeologists,<sup>5</sup> all attempting to understand the physical imprint of man's past activity within the landscape. Hoskins' approach was adopted and adapted by other researchers as historic landscape studies evolved.<sup>6</sup> One of the most recent approaches taken by archaeologists has been Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC). This methodology builds upon landscape analytical techniques developed by ecologists and geographers.<sup>7</sup> Intended as a tool primarily to assist land-use planners within local authorities, it can be seen as a mechanism for rapidly assessing the historic character of a landscape and for providing an easily accessible overview of historical landscape development at a regional level.<sup>8</sup> As a research tool, it has the potential to allow the analysis of regional and sub-regional patterns of settlement and field systems. By using map regression in combination with characterisation, a 'top-down' approach can be taken to historic landscape analysis that complements and contrasts with the 'bottom-up' approach of local historians.

Cumbria is a county for which HLC has been completed,<sup>9</sup> and in which previous academic landscapes studies have primarily been approached from the perspective of the historian and historical geographer.<sup>10</sup> These approaches have been founded on the study of contemporary documents which provide a sound historical basis but lack a reliable wider spatial context. A characterisation approach, based on county-wide

---

<sup>1</sup> Gaddis 2002, 32

<sup>2</sup> Hoskins 1955

<sup>3</sup> Beresford 1956, 1957

<sup>4</sup> Stamp 1955

<sup>5</sup> Crawford 1953; Fox 1938

<sup>6</sup> For a review of Hoskins' influence see Johnson 2007, 55-8; Matless 1993

<sup>7</sup> Zube 1984; Dearden 1981

<sup>8</sup> C. Newman 2009, 195; Clark *et al* 2004

<sup>9</sup> Newman and Hardie 2007

<sup>10</sup> Winchester 1987 and 2000a; Whyte 2003

mapping of eighteenth and nineteenth century date, provides such a context. It is the intention of this thesis to examine whether this mapping provides a means of reconstructing the likely settlement and field patterns of the late medieval landscape.

### **Cumbria: Location, Geology and Topography**

Cumbria is one of England's largest counties, covering an area of 676,780ha (Figure 1.1). It has a very varied and largely rural landscape, and is the second most sparsely populated county in England.<sup>11</sup> It forms the most north westerly part of England and shares a border with Scotland. Though of recent origin, the county has clear natural boundaries, as was noted even before the modern county's foundation,<sup>12</sup> with the Pennines to the east, the Lune Valley and Morecambe Bay to the south, the Solway Estuary to the north and the Irish Sea to the west, and the Lake District massif at its heart. It contains within it all or part of five nationally designated landscapes: the Lake District and Yorkshire Dales national parks, and the North Pennines, Solway Coast and Arnsdale Silverdale areas of outstanding natural beauty (AONBs). The Lake District is the largest national park in England and contains England's highest mountain, Scafell Pike at over 987m.<sup>13</sup> Much of the county has an upland character, especially the central Lake District, the Howgill Hills, the Orton Fells and the North Pennines.

The study area does not include all of the modern county of Cumbria (Figure 1.2) but excludes the sands and estuaries below the high water mark, and a small area of the Yorkshire Dales National Park, comprising the parishes of Garsdale, Sedburgh and Dent. This area clearly shares landscape characteristics with the Yorkshire Dales,<sup>14</sup> was historically part of the West Riding of Yorkshire and was never considered part of the 'Lake Counties'.<sup>15</sup> The concept of the 'Lake Counties' appears to have its roots at least in the eighteenth century and embraced the historic counties of Cumberland, Westmorland and the part of Lancashire known as Lancashire-over-Sands.<sup>16</sup> This is the defined geographical unit which forms the study area for this research. It also includes the township of Dalton which, before 1899, was part of Lancashire but which always

---

<sup>11</sup> Cumbria County Council 2010

<sup>12</sup> Bouch and Jones 1961, 2

<sup>13</sup> Newman and Hardie 2007, 3

<sup>14</sup> Countryside Commission 1998, 76

<sup>15</sup> Winchester 2005, 29; R. Newman 2011a, 98

<sup>16</sup> See West 1778 and Houseman 1802

intercommoned its common wastes with the Westmorland township of Burton-in-Kendal.<sup>17</sup>

Geologically, the Lake District is a small dome of Palaeozoic rocks, the edge of which is generally marked by a sharp change in slope that broadly coincides with the 250m contour and the boundaries of the Lake District National Park (Figure 1.3).<sup>18</sup> Facing the Lake District is the steep scarp face and peaty plateau of the North Pennines. Between these two upland massifs are lowlands including the Eden Valley, which like the Solway coast to the north, is formed of Permo-Triassic rocks. Forming an intermediate zone between the Eden Valley lowlands and the Lake District uplands is a curving band of Carboniferous Limestones stretching around the edge of the Lake District from Kirkby Stephen to Workington.<sup>19</sup> The nature of the Lake District, especially the formation of the lakes, is a consequence of glaciation, which also resulted in extensive areas of drumlins outside the Lake District core and a widespread coverage of glacial drift deposits. Many of the uplands, particularly in the North Pennines, have large areas of peat cover forming blanket bog.<sup>20</sup> Close to the Scottish border and along the Solway coast and around Morecambe Bay especially are extensive areas of lowland peat moss.<sup>21</sup> Salt marsh is a characteristic feature of the Solway coast, the Duddon estuary and Morecambe Bay.

For much of its history, Cumbria was politically, economically and environmentally peripheral with regard to the rest of England. This marginality was a consequence of its location on the border with Scotland and its distance from the centres of economic and political power.<sup>22</sup> The Scottish border was an area of conflict and turbulence from the thirteenth to the seventeenth centuries and this impacted negatively on the economic development of north Cumbria, at least.<sup>23</sup> By 1600 in comparison to other regions of England, Cumbria appears to have been under-developed economically.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Newman and Newman 2009b

<sup>18</sup> Smith 1992, 1

<sup>19</sup> Smith 1992, figure 1, 1-11; Ratcliffe 1997, 13-16

<sup>20</sup> Ratcliffe 1997, 36

<sup>21</sup> Hodgkinson *et al* 2000

<sup>22</sup> Winchester 2006, 12-13

<sup>23</sup> Bouch and Jones 1961, 79

<sup>24</sup> Bouch and Jones 1961, 24-28; Winchester 2006, 40-41

## Historical Context

The modern county of Cumbria was established following local government reorganisation in 1974.<sup>25</sup> It was formed from a combination of the historic counties of Cumberland and Westmorland along with part of the West Riding of Yorkshire and part of Lancashire (Figure 1.2). The part of Lancashire included in Cumbria is known as Lancashire-over-Sands, because it was physically separated from the rest of the county by the sands of Morecambe Bay. From at least the eighteenth century, Cumberland, Westmorland and Lancashire-over-Sands were recognised as having a distinct geographical identity,<sup>26</sup> and became known as either the Lake Counties or Lakeland.<sup>27</sup> Westmorland and Cumberland were among the last counties to be established in England, sometime in the twelfth century, though both had been used as territorial names for at least 200 years previously.<sup>28</sup>

As a territorial unit Cumbria has been studied as an historical entity for nearly 250 years.<sup>29</sup> Since 1866, the area has been covered by the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society which, despite its name, has always included Lancashire-over-Sands.<sup>30</sup> The Transactions, Extra Series and Occasional Papers of the Society provide a valuable resource for anyone studying the archaeology or history of Cumbria. In particular, during the earlier part of the twentieth century, parish and township histories by local historians<sup>31</sup> provide some compensation for the lack of Victoria County History coverage for Cumberland and, to a lesser extent, Westmorland. Cumberland has two general Victoria County History volumes<sup>32</sup> but Westmorland is not covered at all. Lancashire-over-Sands, however, is covered in detail as part of the eight-volume Victoria County History of Lancashire, published between 1907 and 1914.<sup>33</sup>

The landscapes of some individual parishes and townships have been examined by the National Trust within their Lake District estates. These are generally unpublished reports but they tend to be detailed and contain a wealth of historical and archaeological

---

<sup>25</sup> Office for National Statistics n.d.

<sup>26</sup> For example Nicolson and Burn 1777a and b, West 1778; Houseman 1802 and Baines 1829

<sup>27</sup> As shown in the titles of works by Collingwood 1938 and Heaton Cooper 1938

<sup>28</sup> Winchester 1987, 14; Phythian-Adams 1996, 90-3, 110-11

<sup>29</sup> Nicolson and Burn 1777 a and b; Whellan 1860

<sup>30</sup> For example see Collingwood 1933

<sup>31</sup> Such as the Rev T.H.B. Graham

<sup>32</sup> Doubleday 1901 and Wilson 1905

<sup>33</sup> Farrer and Brownbill 1914

landscape information, of all periods. Most of these surveys were undertaken within the last 20 years.<sup>34</sup> In addition, Brian Roberts undertook research in the 1990s on various settlements in the Eden Valley, concentrating on medieval village planning and plan forms.<sup>35</sup> In the later 1990s, Roberts and Stuart Wrathmell mapped England's dispersed and nucleated settlement patterns for English Heritage. This research resulted in two publications, one primarily consisting of maps<sup>36</sup> and the other an assessment of the character of medieval settlement across England.<sup>37</sup> Their work was based on a retrogressive analysis of the 1<sup>st</sup> edition Ordnance Survey nineteenth century 6 inch to 1 mile mapping. Their map placed Cumbria primarily in the zone of dispersed settlement and 'unplanned' field systems which characterise so much of western England. Historical geographers have traditionally divided England and Wales into Highland and Lowland zones with the Lowland zone divided into Champion and Woodland landscapes, or ancient and planned countryside.<sup>38</sup> Cumbria, except for a tiny fraction of Lancashire-over-Sands and south Westmorland, is usually wholly placed in the Highland zone, with the remainder being considered ancient countryside.<sup>39</sup> Yet at a county-scale it is clear that there are areas which primarily share characteristics with the planned landscapes of the Champion regions. These are areas characterised by nucleated settlements and regular fields.<sup>40</sup> The areas which differed were the Solway Plain and Vale of Eden, where nucleation was seen as the predominant settlement characteristic associated with cultivated champion land.<sup>41</sup> This pattern is broadly recognisable in today's landscape, even though the HLC for Cumbria indicated that the picture was more complex, and that the use of nineteenth century map evidence alone might have severe limitations.<sup>42</sup> In particular, Roberts and Wrathmell's maps were drawn after much of the common waste had been enclosed and industrialisation was well advanced and had greatly influenced settlement development.<sup>43</sup> This thesis will test the accuracy

---

<sup>34</sup> National Trust n.d.; Oxford Archaeology North 2003, 2007 and 2009

<sup>35</sup> Roberts 1993; 1996a and 1996b

<sup>36</sup> Roberts and Wrathmell 2000

<sup>37</sup> Roberts and Wrathmell 2002

<sup>38</sup> Baker and Butlin 1973; Rackham 1976, 16-17; Rackham 1986, 4-5; Williamson *et al* 2013, 8-9

<sup>39</sup> Rackham 1976, 16

<sup>40</sup> Williamson 2004, 62

<sup>41</sup> Roberts and Wrathmell 2002, 5 and 64

<sup>42</sup> Cumbria County Council 2009

<sup>43</sup> R. Newman 2009

of both these views in relation to the late-eighteenth century and late medieval landscapes.

There has been one previous specific study of the medieval landscape of Cumbria, produced by Angus Winchester.<sup>44</sup> This was primarily an historical geography based on intensive research into contemporary documents. It was very much a bottom-up approach, based largely on his detailed PhD research in the Barony of Copeland,<sup>45</sup> though his book does cover the whole of the county. Winchester's study provides an overview of the administrative and lordship structure of medieval Cumbria, and examines some of the processes for change. These processes are further studied in Winchester's more recent examination of the development of northern English upland landscapes in the late medieval and early post medieval periods.<sup>46</sup> His work, however, does not link to, or provide an explanation for, the occurrence, distribution and nature of medieval archaeological remains in Cumbria. Whilst Winchester provides an historical overview, unlike Roberts and Wrathmell, he does not examine patterns of settlement and field systems and how they relate to each other. Roberts and Wrathmell, conversely, examine patterns at a national level but an examination of the local conditions which underlie these patterns lay outside their remit.

### **Aims and Objectives**

The primary aim of this research is to produce an analysis of the development of rural settlement patterns and field systems in Cumbria from the later medieval period through to the late eighteenth century. The intention is to span the gap between Roberts and Wrathmell's identification of nineteenth-century-derived patterns and Winchester's detailed analysis of medieval processes. It will examine whether there is any significance to the patterns and how they can be explained. The period of study is bracketed by the effects of population decline at the outset and the impact of industrialisation at the close. In general, the settlement pattern noted in the eighteenth century appears to have been established by the fourteenth century,<sup>47</sup> although there were some minor changes to settlement density pattern and distribution in the late medieval period, especially in more upland areas. The county maps compiled in the later eighteenth century, therefore, to a degree reflect the landscape characteristics

---

<sup>44</sup> Winchester 1987

<sup>45</sup> Winchester 1978

<sup>46</sup> Winchester 2000a

<sup>47</sup> Winchester 2006, 40

which existed in the later medieval period.<sup>48</sup> One of the aims of this research will be to test the accuracy of this hypothesis.

The primary output of this research will be a mappable overview of the later medieval and late eighteenth century landscapes of Cumbria. From this it should be possible to assess differing characteristics throughout the study area in the late Middle Ages and in the eighteenth century and judge the likely level of retention of medieval characteristics into the eighteenth century. It is contended that that this approach will allow a better understanding of the legacy and legibility of medieval characteristics within the modern landscape. The mappable overview also provides a landscape-scale context into which specific archaeological data can be inserted,<sup>49</sup> such as point data derived from the Cumbria HER.<sup>50</sup>

Like all maps, whether scratched in the sand, drawn on vellum or generated from a computerised database, the overview maps are not a description of a specific reality but an interpretation. The maps reflect their purpose<sup>51</sup> and the data available. Hence the overview maps produced by this research focus primarily on settlement type, field systems and patterns of enclosed and unenclosed land. The overview maps are not a reflection of a specific point in time but are a distillation and a synthesis of particular landscape aspects across a chronological spectrum. The maps do not infer that any spatial feature recorded existed in precise chronological association with every other feature depicted. As such, an impression of aspects of both the later medieval and eighteenth century landscapes are provided, though the latter is closer to being a 'point in time' representation.

### **Justification of approach**

The development of the landscape of Cumbria in the late medieval and post medieval periods is a topic suitable for the application of a characterisation-based approach, in combination with map regression. The sub-regional scale approach of HLC provides a clear framework in which to carry out such an analysis. It provides a mechanism for recognising and analysing patterns and a tool for testing hypotheses,<sup>52</sup> as well as

---

<sup>48</sup> MacNair and Williamson 2010, 114-117; Williamson

<sup>49</sup> Turner 2007a, 44-45

<sup>50</sup> Cumbria has two discrete Historic Environment Records for the area of study, for the Lake District National Park and for the area outside the Park

<sup>51</sup> Gaddis 2002, 33

<sup>52</sup> C. Newman 2009, 198



comparison with the patterns defined in other studies.<sup>53</sup> It allows the elimination of later developments in the landscape, in order to identify older historic patterns. It is the patterns of landscape, and the relationship between the landscape elements such as settlement, fields, roads, woodland and so on, which allow a definition of distinctive character.<sup>54</sup>

Beyond the late eighteenth century, and the county maps which provide complete coverage of the study area, the definition of historic character will be reliant on the evidence available, which is inevitably incomplete. Even so, it is possible to define historic landscape character at a county scale for periods earlier than the late-eighteenth century, as long as the limitations are well understood. The external forces, whether natural, political, economic or social, can then be assessed against the landscape patterns in order to look at the underlying pressures which may influence the development of the landscape. One of the ways in which patterns of historic character can be assessed at a county scale is through the use of character areas. These allow areas of different distinct character to be compared against each other and to assess the underlying factors which may have led to the development of that character. The use of two sets of character areas, for the late eighteenth century and for the late medieval period, allow an assessment of the scale of landscape continuity and change to be made between the two, and to assess both against the character areas defined in the HLC project.<sup>55</sup>

The usefulness of HLC as a research tool has been repeatedly questioned. Some have queried the use of modern and nineteenth century maps as aids to understanding earlier landscapes,<sup>56</sup> others have suggested that HLC is poor at actually capturing character.<sup>57</sup> The former point will be addressed to some extent within this study. The latter point criticises the two dimensional nature of HLC because it essentially characterises field shapes and settlement patterns as depicted on maps. This study adopts that aspect of HLC as a strength for understanding past settlement and field morphology. The criticism that this is somehow imperfect because it does not embrace the full experiential perception of an individual moving through a landscape is misguided, as HLC is a technique to characterise on the basis of mapped features and not a mechanism

---

<sup>53</sup> Roberts and Wrathmell 2002

<sup>54</sup> Knowles 1983, 7

<sup>55</sup> Newman and Hardie 2007; Cumbria County Council 2009

<sup>56</sup> Rippon 2007, 6

<sup>57</sup> Williamson 2007, 69

for recreating a three-dimensional perceptual experience. The critique that HLC fails to ‘capture the essence of local distinctiveness’<sup>58</sup> is addressed through the definition and use of character areas, which have been successfully used to tease out the diverse distinctive personalities of local landscapes in other studies<sup>59</sup>.

### **Methodology**

This thesis is based on a digital dataset which was generated from information taken from a range of sources, using data from the HLC project for Cumbria and the Lake District National Park as the baseline. Relevant mapped data was extracted from these and combined with information taken from the late eighteenth century county maps for Cumbria, enclosure maps, and secondary sources to produce a thematic, graphically based overview of the later eighteenth century landscape of the county. Through enhancement, using a variety of cartographic, published primary sources and secondary sources, a map regression was undertaken to produce a map which attempts to depict an impression of the later medieval landscape. Map regression as a technique identifies changes in the landscape from later to earlier maps, allowing such changes to be plotted on a modern map base.<sup>60</sup> Usually this technique is used at a parish or township scale but with the aid of a computer it can be applied at a county scale.

### ***The GIS Mapping***

The mapping of historic landscape features for this study was carried out using the graphical user interface application ArcMap<sup>TM</sup>, which is part of the ArcGIS<sup>®</sup> geographical information system by ESRI. This was used for the spatial plotting and recording of attributes for each historic landscape type. Manipulation of settlement data was carried out using Kernel Density tool in ArcGIS<sup>®</sup> Spatial Analyst.<sup>61</sup>

This study employed an attribute-based approach to the mapping process, similar to that used for the Cumbria HLC Project. The Cumbria HLC project, however, recorded all data as polygons in a single layer with one attribute table. In this study the data for each landscape type was recorded in separate layers, each with its own table of attributes. Most of the layers captured the information as polygons, but some point and polyline data was also used. Given the need to represent much of the data at a county scale and the large numbers of individual entries, for example, it was decided to record

---

<sup>58</sup> Williamson 2007, 70

<sup>59</sup> Turner 2007b, 113

<sup>60</sup> Aston 2013

<sup>61</sup> See below, section on Data Manipulation

settlements as points and roads as polylines. Data derived from settlements, such as grange and vaccary centres, were also digitised as point data to make it more legible at a county scale.

The attribute tables provided information on every object in the table. Each row in the table represented an object in each landscape type with the data which defined it, and each column (or Field) represented a different type of information. Appendix One provides details of the attribute structure for each landscape type, with the range of data used for each column (or Field). In many cases, the range of attributes in each field was free text, such as 'Name' or 'Source'. Some fields had a defined range of attributes, such as 'Settlement Type'. The attribute structure was deliberately kept simple. The aim was not to replicate the kinds of data captured in the HLC, but to add an interpretative layer which could be laid over the original data set. The polygon datasets for irregular enclosure, for example, did not record field shape or boundary loss, as that information can be extracted from the original HLC data set.

### *Data Capture*

The mapping was based on the Ordnance Survey 1:25,000 digital raster versions of the Ordnance Survey Explorer<sup>®</sup> paper map series, sourced from the Digimap<sup>®</sup> Ordnance Survey collection from the EDINA service. Also used were the historic Ordnance Survey maps, Epoch 1 and Epoch 2, taken from Landmark Historic Map Data, also sourced from the Digimap<sup>®</sup> Ordnance Survey collection from the EDINA service.

Relevant layers were imported as Shape files from the vector-based HLC project.<sup>62</sup> This comprised two discrete data sets: for the Lake District National Park and for the rest of Cumbria outside the park and excluding that part of the modern county which historically lay within the West Riding of Yorkshire. The Cumbria and Lake District National Park HLC project was undertaken as part of an English Heritage-funded national programme of HLC. It was based on data derived from the modern and historic Ordnance Survey maps, therefore the earliest evidence base dated to the 1860s. The characterisation of the small area of Cumbria lying within the Yorkshire Dales National Park was undertaken separately as part of the project covering that national park, and has been excluded from this research. The results of the Lake District National Park

---

<sup>62</sup> Appendix 2

characterisation were published as a full report,<sup>63</sup> while the results from the rest of the county were made available as an online research tool with guide.<sup>64</sup>

Only those landscape types were imported which would inform the interpretation of the late eighteenth century landscape and the late medieval landscape. Layers excluded related to features post-dating the late-eighteenth century. The HLC layers used were ‘settlement’, ‘unenclosed land’ ‘wastes and commons’ ‘wastes and commons (village green)’, ‘planned private enclosure’, ‘parliamentary enclosure’, ‘unknown planned enclosure’ ‘dispersed settlement’ ‘nucleated settlement’ and ‘former strip fields’.<sup>65</sup> The ‘unenclosed land’ ‘wastes and commons’ and ‘wastes and commons (village green)’ polygons from the HLC project were used as the baseline data for mapping those areas interpreted as unenclosed or recently enclosed in the late eighteenth century. These areas were adjusted, refined and updated by data taken from the late-eighteenth century county maps and enclosures maps, by ‘heads-up’ digitising of the Ordnance Survey 1:25,000 digital raster maps. Heads-up digitising is a method of manual digitisation, carried out by tracing a mouse or digital pen over raster features displayed on a computer monitor. It is a method of vectorising digital data, in this case tracing features shown on the raster-based Ordnance Survey maps and converting them to vector polygons. The dispersed and nucleated settlement polygon data was also imported from the HLC project, with a subset selected for all those entries known to pre-date 1770. This was converted to point data, to facilitate a county-wide analysis of settlement pattern and distribution. The ‘former strip field’ landscape type was used as a base for a ‘heads-up’ digitisation of areas of former common arable, which was then refined using secondary sources.

Other data was captured by visual comparison of cartographic sources with the baseline maps, and the ‘heads-up’ digitising of the Ordnance Survey manuscript 1:25,000 digital raster maps. It would have been possible to obtain digital copies of the late-eighteenth century county maps, and to georectify them in order to carry out ‘heads-up’ digitising directly. The cost benefit of acquiring good, clean, scanned copies of the county maps and of other manuscript maps, however, was not considered to be greater than visual inspection. Features on the county maps and other manuscript maps were identified and digitised by visual inspection against historic and modern Ordnance Survey maps. The

---

<sup>63</sup> Newman and Hardie 2007

<sup>64</sup> Newman and Newman 2009a

<sup>65</sup> See Appendix 2 for the structure of the attribute tables of each layer

advantage of digitising features in this manner meant that it provided a greater familiarity and understanding of the landscape features both on the historic maps and within the modern landscape.

*Strengths and weaknesses of specific data sources.*

The Cumbrian late-eighteenth century county maps appear to be comprehensive in their depiction of settlement, with even isolated farms and cottages shown as individual dots (Figure 1.4). Any omissions seem to relate to the difficulties of surveying in a largely upland region, with vast expanses of unenclosed mountain, and some areas with relatively few roads or landmarks. This made locating some features, particularly settlement, difficult in places, especially as field boundaries were not recorded. The lack of information relating to enclosures and common arable fields meant that, from the outset, a heavy reliance had to be placed initially on a comparison with the HLC mapping of areas of ancient enclosure and enclosed former common arable fields. This data was then enhanced by information taken from near contemporary mapping to the county maps, primarily enclosure maps, but also where necessary tithe, corn rent and estate maps. The identification of areas recently enclosed by the late-eighteenth century was more problematic as there were fewer sources of evidence other than early enclosure maps. In some cases, these could be enhanced by other, estate maps, but this is an inconsistent data set, and thus the mapped extent of recently enclosed land is almost certainly an underestimate.

The main sources for enhancing information on common arable fields, or elements was Dilley's 1972 PhD thesis on the common fields of Cumberland. These data were supplemented by a series of articles by the Rev. T.H.B. Graham, written in the 1920s and 1930s. Both sources were invaluable for identifying surviving eighteenth century areas of common arable but they were specific to Cumberland, with Graham's articles concentrating on the Eden Valley and parts of the Solway Plain. For the extent of common arable fields in the medieval period, more reliance had to be placed on the areas mapped in the HLC. This was then verified by cross-checking the areas mapped with the historical evidence provided in Dilley's PhD thesis.<sup>66</sup> In Westmorland the HLC remained the primary source for common arable field distribution in both the medieval and post-medieval period as fewer alternative sources were available.

---

<sup>66</sup> Dilley 1972

The late eighteenth century maps were mostly reliable for mapping settlement, as they could be compared directly with historic Ordnance Survey maps. In areas of more difficult terrain, however, the maps seem to be less reliable, with many farms marked as unnamed small circles, making settlement identification more difficult. The place-name volumes were used to establish the baseline for the earliest documented reference to each settlement. The strength of this approach is that this provided complete coverage, as there are volumes for each of the historic counties within the study area. The weakness of the place-name volumes is the difference in their approaches, which is likely to have led to some bias in identifying the distribution of medieval settlement. The most comprehensive are the three volumes for Cumberland, produced in 1950.<sup>67</sup> These include quite detailed entries for each township and parish. Even so, there are large gaps for the border area. In some cases, the earliest known date was identified from Donald's late-eighteenth century county map. The most recent, county-based work was the two volumes for Westmorland.<sup>68</sup> This appears to have been more selective in the entries chosen for each township and parish, with more emphasis on explaining complex names and often omitting names found commonly across the county. Thus, more reliance had to be placed on the identification of places from Jeffery's county map, and this has probably resulted in some under-representation of the extent of late medieval settlement. Finally the oldest work was that produced for Lancashire, which was published in one volume.<sup>69</sup> This was the least detailed work, and there were many gaps in the coverage of settlements shown on Yates's county map. To some extent, the gaps could be filled by reference to other place-name sources and the detailed historical coverage provided by the Victoria County History for Lancashire.<sup>70</sup> Within the Lake District, gaps in dating evidence could be filled by using the more recent place-name volume by Diana Whaley.<sup>71</sup>

The depiction of woodland on the county maps is varied. Donald appears to show mostly larger areas of woodland, whereas Yates shows large areas of woodland where it is close to certain roads. Jeffreys appears to under-represent woodland, though all recorded wood on the county maps was tested against datasets for semi-natural ancient

---

<sup>67</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950

<sup>68</sup> Smith 1967a and 1967b

<sup>69</sup> Ekwall 1922

<sup>70</sup> Mills 1976; Wyld and Hirst 1911; Farrer and Brownbill 1914

<sup>71</sup> Whaley 2006

woodland. Natural England defines surviving ancient woodland, whether replanted or not, as pre-dating 1600, based on both historical and botanical evidence.

### ***Mapping the Late-Eighteenth Century Landscape***

The first task was to create a map of the landscape of Cumbria in the late eighteenth century. The base unit, against which other data sets were assessed, was the HLC data. Attributes, such as settlement, roads and unenclosed land were then taken from the late eighteenth century county maps and used to verify the HLC data. The data was then further enhanced using other, readily accessible digital sources, including enclosure maps.<sup>72</sup> There are three county maps covering the study area within the modern county of Cumbria by William Yates (Lancashire 1786), Thomas Jeffreys (Westmorland 1770,) and Thomas Donald (Cumberland 1774). These late-eighteenth century county maps were drawn at a scale of 1 inch to 1 mile, and the data taken from them were plotted onto a 1:25,000 OS base for reproduction primarily at a 1:50,000 scale.

The map attributes used to compile the late eighteenth century landscape were settlement, woodland, roads, mills, churches and chapels, unenclosed land and recently enclosed land. As mills, churches and chapels were merely specific point data, and not of great relevance at a county scale, they were not considered further within this study. The county maps are not geographically accurate in the sense of a modern Ordnance Survey map, but they were amongst the first maps to be based on trigonometrical surveys using scientific instruments.<sup>73</sup> Although field boundaries are generally not surveyed, the relative position of features such as roads and settlements is accurate enough to visually identify them on modern and historic Ordnance Survey maps using a Geographical Information System.<sup>74</sup>

The late eighteenth century county maps have all been reproduced as modern facsimiles and published.<sup>75</sup> The most robust method of assessing the accuracy of the late eighteenth century county maps would have been to add digital versions of them to the GIS map of the historic landscape. This involved some practical difficulties, particularly given the quality of the twentieth century reproductions of the original maps. For Cumberland and Westmorland, the maps had been photographed and reprinted,<sup>76</sup> with

---

<sup>72</sup> Newman and Hardie 2009; Cumbria County Council 2009

<sup>73</sup> See Chapter 2

<sup>74</sup> See Chapter 2 for a more detailed discussion of the use of the eighteenth century county maps

<sup>75</sup> Hindle 2001a; Hindle 2002a; Harley 1968a

<sup>76</sup> Hindle 2001b and 2002b

some inevitable reduction of quality, particularly with Donald's map of Cumberland which appears to have been taken from a well-used and somewhat dirty printed copy. There were also problems with blurring of the image of the outer edges of the map. Yates's map of Lancashire had been photographed and reprinted in book form in 1968<sup>77</sup> and, like the map of Cumberland, the quality of the reprinted image was too poor to scan and import as a layer into the GIS. Although the map of Lancashire is also available digitally on CD, the images are copyright protected and were not available for importing into the GIS.

An original published copy of the Cumberland map, kept in the county archives in Carlisle,<sup>78</sup> was photographed digitally and a digital version of Jeffery's map of Westmorland was provided by Cumbria County Council,<sup>79</sup> scanned from the map held in the Cumbria Record Office in Kendal. Attempts were made to georeference the maps of Cumberland and Westmorland, and add them as layers to the GIS. It was clear, however, that there were some issues of accuracy related to both maps, leading to errors when comparisons were made with modern Ordnance Survey maps. As a result, information was taken by visual comparison between digital versions of the county maps and nineteenth-century and modern Ordnance Survey maps. In most cases, features marked on the eighteenth-century maps could be identified on the later maps, and therefore added accurately to the GIS map. This methodology allowed the comparison of the eighteenth-century county maps with modern mapping, and an estimate of accuracy to be made. This confirmed that the late-eighteenth century county maps were accurate in the relative positions of features, and suggested that they were reasonably accurate geographically. To test this assumption further, however, would require the maps to be scanned or recorded by vertical photography in order to georeference each map sheet with a smaller degree of error. This was not necessary as part of the current research purposes and aims, because features on the county maps could be recognised on the digital 1<sup>st</sup> edition Ordnance Survey maps and the information plotted from those using 'heads-up' digitisation.

The accuracy of the HLC data was compared against information taken from the eighteenth century county maps. None of the late-eighteenth century county maps show field boundaries, so a direct comparison between these maps and the Ordnance Survey

---

<sup>77</sup> Harley 1968a

<sup>78</sup> CCA shelfmark CA/6/19

<sup>79</sup> Kindly provided by Cumbria County Council from the original scan by John Robinson



maps cannot be made to determine the extent of smaller areas of enclosure subsequent to the late eighteenth century. It has been argued that the lack of boundaries shown on Jeffery's map means that the extent of enclosures cannot be shown for the period.<sup>80</sup> By plotting the unenclosed land, however, an estimate was made of the extent of enclosed and cultivated land from what remains. Unenclosed waste is shown on all the county maps, though the edges of common waste are most clearly shown where there are significant areas of unenclosed moss or lowland moor. In areas of fell and upland moor, steep hill slopes depicted by hachures are taken to mark the edge of unenclosed land, and it can be difficult to plot the exact limits of enclosure. Where unenclosed land extends beyond the hills and fells, the boundaries are usually shown with a definite edge.

The scale at which the county maps were drawn does not allow for the accurate mapping of unenclosed waste without other, corroborative data, therefore the areas of mapped unenclosed land was refined further, with information taken from enclosure maps of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. For much of the former county of Westmorland information on newly enclosed land shown on the enclosure maps was provided by Professor Ian Whyte, transcribed onto modern 1:25,000 Ordnance Survey maps. For the whole of the county of Cumberland, for Lancashire-over-Sands, and for areas where questions of uncertainty arose in Westmorland, original enclosure maps were consulted. This involved visits to all four Cumbria Archive Centres in Carlisle, Barrow-in-Furness, Kendal and Whitehaven, as well as to the Lancashire Record Office in Preston and the National Archives in Kew. A total of 305 enclosure maps were consulted. A full list is contained in the Bibliography and in Appendix 3 where a list of all maps used is listed by modern parish.

The areas of new enclosure, as shown on the late-eighteenth century enclosure maps, were plotted onto modern 1:25,000 Ordnance Survey maps, and then digitised onto ArcGIS as polygons, using a digital copy of the Ordnance Survey 1:25,000 as the base map. Areas of land, which were newly enclosed in the late eighteenth century, were plotted against modern field boundaries where possible, using historic Ordnance Survey maps to provide further information where boundaries had changed significantly.

Enclosure maps form the key, independent and verifiable data source for identifying areas of recently enclosed and unenclosed land in the late eighteenth century. They were usually undertaken by professional surveyors, both trained in accurate mapping and

---

<sup>80</sup> Richards 2011, 16, note 10

generally knowledgeable about contemporary local farming practices.<sup>81</sup> They provide detailed information on parish and township boundaries, the extent and shape of settlements, as well as defining areas enclosed in a systematic and planned manner from the mid- eighteenth century through to the middle of the nineteenth century, often on a large scale. In some cases, they also identify areas of existing, or ancient enclosures. The majority of maps and agreements concern the enclosure of common waste, but there are also a number recording the enclosure of areas of common arable. In most cases, they were used to confirm or adjust the boundaries of unenclosed land and recently enclosed land.

Some areas of earlier eighteenth century, systematic and planned enclosure have no known documentary record. Thus, they were identified and mapped from the HLC project, the late eighteenth century county maps and enclosure maps. Specifically, large-scale enclosure which had taken place before 1770 was categorised and mapped as recently enclosed land. In addition, HLC was used to identify individual, and often large, piecemeal enclosures, usually intakes from the fell sides, and some nineteenth-century enclosure maps documented the systematic enclosure and partition of existing post medieval cow pastures on the low fells.<sup>82</sup>

Initial data on settlement was taken as a subset from the HLC polygon layer, based on those places also shown on the county maps. The HLC polygon data recorded the extent of settlements as they were depicted on the Ordnance Survey 1<sup>st</sup> edition maps. For individual farms and houses, this probably reflected the actual size of the settlement in the late eighteenth century, but for nucleated settlements, it was more difficult to accurately assess whether this was a true reflection of the size of the eighteenth century town or village. All three county maps made some attempt to show the settlement layout and relative size and importance of towns and villages, though clearly, at a 1 inch to 1 mile scale this is not very detailed, and this did not necessarily reflect the actual size of the settlement. As a result of the difficulty in depicting the actual size of larger settlements in the late eighteenth century, and to depict a meaningful distribution of settlements at a county scale, the polygon layer was converted to a points layer. Each settlement point was then characterised as either discrete (i.e. individual) settlements, small nucleated settlements or nucleated settlements, based on the conventions used for the late eighteenth century county maps. On the county maps, individual houses and

---

<sup>81</sup> See Chapter 2

<sup>82</sup> KCA WPR/9/14/1/3; WPR/9/14/1/7; WPR/9/14/1/8

farms are shown as single dots, hamlets are shown as small clusters of dots, and towns and villages were depicted according to their size and plan form. A decision on how to categorise smaller villages or larger hamlets was estimated on the number of dwellings. A note has been made of each settlement which is no longer extant.

The map of Cumbria's eighteenth century landscape is intended to be viewed at a minimum scale of 1:50,000. The depiction of settlement as polygons is therefore impractical at this scale, and the centre of each settlement polygon, therefore, has also been represented by point data, symbolised according to type: discrete or individual farms and houses, small nucleations such as hamlets, and town and villages. The aim of characterising the late-eighteenth century landscape of Cumbria was to map landscape pattern in the form of settlement, enclosure and unenclosed land at a county scale, rather than trying to create a digital version of the late-eighteenth century county maps.

#### ***Mapping the Late Medieval Landscape***

The map of the late medieval landscape was based on the eighteenth-century landscape mapping, enhanced by data taken from primary sources, both published and unpublished, as well as selected secondary sources. One of the key sources of information was the range of pre-late-eighteenth century estate maps available in the Cumbria archives offices and in the National Archives in Kew. A complete list of the maps consulted is provided in Appendix 3. Amongst the manuscript maps used were a number dating to the sixteenth and seventeenth century, which provide glimpses into the landscape at the end of the medieval period. These include the important series of thirteen maps which accompany the early seventeenth century Gilsland survey,<sup>83</sup> which taken together provide an overview of a large area of Cumberland. Three maps of Sadgill, dating to 1578, help to capture the process of piecemeal enclosure and improvement from the waste,<sup>84</sup> whilst the map of Bolton Wood<sup>85</sup> near Gosforth in west Cumbria shows the extent and nature of late medieval settlement.<sup>86</sup> The 1586 map of Angerton Moss<sup>87</sup> also provides a picture of the piecemeal enclosure of wastes, in this case the gradual process of taking in and improving land around the edge of the

---

<sup>83</sup> CCA DHN/C713-001 — DHN/C713-013

<sup>84</sup> TNA MPB/1/61

<sup>85</sup> TNA Ward/2/61/241/14

<sup>86</sup> For these maps, see Chapter 6

<sup>87</sup> TNA MPC/1/34

extensive lowland mosses.<sup>88</sup> The late sixteenth and early seventeenth century maps of the lands around the Scottish borders<sup>89</sup> also provided invaluable information of the extent and nature of settlement prior to extensive rationalisation and reorganisation of the landscape, as well as on the extent of woodland cover in the area at the end of the medieval period.<sup>90</sup>

Some maps, particularly some of the Gilsland Survey maps, provided important information of the extent of common arable fields at the end of the medieval period.<sup>91</sup> Even at the beginning of the seventeenth century, the maps show the process of consolidation of holdings in the common arable fields and piecemeal enclosure had already begun. In general, however, evidence for the presence of common arable fields and for the date and rate of enclosure was derived from secondary sources. Most of these related to Cumberland, with a series of early twentieth century articles in the *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society* by Graham and Elliott.<sup>92</sup> In addition the PhD thesis by Dilley on common land provided a list of former common arable field locations.

The identification of medieval settlement was based mainly on the place-name evidence used to establish the settlement pattern of the late-eighteenth century. A subset of this data was produced for those settlements where the first documented date was pre-1600. Some additional medieval settlements were identified from primary and secondary sources, as well as from sixteenth and seventeenth century manuscript maps. Monastic granges were identified from sources such as cartularies. These were available as published and transcribed primary sources,<sup>93</sup> with the cartulary for Lanercost Priory transcribed and analysed in a PhD thesis.<sup>94</sup> The three volume *Records of the Barony of Kendale*,<sup>95</sup> and *The Later Records Relating to North Westmorland or the Barony of Appleby*,<sup>96</sup> contained information on granges and secular grants of land which were useful for mapping the origins of many settlements. Particular attention was paid to

---

<sup>88</sup> This map is discussed in more detail in Chapter 5

<sup>89</sup> TNA MPF/1/257, 1552; MPF/1/285, 1590; MPC/1/80, 1607

<sup>90</sup> These maps are discussed in Chapter 6

<sup>91</sup> For example at Talkin, CCA DHN/C713-008

<sup>92</sup> See Bibliography

<sup>93</sup> For example Atkinson 1888 and Wilson 1915

<sup>94</sup> Todd 1991

<sup>95</sup> Farrer 1923; Farrer 1924; Curwen 1926

<sup>96</sup> Curwen 1932

monastic granges because the sources provided more detail, including some descriptions of land holding boundaries, than was readily available for other types of discrete settlement. Plotting the distribution of the granges provided an overview of a type of discrete settlement, which aided the analysis of dispersed settlement.

Other sources used for the identification of medieval settlements and enclosed lands were mainly secondary sources, in particular the work of Angus Winchester. This included his PhD thesis<sup>97</sup> and *Landscape and Society in Medieval Cumbria*,<sup>98</sup> as well as a number of articles, all of which are listed in the Bibliography. Winchester's work was also essential in the identification of forests and vaccaries,<sup>99</sup> along with the national project on mapping medieval forests which was published as *Forests and Chases of Medieval England and Wales c. 1000-c.1500*.<sup>100</sup> This work also provided information on deer parks, though the mapping was based largely on data gathered by Harry Hawkins's personal research which he freely made available. This was supplemented by primary records from the Calendar of Patent Rolls, which are published online by the University of Iowa.<sup>101</sup>

### ***Data Manipulation***

In order to compare the distribution and levels of dispersion and nucleation of settlement within the study area, and to compare those with the settlement maps produced by Roberts and Wrathmell,<sup>102</sup> the density tool in ArcGIS® Spatial Analyst was used to analyse settlement patterns. This was done using the Kernel Density tool which calculates the density of features in a neighborhood around those features. The density value is calculated from a conceptual smoothly curved surface over each point, with the highest surface value at the location of the point, diminishing to zero at a defined search radius distance from the point. The density analysis was run for late-eighteenth century settlement and for medieval settlement. The analysis was run twice for each settlement data set. The first was unweighted, giving equal value to all types of settlement: discrete farms and cottages, small nucleations and nucleated settlements. The analysis was then run again with weighted values allocated to the settlements according to size. The

---

<sup>97</sup> Winchester 1978

<sup>98</sup> Winchester 1987

<sup>99</sup> Winchester 2003a; Winchester 2004; Winchester 2010b

<sup>100</sup> Langton and Jones 2010

<sup>101</sup> Boynton 2003

<sup>102</sup> Roberts and Wrathmell 2000; 2002

weighting value determined the number of times the point was counted in the calculation. For example, small nucleations were given a value of three, so the point was counted as three points. This is explained further in Chapter 6, where this approach is used to examine issues relating to settlement dispersion and nucleation.

### ***Ground Truthing***

Site visits were confined primarily to rights of way and comprised visual inspections only, no surveying was undertaken. They were carried out in order to clarify questions arising from the mapped data, and to provide confirmation of the interpretation of some features. Visits were concentrated in the Vale of Eden, especially in nucleated settlements such as Dufton, Hilton, Murton, Newby, Reagill and Sleagill, as well as on the west coast around the villages of Rottington and Coulderton and at Wasdale Head in Wasdale.

Visits were also made to answer specific questions which arose during the mapping process. In Ainstable, ground truthing was carried out to identify the nature of the modern settlement and whether there was surviving evidence for the settlement shift which appears to have taken place since the late eighteenth century. Hardendale and Oddendale were visited as settlements which appear to have shrunk from their medieval extent, and Warcop in order to identify a possible shift in settlement focus. The area around the parish boundary between Preston Patrick and Preston Richard was walked over, as it had been subject to complex processes of change since the late eighteenth century, in order to identify any surviving evidence for earlier boundaries which matched the documentary evidence. Finally, part of the Forestry Commission's land at Ennerdale was walked over to inspect the nature of the archaeological evidence of the sites of the vaccaries which once stood near the head of the lake.

### **Summary of Thesis Approach**

The purpose of this study is to examine the development of rural settlement patterns and field systems from the late medieval period to the late eighteenth century. To do this, the chosen research methodologies were HLC and map regression. Four specific research questions were posed:

- can HLC be used as a tool to understand past landscapes and analyse landscape change?
- can a landscape-scale, map-based approach complement and address deficiencies within the standard historical approach?

- to what extent do the late-eighteenth century county maps provide a basis for a digital map of late-eighteenth century Cumbria?
- can a digital map of the late-eighteenth century landscape provide a platform to develop an interpretive map of the late medieval landscape?

On the basis of these questions, it was intended to test the following:

- the potential of the late-eighteenth century county maps as a data source to inform the landscape character of the medieval period
- the implication within the Cumbria HLC that there is a legible medieval landscape inheritance in the modern landscape character
- the accuracy of Roberts and Wrathmell's view of settlement in Cumbria
- the contention that characterisations based on nineteenth-century maps have severe limitations for understanding past landscapes.

The questions were addressed and the research progressed by using the existing Cumbria HLC as the baseline data. Certain data categories were selected from it in order to match those data categories which could be extracted from the late-eighteenth century maps. These were combined to create a data set with greater time depth than that possessed by the original Cumbria HLC. One aspect which required enhancement was the accuracy of the boundaries of unenclosed land. This was improved by digitising data derived from contemporary enclosure maps. The Cumbria HLC, the county maps and the enclosure maps formed a basis for a digitised map of the later eighteenth century landscape.

The primary deficiency within the data set for the late-eighteenth century, with regard to using it to examine earlier landscapes, was the lack of data on field systems. This was addressed by using other post-medieval maps and secondary sources. Place-name evidence was used to establish the earliest known date for settlements on the late-eighteenth century map. A limited amount of archaeological data was used to provide a greater depth of information on specific medieval sites, and published primary and secondary sources were used to add further detail where necessary. On the basis of these approaches, there were two principal products: a map depicting aspects of the late-eighteenth century landscape, and an interpretive map of the late medieval landscape.

### **Summary of Thesis Structure**

The research results are presented in a series of chapters which follow the structure of the research, hence the work on developing the map of the eighteenth century landscape is presented first in Chapters 2 and 3. The analysis of the medieval landscape, which was based upon the eighteenth century mapping, is presented in Chapters 4, 5 and 6. Chapter 2 deals with the nature of the key eighteenth century sources, primarily the county maps, their quality and how they were made. Chapter 3 focuses on the results of the mapping of the late-eighteenth century landscape, and provides a characterisation of that landscape by dividing the study area into landscape character areas. The landscape development trends revealed by this characterisation are analysed and presented in this chapter. Chapter 4 introduces the medieval landscape of Cumbria, focusing upon the impact of secular lordship on land use. In particular, it examines the effects of forests and chases. Other forms of land use suited to upland and agriculturally marginal environments, such as deer parks and vaccaries, are also examined within this chapter. Chapter 5 considers the influence of religious lordship, primarily the monasteries and their impact upon the landscape. Chapter 6 brings the results of the previous two chapters together in its examination of settlement and field systems. Chapter 6 concludes with a characterisation of the later medieval landscape.

Chapters 3 to 6 are copiously illustrated with maps derived from the digital dataset. They are used to both present results and to graphically inform the analysis described in the text. The analysis of the eighteenth century and late medieval landscapes, when contrasted with each other, allows a consideration of landscape evolution between the fourteenth and late eighteenth centuries. This is highlighted in Chapter 7, which also considered the strengths and weaknesses experienced in using the research approach used in this study. Consideration is also given to the potential for further application of this study's methodology to other projects.



## **Chapter 2. Mapping the Late Eighteenth Century Landscape of Cumbria**

The map of the late eighteenth century landscape of Cumbria was derived from three main sources. The base data was taken from the HLC project for Cumbria. The HLC comprised two separate datasets, covering the Lake District National Park and the remainder of the modern county outside both the Lake District and Yorkshire Dales National Parks. This HLC data was then enhanced by information taken from late eighteenth century county maps, and by eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century enclosure maps. The late-eighteenth century county maps provided the earliest complete coverage of the study area based on systematic, trigonometrical survey. It is important to appreciate the background to the production of these maps, including the main characters involved in their creation, and to review the strengths and weaknesses of using them to compile a digital map of the late-eighteenth century landscape. These issues are set out and explored below. An analysis of the aspects of the late-eighteenth century landscape, mapped from these sources is set out in Chapter 3.

### **Late-Eighteenth Century County Maps**

From the sixteenth century the basic British cartographic unit was the county.<sup>103</sup> For 200 years, the production of county maps remained mainly small-scale and questionable in accuracy, with later maps often copying earlier surveys.<sup>104</sup> For this reason, their systematic use in this present study has been limited in time to no earlier than the late eighteenth century. Larger scale, more accurate cartography began in the early eighteenth century, usually at a scale of one inch to one mile.<sup>105</sup> Whilst some of these large-scale maps, such as Henry Beighton's map of Warwickshire, were based on trigonometrical survey, most, like Bowen's and Kitchen's maps of the mid-eighteenth century, were less accurate and based on the traditional techniques of copying information from earlier maps.<sup>106</sup>

The impetus for new, more accurate and scientifically surveyed maps came from the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce.<sup>107</sup> It was granted a royal charter in 1847, prefixing its societal name with 'Royal' and henceforth

---

<sup>103</sup> Smith 1988, 72

<sup>104</sup> Harley 1965, 56

<sup>105</sup> Ravenhill 1972

<sup>106</sup> Smith 1988, 73; Beresiner 1983, 26

<sup>107</sup> Royal Society of Arts 2008-9

becoming known as the Royal Society of Arts. In 1759, they decided to award a prize of £100 for ‘*an accurate survey of any county upon the scale of one inch to one mile*’.<sup>108</sup> This encouraged a number of map makers to produce county maps from new survey data, rather than copying the work of earlier surveyors.<sup>109</sup> The Society stipulated that maps had to be based on trigonometrical survey, with accurate road distances and correct latitude and longitude.<sup>110</sup> Eighteenth-century map makers were able to undertake trigonometrical survey at a county scale because of improvements in surveying equipment made since the sixteenth century.<sup>111</sup>

These new instruments enabled the application of geodetic surveys, which were based on a mathematically derived grid with a topographical survey to fix individual features within it. The grid was created from one or more base lines measured out and fixed on the ground. To ensure the accuracy of a base line, it had to be level and its length measured by means of a Gunther’s Chain. Once the base line was in place, stations were established on prominent landmarks which were intervisible, so that measurements could be taken from the end of the base line to the nearest stations using a theodolite.<sup>112</sup> The theodolite measured not only distance but also the bearings of the stations. Measurements were then taken back to the base line and between stations, until a network of interconnected triangles had been made across the area being surveyed. This was the mathematical grid which formed the base of the map, and onto which individual features could be placed using topographical survey. This was done using a variety of methods, including further triangulation, plane tabling and road traverses. Plane tabling was the most time-consuming, so lesser triangles were often surveyed between the main ones, and the details filled in by road traverses.<sup>113</sup>

The production of such accurate and detailed new surveys was clearly a protracted and expensive process, so the encouragement of a cash prize did offer an important incentive, even though accurate map making was already underway in some counties before 1759.<sup>114</sup> With regard to the county maps produced, however, only 23 map-makers submitted claims, and only 13 county maps received prizes from the Society.

---

<sup>108</sup> Smith 1988, 73

<sup>109</sup> Hindle 2001a, 149

<sup>110</sup> Hindle 2001a, 139

<sup>111</sup> MacNair and Williamson 2010, 22

<sup>112</sup> MacNair and Williamson 2010, 22

<sup>113</sup> MacNair and Williamson 2010, 25

<sup>114</sup> MacNair and Williamson 2010, 10

Even so, the influence of the Society in encouraging new surveys and maps was probably greater than the figures imply. As Harley argued, this low figure is skewed by the number of new map projects undertaken by Jefferys which were not accepted by the Society, despite his eminent position as Geographer to the King.<sup>115</sup> Others, who did win the prize, were probably encouraged to go on to survey other counties. The intention of the Society was to encourage map makers to eventually map the whole of England, and by 1800, this ambition had almost been realised.<sup>116</sup>

In addition to the impetus given by the Society of Arts, there was also considerable contemporary demand for new maps from local landowners, many of whom made financial contributions to county map production, as evidenced by the subscription lists.<sup>117</sup> Among the likely reasons for the interest of landowners in map-making and map-owning at a county scale, were the contemporary landscape changes being encouraged and sponsored by their class.<sup>118</sup> This coincided with intellectual developments, such as rising levels of geographical literacy. Overall, it can be argued that the new late-eighteenth century county maps led to a virtual remapping of England at a scale of one inch to one mile or larger, and their importance is reflected in the number which appeared in sales catalogues between 1790 and 1840.<sup>119</sup>

### **The Late-Eighteenth Century County Maps of Cumbria**

There are three county-scale maps, covering the historic counties of Westmorland, Cumberland and Lancashire-over-Sands, within the study area of the modern county of Cumbria. The part of the former West Riding of Yorkshire, which is within Cumbria but outside the scope of this study, was covered by a fourth map by Thomas Jefferys. The map of Westmorland was also produced by Thomas Jeffreys, in 1770 (Figure 2.1). This was followed by a map of Cumberland in 1774, (Figure 2.2) begun by Jefferys and completed by Thomas Donald, and finally William Yates's map of Lancashire which was published in 1786. All three map makers were significant contributors to the late-eighteenth century survey and production of county-scale maps, and Donald and Jefferys were part of an important group of map makers who were involved in the production of many of the new surveys. These included Joseph Hodkinson, the engraver of the map of Cumberland, who surveyed Suffolk with Donald and John

---

<sup>115</sup> Harley 1965, 61-2 and see below, section on Thomas Jefferys

<sup>116</sup> Harley 1965, 62

<sup>117</sup> Hindle 2001a, 139

<sup>118</sup> See Chapter 3

<sup>119</sup> Harley and Walters 1978, 46

Ainslie, one of Scotland's foremost surveyors. Ainslie worked in partnership with Hodskinson and Donald for Thomas Jefferys and his son, also called Thomas.<sup>120</sup>

The attribution for the creation of the county maps varies, sometimes credited to the publisher, sometimes to the surveyor or surveyors, and at other times to the engraver. The map of Norfolk, for example, is attributed to William Faden, the publisher, rather than to Thomas Donald and Thomas Milne, the surveyors, whereas the map of Suffolk, also published by Faden, is attributed to its main surveyor, Joseph Hodskinson.<sup>121</sup>

Likewise, the map of Westmorland is credited to Thomas Jefferys, as the publisher and originator of the survey, rather than to Donald and John Ainslie, the surveyors.<sup>122</sup> The map cartouche names only Jefferys as the surveyor and engraver (Figure 2.3). The map of Cumberland has a more complicated history, because it originated as one of Thomas Jefferys' surveys, but was not completed until after his death. Generally, the Cumberland map is attributed to Thomas Donald, as the main surveyor, though Joseph Hodskinson played a key role as the engraver and initial publisher in 1774. The map cartouche cites Donald as the main creator, '*at the request of the late Mr. Jefferys*', and Hodskinson as the engraver (Figure 2.4).<sup>123</sup> The map was republished by Hodskinson in 1783, then by Faden in 1810 and Fryer in 1818, with Hodskinson and Faden also publishing the map at half-inch scales at the same time. The map of Lancashire is attributed solely to William Yates, who was both the main surveyor and publisher. The map was first proposed as a partnership venture, however, between Yates and John Chapman and then, after Chapman's death in 1779, the surveyor William Green.<sup>124</sup>

The map of Lancashire produced by William Yates<sup>125</sup> was created from two base lines of six miles and ten miles in length measured out on the 'Sea Beach'. The exact location of these lines is not known, but the ten mile line is thought to have been on the coast, thus forming two sides of the first triangle on level ground at sea level.<sup>126</sup> Three principal stations were then established on prominent landmarks, probably including Warton Crag just to the south of the Westmorland county boundary, and from there further stations on other landmarks. In Lancashire-over-Sands, the Old Man of

---

<sup>120</sup> MacNair and Williamson 2010, 19, 23, 49, 50-1

<sup>121</sup> MacNair and Williamson 2010, 49

<sup>122</sup> Hindle 2001b

<sup>123</sup> Hindle 2002b

<sup>124</sup> Harley 1968a, 10

<sup>125</sup> See below for a discussion of those involved in the production of the Cumbria maps

<sup>126</sup> Harley 1968a, 11-12

Coniston, as the highest point, was chosen along with Piel Castle in Morecambe Bay, Gummershow Hill near Windermere, and Mount Barnard in the Cartmel peninsula. The resulting network of triangles was reproduced on the map as a demonstration of the work which had gone into producing the map, and of the accuracy of that work.<sup>127</sup> Yates did not reveal in detail his survey methods stating only that, '*a series of Triangles was propagated thro the whole Survey; the most eminent Places were determined by observation of three primary Stations and the directions and measure of the Roads, the course of the Rivers and Canals, and the situations of the intermediate parts by the Theodolite and Perambulator*'.<sup>128</sup> From this it can be deduced that, once the position of the prominent places had been fixed by theodolite, roads, rivers, canals and boundaries were measured by a perambulator (a single wheel of known diameter which recorded the number of revolutions, and thus distances travelled). Changes in angles would have been recorded by theodolite or compass. Where the perambulator was not practical, they may have used a pedometer to record the surveyor's paces, probably plotting these on a plane table.<sup>129</sup>

The survey triangles were not reproduced on the maps of Cumberland and Westmorland. The scientific methods employed on the map surveys were set out clearly on the maps themselves, however. The map of Cumberland, for example, surveyed by Thomas Donald for Thomas Jefferys, stated '*In this Survey the Horizontal Distances are deduced by Trigonometrical Calculations from a Base line measured on Level Ground, the Roads, Rivers, &c. actually Surveyed and truly Delineated*', and amongst Jefferys' effects catalogued after his death were drawings of the '*triangles relating to the survey*' for the map of Westmorland amongst others.<sup>130</sup> There are no details on the survey methods, but once the network of triangles was established, the details for both maps would have been filled in by similar means to those used in the survey for the map of Lancashire; that is by theodolite, compass, plane table and road traverses.<sup>131</sup>

---

<sup>127</sup> Yates 1786

<sup>128</sup> Yates 1786

<sup>129</sup> Harley 1968a, 12-13

<sup>130</sup> Harley 1965, 58

<sup>131</sup> Hindle 2001b; Hindle 2002b

## **The Late-Eighteenth Century Map-Makers**

### ***Thomas Jefferys***

Jefferys was a well-established London-based map maker and seller, who was appointed Geographer to King George III. He was considered one of the foremost cartographers of the eighteenth century,<sup>132</sup> and was one of the most significant contributors to the series of trigonometrically accurate county-scale maps. Little is known about his background. He appears to have been born in the first couple of decades of the eighteenth century, given the 1750 date of his marriage to Elizabeth Francis, in London.<sup>133</sup> His professional background is uncertain, and he may have been trained as an engraver rather than a surveyor, as that was his professional affiliation in various documents, including his will.<sup>134</sup> Like other map makers up to that time, many of his early maps were reproduced from existing copper-plates which he had purchased, or were new engravings from existing cartographical sources.<sup>135</sup> As well as producing county maps and atlases from existing surveys, Jefferys also produced illustrations for text books, general views, town plans, and maps of the Americas and parts of Europe during the Seven Years War. He was most particularly renowned for his engraving and publication of maps from others' original surveys of North America in the 1750s and 1760s, which were supplied on a regular basis to the government.<sup>136</sup>

Jefferys turned his attention to county maps based on new surveys after the Royal Society of Arts announced its prize in 1759. His ambitious intention was to survey and publish maps of a group of counties in the south and east Midlands and the counties of Northern England. He surveyed and published a map of Bedfordshire in 1765, and in 1766 he was in the process of surveying Buckinghamshire, Huntingdonshire and Oxfordshire, with plans to survey Nottinghamshire.<sup>137</sup> The cost of undertaking several surveys at once, however, may have been a serious mistake, and in 1766, Jefferys filed for bankruptcy.<sup>138</sup> As a result, Jefferys allowed his membership of the Society of Arts to lapse, thus making him ineligible for the Prize, and he had to delay publication of some of his maps. The map of Westmorland was postponed by two years, until 1770, and the

---

<sup>132</sup> Harley 1966, 27

<sup>133</sup> Harley 1966, 30

<sup>134</sup> Harley 1966, 30

<sup>135</sup> Harley 1966, 30

<sup>136</sup> Harley 1966, 33-6

<sup>137</sup> Harley 1966, 42

<sup>138</sup> A detailed discussion of the events and consequences of Jefferys' bankruptcy is given in Harley 1966

maps of Cumberland, Yorkshire and Northamptonshire were not published until after his death in 1771.<sup>139</sup>

Although Jefferys' earlier work comprised mostly the publication of pre-existing surveys, or the reproduction of maps from existing plates, the standard of his new surveys for the county maps was of high quality. He employed some of the best surveyors, including John Ainslie, Thomas Donald and Joseph Hodskinson in Cumberland, Westmorland and Yorkshire. The surveys were carried out to the best contemporary standards of survey accuracy and cartographic depiction. Some of the field maps were surveyed at two inches to one mile, being reduced to the publication scale of one inch to one mile.<sup>140</sup>

### ***William Yates***

William Yates was a surveyor and customs officer, born in Liverpool in either 1738 or 1740.<sup>141</sup> He appears to have gained experience as a surveyor by working on the map of Derbyshire produced by Peter Burdett in the 1760s, which was only the second county survey awarded the Society of Arts Prize. Following this, he became a surveyor in the Liverpool district, and from 1772 he also took on the position of an officer in the Liverpool Customs House.<sup>142</sup> As a surveyor, he worked on a *Map of the Environs of Liverpool*, published in 1769, and then on the survey for a map of Staffordshire up until 1775, in collaboration with John Chapman with whom he had first worked in Derbyshire. He also assisted Peter Burdett with a survey of Cheshire, published in 1777. He was, therefore, well placed with substantial and relevant experience to undertake the production of the map of Lancashire, which was first proposed in 1775 in partnership with Chapman.<sup>143</sup> Following the death of Chapman in 1779, Yates engaged the surveyor, William Green, to help finish the map but, although the survey appears to have been completed in 1780, the map was not engraved until 1786. The map won a Society of Arts prize, and Yates went on to produce a map of Warwickshire and played a significant role in the improvement of water supplies to the town of Liverpool.<sup>144</sup>

---

<sup>139</sup> Harley 1966, 46

<sup>140</sup> Harley 1966, 44

<sup>141</sup> Harley 1968a, 8

<sup>142</sup> Harley 1968a, 9

<sup>143</sup> Harley 1968a, 9-10

<sup>144</sup> Harley 1968a, 11

### ***Thomas Donald***

Thomas Donald was the third key figure involved in the production of county maps in Cumbria. A professional surveyor, he was born in the early 1750s in Anthorn, on the Solway coast of Cumberland.<sup>145</sup> He worked on estate and town surveys, including a 1775 plan of an estate in Plumpton Park,<sup>146</sup> surveys in Loweswater in 1776 and 1782,<sup>147</sup> and Brackenthwaite in the parish of Lorton in 1779.<sup>148</sup> He became best known for his involvement with county maps, and from the age of 15 or 16, he was an assistant to the surveyor John Ainslie, working with him on the surveys of Buckinghamshire and Yorkshire (along with Hodskinson). For the survey of Cumberland Ainslie probably assisted Donald.<sup>149</sup> It is thought that Donald may also have worked with Ainslie for Jefferys on the survey of Westmorland in 1768.<sup>150</sup> Donald's association with Thomas Jefferys lasted seven years and with John Ainslie for six years.<sup>151</sup>

### ***Other Key Figures***

Along with John Ainslie three others played subsidiary roles in the production of the county maps of Cumbria, they were, Joseph Hodskinson, John Chapman and William Green. John Chapman was the partner to William Yates for the proposal to produce a map of Lancashire, which was first advertised in Liverpool newspapers in 1775.<sup>152</sup> He was a well-established and greatly respected surveyor who was involved in the map of Derbyshire with Peter Burdett in 1767, and in the map of Essex with Peter André in 1777.<sup>153</sup> His association with Yates probably began in Derbyshire.<sup>154</sup> William Green, who took over the partnership after Chapman's death in 1779, was a young land surveyor, aged only 19.<sup>155</sup> He established a good reputation, and following the map of Lancashire, he produced a plan of Manchester. After meeting with the topographer Thomas West, he began to develop as an artist. Basing himself in the Lake District, he

---

<sup>145</sup> MacNair and Williamson 2010, 60

<sup>146</sup> CCA DWM/1/80/1

<sup>147</sup> CCA DWM/2/96 and DWM/1/238

<sup>148</sup> CCA DWM/1/31

<sup>149</sup> Hindle 2002a, 32

<sup>150</sup> Hindle 2001b

<sup>151</sup> MacNair and Williamson 2010, 60

<sup>152</sup> Harley 1968a, 9

<sup>153</sup> Smith 1988, 77, 84

<sup>154</sup> Harley 1968a, 9

<sup>155</sup> Armit Museum n.d.



became best known for his aquatints and etchings, many of which were reproduced as prints in works on the Lake District.<sup>156</sup>

Joseph Hodskinson began his career as an engraver and worked on the map of Bedfordshire, published in 1765 by Jeffreys and surveyed by Ainslie and Donald. Hodskinson also worked as the engraver with the same team on the map of Yorkshire.<sup>157</sup> By the time work on the Cumberland map was being undertaken, he was based in offices on The Strand close to the offices of William Faden and he was working as a surveyor.<sup>158</sup> It was as a surveyor that he undertook work on the map of Suffolk between 1777 and 1782, for which he won the Society of Arts Prize.<sup>159</sup> In the 1780s, initially as a surveyor, he was devoted largely to civil engineering projects. By the 1790s he had become a consultant civil engineer, working on drainage, navigation and harbour projects, including in the Fens and on the Rochdale Canal.<sup>160</sup>

John Ainslie was a cartographer and land surveyor, born in Jedburgh on the Scottish borders. He was apprenticed to, and then worked for, Thomas Jefferys, and for whom he surveyed Bedfordshire (with Thomas Donald), Buckinghamshire and Yorkshire, as well as Westmorland. After Jefferys's death in 1771 Ainslie returned to Scotland, where he made large scale county maps and was one of Scotland's most important surveyors. He published a map of eastern Scotland, as well as charts of the south-west coast from Saltcoats to Whitehaven in Cumberland, and charts of the east coast of Scotland. He produced numerous estate plans, and surveyed canal routes, and new harbours. He also became involved with agricultural improvement, publishing *The Gentleman and Farmer's Pocket Book, Companion and Assistant* in 1802 as well as a treatise on land surveying.<sup>161</sup>

### **Comparing the Late-Eighteenth Century County Maps**

The maps depict similar features. All distinguish between different types of settlement, such as market towns, parish centres, townships, gentlemen's seats or noted houses and farm houses. They all show the hundredal divisions, roads, churches and chapels, significant areas of woodland, moss, moorland, hills defined by hachures, water and

---

<sup>156</sup> Harley 1968a, 10

<sup>157</sup> Skempton 2002, 326

<sup>158</sup> MacNair 2010

<sup>159</sup> Skempton 2002, 326

<sup>160</sup> Skempton 2002, 327

<sup>161</sup> Adams 2010

wind mills, and landscape parks (Figures 2.1 and 2.2). Unsurprisingly, given that both were surveyed and produced through Thomas Jefferys, the maps of Cumberland and Westmorland have more similarities with each other than either of them has with the map of Lancashire.

Natural features, such as unimproved moors and mosses, and hills are shown using similar conventions, but they appear cruder and less refined on the Lancashire map. All maps use hachures to mark steep slopes, though they are more heavily drawn on the Lancashire map. Likewise, the convention for waste is also more crudely drawn, and the edges are not defined by solid lines, thus appearing vague in extent. All maps show a difference in enclosed and open, or partially open roads, though only the Cumberland and Westmorland maps actually define the different conventions in the explanation. The maps of Cumberland and Westmorland also show the known Roman roads and main Roman forts. Finally, all three maps show not only the notable seats and farm houses, but also cottages, though they are not distinguished from farm houses by a separate convention (Figures 2.5 and 2.6).

#### **Reviewing the Accuracy and Limitations of the Late-Eighteenth Century County Maps**

It might be expected that the maps would be most accurate in the lower-lying, less mountainous areas of the county, and the greatest errors would be found on the boundaries between individual map sheets in the areas of the high fells. A previous analysis of Jefferys' 1771 Map of Yorkshire, however, suggests that any errors may be related to the abilities of individual surveyors.<sup>162</sup> A comparative study of maps of Yorkshire examined the accuracy of Jefferys' county map, particularly in relation to Greenwood's early nineteenth century map and the mid-nineteenth century Ordnance Survey maps. An analysis of the trigonometrical survey showed that inaccuracies did not relate to areas of more challenging terrain. Indeed, the best surveyed area appeared to be the more mountainous north west of the county. Overall, the most accurate parts appear to have been the work of John Ainslie and the poorest areas seem to have been those carried out by Joseph Hodkinson.<sup>163</sup> Draughtsman or engraver errors were also noted on the map of Yorkshire, for example discrepancies on sheet edges.<sup>164</sup> Yet generally, the depiction of main rivers and roads are considered to be highly accurate,

---

<sup>162</sup> Jones 1981, 358

<sup>163</sup> Jones 1981, 358

<sup>164</sup> Jones 1981, 365

although it is difficult to confirm the accuracy of more minor roads and routes across unenclosed moors.<sup>165</sup>

The map of Cumberland seems to have been surveyed by Donald with the help of John Ainslie, both reliable surveyors; Hodskinson does not appear to have been one of the surveyors, but he was the engraver and publisher. Donald and Ainslie also surveyed the map of Westmorland, and a high standard might be expected. Any errors in the accuracy of surveying may well be related to the particular nature of Cumbria; not only the extremely mountainous terrain, but also the vast expanses of unenclosed and relatively featureless moorland, which characterised Westmorland, in particular, but also large areas of Cumberland. Even today there are large areas of unenclosed moorland in addition to the fells and navigation on foot can be difficult away from the main roads and footpaths, even with a detailed map. Although ridges of high land, extensive woodland and moorland dominate the inland areas of Lancashire-over-Sands, Yates' map appears to contain few errors. This is possibly because the long coastline and lakes would have provided more reliable features for the survey.

Despite the difficult terrain and sparse settlement in Westmorland, Jefferys' map appears to be remarkably accurate and internally consistent, although not accurate enough to allow it to be georeferenced as an overlay to modern maps. Even so, some of the settlement details are vague, and there are a few discrepancies in some place names. There are one or two noticeable errors, such as the transposition of the neighbouring place names Reagill and Sleagill (Figure 2.7). The similarity of the names makes this more likely to be an error made by the draughtsman or engraver than by the surveyor. Elsewhere, discrepancies may have been the result of changes in place names, or the methodology employed by the surveyors in identifying them. Many of the settlements were scattered farms, and local enquiries on the names of these places would have returned the name of the tenant of the time. This makes it more likely that the names recorded on Hodgson's map, produced around 50 years later<sup>166</sup> and on the nineteenth century Ordnance Survey maps, would differ from those recorded in the 1760s.

A good example of this is Glenridding in the north-west corner of the county of Westmorland (Figure 2.8). Here a scattering of individual houses or farms are depicted on Jefferys' map, only a few of which are named: Row, Tenterhow, Gate Side, New Close and Thwaite. None of these names are given on Hodgson's map, where

---

<sup>165</sup> Jones 1981, 368-71

<sup>166</sup> Hodgson 1828

Glenridding is shown as a hamlet and there are individual settlements named Rattlebeck, Eagle, Wet Side and Bull How. The first edition Ordnance Survey map names a mixture of the two sets of names. Clearly, some settlement names have changed over time, perhaps with a change of tenants, others became identified as part of the settlement of Glenridding which developed in the nineteenth century. To some extent, the depiction of settlement in Glenridding on Jefferys' map must be considered to be symbolic of a small and relatively scattered community. The places named being those for which information could be garnered by the surveyors, or appeared to be the more significant dwellings in the settlement. Eagle Cottage is a listed building thought to date from the early part of the seventeenth century. It was considered significant enough to be named on both Hodgson and on the Ordnance Survey first edition, but not on Jefferys. It lies in the area named Thwaite in 1770. This appears to be a different dwelling, though it could be the same house with a different name.

There are similar issues with Donald's map of Cumberland, where the placement of some individual settlements is vague, and many sites are not named. These are mostly in the more remote areas of the former county, and given the difficulties of accessing some of these places, unsurprising. Yates, in his explanation of the map of Lancashire, states that it only shows gentlemen's seats and farmhouses, which has been taken to be a limitation of the map.<sup>167</sup> In comparison with the first edition and modern Ordnance Survey maps, however, his depiction of the distribution and density of settlement appears to be reasonably accurate, and this part of the modern county probably posed fewer difficulties for the surveyors in terms of landmarks and access. This limitation in the type of settlement shown was probably of greater importance elsewhere in Lancashire, particularly in the coalfields and the east Lancashire textile areas, where settlement was expanding rapidly with small cottages being built close to mines and new settlement springing up on common waste near to existing towns and villages.

It could be said that errors and inaccuracies might limit the usefulness of the county maps in interpreting the late-eighteenth century landscape of Cumbria, however, it has been argued that such limitations do not invalidate topographical content, as '*evaluation should always be undertaken in the light of specific historical requirements: elaborate techniques may be unnecessary to verify simple facts*'.<sup>168</sup> Even at a small scale, and with issues of detail, they can provide useful data for interpretation of landscape change. At

---

<sup>167</sup> Harley 1968a, 14

<sup>168</sup> Harley 1968b

Dalton, on the southern boundary of Cumbria, Yates' map shows a small area of waste which is depicted 40 years later as enclosed and named 'New Enclosure'.<sup>169</sup> The significance of this is that it helps to confirm that the visible, archaeological remains of settlement within the common are likely to post-date Yates' map.<sup>170</sup>

In general, the depiction on all the maps of the relative positions of settlements to each other, and other landscape features, are consistent and accurate. The accuracy of the edges of unenclosed waste, for example, can be assessed in most places against the transposed limits of new enclosures taken from the enclosure maps. Given the scale at which the county maps were surveyed and drawn, the areas of unenclosed waste, where defined, tends to adhere closely to the enclosure map limits when digitised onto Ordnance Survey map backgrounds. Indeed, it has been argued that it is the comparison of topographical detail of historic maps with modern maps that is one of the most important tests of accuracy.<sup>171</sup>

The exercise of mapping the limits of unenclosed waste from the county maps was made more difficult by the inconsistent representation of its edges. In the high fells, for example, the map makers clearly considered the depiction of hachures showing steep terrain to be more important than showing the full extent of unenclosed land. Depicting closely spaced hachures and unimproved waste across the same space was impracticable, leading the map makers to compromise and prioritise. In the lower-lying areas of the county, moorlands were usually provided with an edge where they met cultivated or enclosed land, and particularly where major roads pass through or close to them. In areas of sparse settlement, away from roads, this convention was not consistently applied and the edge of unenclosed waste was not marked.

Unlike Faden's Map of Norfolk, the Cumbrian late-eighteenth century county maps do not include specific information on common arable fields. In Norfolk, where these survived as extensive tracts, the common fields are named according to the township to which they belonged. Elsewhere, where there are only small, scattered areas surviving, they are distinguished by unbounded roads crossing areas that are not common waste. They are also marked by their boundaries with the enclosed fields.<sup>172</sup> In Cumbria, some inferences on the boundaries of common arable fields could be deduced by the depiction

---

<sup>169</sup> Newman and Newman 2009, 7-8

<sup>170</sup> National Heritage List n.d., scheduled monument 1021249

<sup>171</sup> Harley 1968b

<sup>172</sup> MacNair and Williamson 2010, 143-63

of stretches of road with unbounded edges outside areas of common waste. As in Norfolk roads in unenclosed areas are shown with dotted outlines and with solid lines where they ran through enclosed lands. Common arable fields were not mapped on the Cumbrian county maps because relatively few of them had survived into the late eighteenth century, and at a scale on one inch to one mile, small or fragmentary common fields would have been difficult to show.<sup>173</sup>

Where, in the medieval period, there had been small common arable fields they tended to have been enclosed at an early date. In general, where there had been more extensive common fields, so much piecemeal enclosure had taken place that by the late eighteenth century only fragments survived. Even so, some of these surviving fragments continued to be farmed in common into the first half of the twentieth century, and were documented in a series of articles by Reverend Graham in the Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society. In 1818 William Marshall noted that, in the district of Carlisle, much fertile land was still ‘*in the unprofitable state of commonage*’.<sup>174</sup> Where larger common arable fields continued in use into the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, for example to the west of Penrith, they were enclosed under Act of Parliament in the late eighteenth and nineteenth century. In these areas some limited information could be deduced from the county maps.

The distribution of settlement is depicted quite well on all three county maps, and many are named, which made identification simple even where spelling varies from the modern form or the name was partially garbled because surveyors may have misheard local pronunciations. In steep-sided valleys, particularly within the Lake District, the relatively high density of individual farms and cottages, as represented by small circles, and lack of place-name labels suggests that a number of farms and individual houses are not shown. In some cases unnamed settlements could be matched to places named on later Ordnance Survey maps, but there are a number of places which could not be identified and named. The first edition Ordnance Survey maps also reveal that the county maps were broadly accurate in their depiction of the shape and size of nucleated rural settlements.

Road improvements in the late eighteenth and nineteenth century, in conjunction with the process of large-scale enclosure of waste, led to the realignment of many roads

---

<sup>173</sup> Newman and Hardie 2007; Newman and Newman 2009a

<sup>174</sup> Marshall 1818, 158

across areas of former mossland and moorland. As a result, it can be difficult to trace the pre-enclosure line of roads, as shown on the county maps, on to modern maps. Where the course of roads can be determined with accuracy, because they remain relatively unchanged on modern maps from the late-eighteenth century county maps, their routes have been recorded as certain on the digital map. Where routes have changed, but their former alignment can be traced by relict features in the landscape, such as field boundaries, they have been defined as possible. Where the late-eighteenth century alignment has been completely superseded by a new road, the GIS map depiction of the old route is recorded as uncertain. In most cases, it is not possible to trace the routes these pre-enclosure roads took, either from aerial photographs or from evidence on the ground. The roads would have been unpaved, and travellers would have made their way across the unenclosed commons on the driest route they could find (Figure 2.9). As well as the main routes, many commons were also crossed by numerous minor tracks which linked settlements around the commons, and which were used by local communities to access their commons, for stock and to fetch materials such as turves and rushes.<sup>175</sup> In wet areas some routes would have been wide tracts of mud and frequently impassable, and in the rocky fells, the routes were difficult. Travellers would have spread out to avoid the worst areas, creating wide swathes of meandering tracks rather than definable roads. Some idea of the state of the roads in the fells can be gleaned from Celia Fiennes, who says in her account of her journey to the Lake District at the beginning of the eighteenth century that, '*much of [the road] was stony and steep far worse than the Peake in Derbyshire*'.<sup>176</sup> A century later, little seems to have improved, when William Marshall reported to the Board of Agriculture that the public roads of Cumberland were '*insufferably bad:- notwithstanding the great plenty of good materials that abound in most parts*'.<sup>177</sup>

### **Mapping Eighteenth Century Cumbria**

Before the mid-eighteenth century, the county maps of England and Wales were not accurate representations of landscape features.<sup>178</sup> The later eighteenth-century county maps are the first to have been produced using standardised geodetic methods.<sup>179</sup> Thus, it is claimed that they represent an important technical achievement, and have made 'a

---

<sup>175</sup> Whyte 2003, 7

<sup>176</sup> Morris 1949, 190

<sup>177</sup> Marshall 1818, 171

<sup>178</sup> Harley 1965; Walters 1968

<sup>179</sup> MacNair and Williamson 2010, 15-16, 22-5

*unique contribution to the development of regional mapping in Europe*'.<sup>180</sup>

Consequently, the county maps are capable of providing a reliable record of aspects of the late-eighteenth century landscape. In Cumbria, they provide a view of the landscape during a period of extensive change, relating to agricultural improvement and enclosure.<sup>181</sup> It is a vignette of a landscape just before the major landscape impacts of industrialisation, though the hints of Cumbria's industrial future can be discerned.<sup>182</sup> Although similar processes were having a landscape effect across England and Wales, their expression recorded on the county maps differs in accordance with contemporary local economic development and priorities, as well as past local trends, customs and traditions. The county maps provide a convenient, county-wide, landscape-scale consistent base map which can be built upon with data from other sources, such as the enclosure maps and place-name evidence. Not only do they provide a window onto the eighteenth century landscape, however, as noted by MacNair and Williamson, they can also be 'read' as evidence of aspects of the landscape of a more remote past.<sup>183</sup>

The following chapter discusses the use of the late-eighteenth century county maps of Cumbria to provide a greater time-depth and accuracy to the existing Cumbrian HLC. With the additional enhancement of data from enclosure maps and other cartographic and secondary sources, the late-eighteenth century landscape of Cumbria has been characterised, mainly on the basis of settlement type and the degree of enclosure. This late-eighteenth century landscape characterisation then formed a baseline to which data from primary and secondary sources was added to attempt a characterisation of the late medieval landscape, which is set out in Chapters 4 to 6.

---

<sup>180</sup> Laxton 1976, 37

<sup>181</sup> MacNair and Williamson 2010, 200

<sup>182</sup> Walters and James 1984, 6

<sup>183</sup> MacNair and Williamson 2010, 183



### Chapter 3. Mapping the Late-Eighteenth Century Landscape: Snapshot of a Rapidly Evolving Environment

*Not far from Brampton there are some coal mines between the hills that contribute towards giving the surrounding countryside a more pleasant appearance, because the coal can be used for burning lime to fertilise fields and meadows.*<sup>184</sup>

*On the return trip from the iron-works I saw in a number of places how pine trees had been planted on the hills and seemed to grow vigorously. Lime for the fertilising of fields and meadows in this district was burnt in lime kilns.*<sup>185</sup>

These two quotes from the travel diaries of Swedish entrepreneur, Reinhold Angerstein, encapsulate the drive towards agricultural improvement and its connection with the growth of industry which was happening everywhere in England in the mid- to late-eighteenth century, and no less in Cumbria. The first quote refers to the small coalfield belonging to Lord Carlisle in north Cumberland,<sup>186</sup> around the Tindale fells. From there lime would have been used to improve the fields in townships such as Hayton, which had enclosed its common waste in 1704.<sup>187</sup> The second quote refers to the woodlands in Lancashire-over-Sands, particularly to the already well-wooded areas of High Furness, where farmers were taking in new fields from the low fells between the existing and expanding areas of woodland planted by the owners of large estates such as the Bishop of Llandaff.<sup>188</sup>

Industry had long been a significant element of the economy of the Cumbria during the eighteenth century, and was a major factor in shaping the nineteenth century landscape, particularly through mining coal, lead and other minerals. The late-eighteenth century marks a period of major change; the creation of new towns especially in relation to ports,<sup>189</sup> large-scale enclosure of the common wastes was just beginning,<sup>190</sup> settlement was starting to expand in response to a growing population, and communications were being improved through the building of toll roads.<sup>191</sup> By mapping the landscape at the

---

<sup>184</sup> Berg and Berg 2001, 275

<sup>185</sup> Berg and Berg 2001, 292

<sup>186</sup> Webb and Gordon 1978, 2

<sup>187</sup> Graham 1907, 43; 1908b, 344

<sup>188</sup> Newman and Hardie 2007, 106

<sup>189</sup> Newman 2013

<sup>190</sup> Whyte 2003

<sup>191</sup> Hindle 1998

time of the first county maps to be surveyed by triangulation, and by comparing it to the landscape as shown on the Ordnance Survey maps of the mid-nineteenth century, it is possible to assess how great that rate of change was. An example of where this was useful to the current study was in the investigation of settlement change in relation to roads and industry-related expansion in south Westmorland.<sup>192</sup>

A digital map of the late-eighteenth century landscape was created by combining information taken from the three county maps of the period which covered the study area. Alongside data taken from the HLC on land enclosed after 1770 and on areas of remaining unenclosed land, it was possible to reconstruct the extent of unenclosed common waste, on both upland hills and moors and lowland mosses, in the late eighteenth century. This was then refined by information taken from enclosure maps, which allowed the areas of unenclosed land to be drawn more accurately and to include some areas too small to be shown on the county maps to be added, such as outgangs and village greens. The plotting from enclosure maps of outgangs, narrow extensions of unenclosed land extending into settlements providing tracks for the movement of stock, was particularly useful as they were indicators of stock farming which had its origins in the medieval period. Other landscape types which were plotted onto the eighteenth century digital map included woodland, roads and settlement, the baseline data for which was taken from the late-eighteenth century county maps, and then enhanced from other sources.<sup>193</sup> This chapter explains the results of the map of the late-eighteenth century landscape, with sections on the major landscape types. It also seeks to explain some of the forces for change which had created the late-eighteenth century landscape, and the ongoing processes of change, such as the large-scale enclosure of common waste.

## **The Late-Eighteenth Century Landscape**

### ***Unenclosed Land***

By the last quarter of the eighteenth century, analysis of the data for unenclosed land indicates that half of Cumbria was still unenclosed waste which, in total, covered over 3,300 km<sup>2</sup> (Figure 3.1; Table 3.1). This took the form of fell, moorland or moss, and almost everything over 300m OD was unenclosed, creating a large, continuous belt of unenclosed waste in the central Lake District fells and along the Pennines. The only land above the 300m contour which was not unenclosed waste was in the valleys which

---

<sup>192</sup> See Chapter 6

<sup>193</sup> See Chapters 1 and 2

cut into the Pennines and Lake District massif, such as the valleys of the Nent and South Tyne around Alston, the shallow valleys of Stainmore, Wetsleddale valley and the upper end of Borrowdale on the east side of the Lake District fells.

Within the study area, Westmorland was the least enclosed historic county, with 55% of its total area being unenclosed, with much of that land being over 200m OD (Figure 3.2). It has been asserted, however, that three quarters of Westmorland was commonable waste in 1793,<sup>194</sup> but this is clearly an overestimate when compared with the mapped proportion of unenclosed land, which would have made up most of the common waste. This view appears to date back to observations made by the Bishop of Llandaff in the late eighteenth century Board of Agriculture report<sup>195</sup> concerning the state of the county in 1689. At one point, the Bishop states '*I am disposed to conjecture that three-fourth parts of Westmoreland consist of uncultivated land*',<sup>196</sup> and it appears that it is this statement that influenced subsequent commentators. He also noted, however, '*But whether the uncultivated land in Westmoreland be equal to three-fourths or one-half of the whole, it cannot be questioned, that there is so much of it, as to render its improvement a matter not only of individual concern, but of national importance*'.<sup>197</sup> Taking the Bishop's views as a whole, the extent of mapped commonable waste mapped in this study does appear to fit with contemporary observation.

The unenclosed high land effectively cut Westmorland in two, the division created where the Lake District mountains meet the Howgill Hills at Tebay. This was reflected in the division between the medieval baronies of Westmorland to the north and Kendale to the south. In the lowlands, there were extensive areas of unenclosed moorland in the Eden Valley and the Lune Valley, as well as across the whole area of the Barony of Kendale. In Kendale, unenclosed land extended down below the 200m OD line, generally following the low drumlin hills to the east of Kendal and west of the Lune Valley. There were also extensive areas of unenclosed waste across the low fells west and south west of Kendal.<sup>198</sup>

In Cumberland, too, unenclosed waste was a dominant landscape character type, making up 49% of the historic county (Figure 3.3). This was mostly concentrated in the Lake

---

<sup>194</sup> Bainbridge 1942, 62

<sup>195</sup> Marshall 1818, 206

<sup>196</sup> Marshall 1818, 212

<sup>197</sup> Marshall 1818, 213

<sup>198</sup> Cumbria County Council 2009; Newman and Hardie 2007

District fells and along the Pennines, but there were also significant areas of unenclosed lowland. Some of this was the legacy of the medieval Forest of Inglewood, particularly Westward, where large areas remained as unenclosed moorland until the early nineteenth century. Extensive unenclosed wastes also occurred north of Hadrian's Wall in the former Barony of Gilsland and along the productive coal measures of the west coast. The Solway Plain, too, had expanses of unenclosed mossland. This low-lying area had much land under 10m OD, and it was these areas which remained unenclosed and unimproved until the nineteenth century,<sup>199</sup> indeed some areas remain unenclosed today.

Lancashire-over-Sands had a much lower percentage of unenclosed waste equating to 35% of the total area (Figure 3.4). It was concentrated in the Furness fells, with much of it lying above 200m OD. There were also significant areas lying below 10m OD, particularly along the long coastline of the Furness and Cartmel peninsulas where there were extensive mosses, salt marshes and river estuaries.

#### ***The Progress of Enclosure: Waste***

The evidence for late-eighteenth and nineteenth century parliamentary enclosures of the waste is usually shown on contemporary maps, but enclosure pre-dating 1770 seldom has surviving map evidence. A few large-scale enclosures by private act of parliament or by agreement have maps. Much of the evidence for enclosure preceding the 1770s comes from identifying likely earlier waste intakes from field characteristics shown on late nineteenth century Ordnance Survey maps, in areas mapped as enclosed in the late eighteenth century but usually adjacent to unenclosed land. This information allows some estimation of likely upland waste enclosure prior to 1770 (Figure 3.1, Table 3.1). Mapping the pre-1770 enclosures from such evidence undoubtedly leads to under representation. Only those enclosures for which there was some dating evidence, either comparative or definitive, have been mapped.

Piecemeal enclosure, in the form of intakes, had been progressing from the end of the medieval period. By the middle of the eighteenth century, however, more systematic enclosure was beginning to take place. An illustration of the different processes of enclosure can be seen in the area around Appleby, where enclosure of the common wastes was ongoing around 1770. The band of common north and north-west of the county town, for example, was shared by Appleby and the township of Crackenthorpe,

---

<sup>199</sup> Cumbria County Council 2009; Hodgkinson *et al* 2000, 85-144

divided by the line of a Roman road. Crackenthorpe's side of the common was enclosed by agreement in 1768,<sup>200</sup> whilst Appleby followed by a private act of parliament four years later (Figure 3.5).<sup>201</sup> By this date a small area of Appleby's common by the river had also been enclosed and improved by agreement (Figure 3.6). This was known as Minskough Moor in 1684,<sup>202</sup> the first element of the name meaning 'wood held in common'. That it was called a moor in 1684 suggests that most of the tree cover had already gone by the later seventeenth century. By 1770<sup>203</sup> it was probably already improved and enclosed as shown on nineteenth century Ordnance Survey maps, when only a small band of woodland survived along the river banks.

The extensive common wastes in the Forest of Inglewood also began to be systematically enclosed around this time. The commons of Sebergham, Skelton and Castle Sowerby were enclosed by act of parliament in 1765 and 1769 (Figure 3.7),<sup>204</sup> while the commons of St Cuthbert Without, south of Carlisle, were enclosed in 1778.<sup>205</sup> These areas are still distinguishable in the landscape by the regular, rectilinear field patterns, which had clearly been planned and surveyed in one go. In this, they are little different to the large-scale nineteenth century fields which enclosed the remaining substantial areas of common in Inglewood. Further north, systematic enclosure had also begun in the mid-eighteenth century. In Solport and Nichol Forest parishes, for example the lower lying common wastes were enclosed across two years, 1760 and 1761 (Figure 3.8).<sup>206</sup> In Hayton, east of Carlisle, the common wastes which surrounded the enclosed and cultivated enclosures had been taken in and improved in 1704 (Figure 3.9). By the 1770s, this had led to an expansion of settlement in the form of individual farmsteads across the former commons. The remaining commons, on the edges of the parish, began to be enclosed from the beginning of the nineteenth century. A similar trend can be seen on the west coast of Cumberland. Here large areas of the lowland commons began to be enclosed in the 1760s (Figure 3.10). South of the town of Workington, the commons on

---

<sup>200</sup> CCA WD/HH/15

<sup>201</sup> KCA WQR/1/12

<sup>202</sup> Smith 1967b, 95

<sup>203</sup> Jefferys 1770

<sup>204</sup> Sebergham was enclosed in 1765 (CCA/QRE/1/4); Castle Sowerby (CCA QRE/1/41) and Skelton (CCA QRE/1/71) in 1769

<sup>205</sup> CCA QRE/1/83

<sup>206</sup> Nicholforest was in 1761 (CCA D/MBS/1/29) and Solport in 1760 (CCA QRE/1/144 ) and 1761 (CCA D/MBS/1/40)

the edge of the township of Harrington were enclosed in 1761.<sup>207</sup> Two years later, parts of the commons in the neighbouring township of Moresby were enclosed,<sup>208</sup> followed in 1768 by commons in the townships of Distington<sup>209</sup> and Hensingham.<sup>210</sup>

What these areas of eighteenth-century large-scale enclosure have in common is the presence of a strong improvement-focused manorial lord to drive them forward. Harrington, for example, was a manor of the Curwens, who were also lords of the manor of Workington, and who had considerable interests in coal mining and the development of a port at Harrington.<sup>211</sup> The townships of Moresby, Distington and Hensingham were all part of the Lowther estates.<sup>212</sup> The Lowther family had substantial lands in Cumberland and were instrumental in developing the coal mining industry on the west coast and in the port and town of Whitehaven.<sup>213</sup> The lands at Sebergham and Castle Sowerby were under the seigniority of the Duke of Portland, who held the Forest of Inglewood,<sup>214</sup> whilst Skelton, also in the forest, appears to have been enclosed through the co-operation of the two lords of the manor: Fletcher of Hutton Hall and the Duke of Devonshire.<sup>215</sup> Likewise, the lowland commons of Solport and Nichol Forest were part of the estate of the Grahams of Netherby.<sup>216</sup> All these areas of common lay at low altitudes, and all must have presented obvious potential for enclosure and improvement.

The situation at Hayton is a good example of the trend towards agricultural improvement in the eighteenth century (Figure 3.9). Here, a map of 1710 depicts the parish shortly after the lowland commons were enclosed, and an indenture of 1704 describes how this came about.<sup>217</sup> In 1704 an indenture made by the lord of the manor, Charles, first Earl of Carlisle, conveyed all the commons and wastes of the manor to the yeomen of Hayton, *'for the purpose of inclosure and division amongst the commoners*

---

<sup>207</sup> WCA D/Cu/7/4

<sup>208</sup> CCA QRE/1/6

<sup>209</sup> CCA QRE/1/85

<sup>210</sup> CCA QRE/1/48

<sup>211</sup> Nicolson and Burn 1777b, 51-2

<sup>212</sup> Nicolson and Burn 1777b, 40-2, 46-50

<sup>213</sup> Beckett 1981

<sup>214</sup> Nicolson and Burn 1777b, 325, 345

<sup>215</sup> Nicolson and Burn 1777b, 385-6

<sup>216</sup> Nicolson and Burn 1777b, 464-74, 480

<sup>217</sup> Private documents in the hands of Revered T.H.B. Graham (1907)

*generally, so that every owner of land should take a specific portion of the enclosed waste instead of roving rights over the whole*'.<sup>218</sup> The map of 1710 showed the infields, or anciently enclosed lands, the High Common, which remained as common pasture, and the Low Common which was newly divided. This process allowed for the yeomen of the parish to acquire their own holdings, and establish and develop a steading, which they could improve and thus increase the return from their land.

Most of the land mapped as being recently enclosed by 1770, however, was the result of a piecemeal process, for which there was often no definitive documentary or map evidence. In several places, small, irregular fields were noted on modern and historic Ordnance Survey maps, which appear to be extensions into areas of unenclosed common waste. This could be seen in Nether Wasdale for example, where encroachments onto the fellside took the form of small enclosures adjacent to existing holdings. In most cases, these encroachments have not been mapped, as it has not been possible to date them from the evidence used in this study. Where local landscape surveys have been undertaken, as by the National Trust on their Lake District estates, early intakes have been identified. In Wasdale Head, for example, a series of intakes on the lower fellsides suggested a progression of piecemeal enclosure between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, and in the Langdale Valley from the sixteenth century onwards.<sup>219</sup>

Even with such limitations, a total of 16,768ha, or 2.5% of the total survey area, was mapped as having been recently enclosed in 1770. One such area which had been partly enclosed piecemeal was around the Solway Moss, north of the River Esk, though evidence is scarce as to when or how rapidly this had happened. This area had been part of the Debateable Land in the later medieval period, as it was contested between England and Scotland. Because of this uncertainty of ownership, parts had been settled by those wishing to remain beyond the reach of the law, particularly members of the Graham family.<sup>220</sup> Even so, large areas remained as unenclosed waste, the largest being Solway Moss where, following a bog burst in 1771,<sup>221</sup> many of the surrounding enclosed areas temporarily reverted to uncultivated waste.

---

<sup>218</sup> Graham 1907, 43

<sup>219</sup> Lund and Southwell 2002

<sup>220</sup> Graham 1912

<sup>221</sup> A description of the event is given in some detail in Gilpin 1786, 135-7

Although a cataclysmic event for the local population, it was not unique but was echoed in other bog bursts across the North West of England in the post medieval period.<sup>222</sup> Between the Moss and the River Esk the land had been improved and was described as a cultivated plain, and lay at a lower level than the Moss but separated from it by a levée. The major storm which was recorded over southern Scotland and northern England on 16 and 17 November 1771 is thought to have tipped the peat moss into hydrological instability. The bog erupted breaching the levee and sending liquefied peat north-east across the surrounding countryside, inundating the houses and fields of its inhabitants. Gilpin provides a graphic description of '*the gush of mud carried before it through the first two or three hundred yards of it's [sic] course, a part of the breastwork. ... But it soon deposited this solid mass; and became a heavy fluid. One house after another, it spread round – filled – and crushed into ruin*'.<sup>223</sup> The result was the loss of an estimated 500ha of farmland. The area ruined is shown on Donald's 1774 Map of Cumberland, and even in the nineteenth century, this area remained sparsely populated (Figure 3.11).

### **Woodland**

By the late eighteenth century, woodland accounted for as little as 1.7% of the total study area (Figure 3.12). This is a remarkably low level of woodland cover by today's standards. In 2005, the national average stood at 12%, though Cumbria, the most wooded area of North West England, had only 7% woodland.<sup>224</sup> The area of woodland cover had clearly decreased in the post medieval period. A 1552 map of the Debatable Land between England and Scotland, for example, shows settlements in clearings along a border with a well-wooded landscape (Figure 3.13).<sup>225</sup> This does not appear to be just a map maker's convention, and a separate map of Nichol Forest from 1607 (Figure 3.14),<sup>226</sup> which includes the same border area, also depicts plentiful woodland. By the time Donald's Map of Cumberland was produced in 1774, there was not enough woodland here to be worth plotting at a county scale (Figure 3.15).

In many areas of the country, lack of investment in coppice management, the process of enclosure, both piecemeal and systematic, and agricultural improvement led to the

---

<sup>222</sup> Hodgkinson *et al* 2000, 121

<sup>223</sup> Gilpin 1786, 136-7

<sup>224</sup> Newman and Hardie 2007, 98

<sup>225</sup> TNA MPF/1/257

<sup>226</sup> TNA MPC/1/80



removal of tree cover.<sup>227</sup> Much of this destruction was of wood pasture and of individual trees or small stands on non-woodland sites, particularly to aid the improvement of farmland.<sup>228</sup> Some woodlands survived because they were in relatively difficult areas to improve, such as the steep valley sides of streams and rivers. Within the study area, this gill woodland is almost certainly under-represented on the county maps because it would not have been possible to plot at that scale. Some larger remnants of the ancient woodlands still survived, however, and not just on valley sides. Donald's map shows patches of the formerly extensive woodland surviving in the Forest of Inglewood at Sebergham and Castle Sowerby. That the woodland still had great value is demonstrated by the fact that it was deliberately excluded from the 1769 enclosure of areas of common waste (Figure 3.16).<sup>229</sup>

Contemporary commentators provide a glimpse into perceptions of the extent and nature of woodland, at least in the Lake District. Thomas West, writing in 1778, notes how in the Furness Fells '*much of the valleys and the bases of most of the hills are covered with young wood, which at certain periods is cut down and charred for the use of neighbouring furnaces*',<sup>230</sup> a clear reference to the management of the woodlands as coppices. Wordsworth, too, comments on the coppice woods, protected by enclosures, though he also notes the fast-disappearing forest trees and hollies.<sup>231</sup> Coppice woodland had been important for the production of charcoal from the medieval period, and demand had risen with the growth of the iron and other metal industries. Woodland was concentrated in the areas of highest demand, mainly the Furness Fells, but also in Borrowdale and Lorton Vale towards Keswick.<sup>232</sup> Coppicing remained particularly important in the Furness Fells where it served other woodland industries, such as tanning, making potash for soap for the cloth industry, and woodland crafts.<sup>233</sup>

The creation of limited-species timber plantations was widespread from the 1770s. Where woodland had been planted, it was often as coppices, although stands of timber trees were becoming more common.<sup>234</sup> In Cumbria in the late-eighteenth century, the

---

<sup>227</sup> Linnard 1982, 60-1

<sup>228</sup> Rackham 1976, 97

<sup>229</sup> CCA QRE/1/41

<sup>230</sup> West 1780, 270

<sup>231</sup> De Sélincourt 1977, 43

<sup>232</sup> Newman and Hardie 2007, 102-3

<sup>233</sup> Bowden 2000, 6

<sup>234</sup> Rackham 1976, 97

owners of large estates had seen the opportunity to create plantations on poorer quality land, which they could then enclose. This was particularly the case on Claife Heights, in High Furness, where John Christian Curwen planted larches from 1794.<sup>235</sup> This process had already begun at the time of Angerstein's tour through Cumbria in the 1750s,<sup>236</sup> but was clearly a recent innovation as, in 1810, Wordsworth noted that '*other trees have been introduced within these last fifty years, such as beeches, larches, limes &c., and plantations of firs, seldom with advantage*'.<sup>237</sup> The novelty of the plantations was also noted by Thomas Gray in his tour through the Lake District in 1769, when he remarked on the '*patches of scrubby plantation on its [Windermere's] banks*'.<sup>238</sup> From this, it is clear that the plantations were recent and still a very new concept for the traveller to the Lake District. It was not possible to map these areas of woodland expansion, as the planting of new woodland, particularly coniferous plantation, continued into the twentieth century, with large-scale commercial plantings which followed after the First World War. These absorbed and disguised the areas of smaller-scale plantations which had been ongoing from the late eighteenth century (Figure 3.17).<sup>239</sup>

### **Parks**

On the three county maps, 19 deer parks are shown as distinct features, defined by a park pale, though from documentary and manuscript cartographic sources, a total of 25 parks were mapped for the late eighteenth century (Figure 3.18, Table 3.2). Amongst these were some which had been established in the Middle Ages, as at Lowther, Greystoke, Levens, Troutbeck and Ulpha, but also others on newer large estates such as Hutton in the Forest, Dalemmain and Holker (Figures 3.19 and 3.20). Although these parks continued to function as deer parks, they had also been transformed by careful design into polite ornamental landscapes, celebrating contemporary ideals of landscape beauty. Despite an evolving function, these parks were as much a physical representation of lordly power in the landscape in the late eighteenth century as they had been in the medieval period.

Levens Park was an early example of a designed landscape, which still survives today (Figure 3.19), laid out to a plan by Guillaume Beaumont in the 1690s, which took

---

<sup>235</sup> Whyte 2003, 78-9

<sup>236</sup> Berg and Berg 2001, 292

<sup>237</sup> De Sélincourt 1977, 44. The beech tree is native to southern England and was an introduction to Cumbria; Woodland Trust n.d.

<sup>238</sup> Murray 2012, 43

<sup>239</sup> Newman and Hardie 2007, 106-7

advantage of the existing park's situation on both banks of the River Kent.<sup>240</sup> In 1776, William Gilpin described it as '*a happy combination of everything that is lovely and great in landskip*'.<sup>241</sup> Even though it was designed as a pleasure ground, to express scenic beauty and provide vistas along the river's banks, it retained its original purpose as a hunting preserve, and a plan from the 1750s depicts the park with its deer, and with a fisherman on the riverside.<sup>242</sup> The park at Lowther, too, continued to function as a deer park, but was greatly enlarged by the end of the sixteenth century, when it was extended to incorporate the hall at its north end (Figure 3.20).<sup>243</sup> This extension not only provided a larger hunting reserve, it also created pleasure grounds which could be accessed directly from Lowther Hall. A consequence of this was the removal of Lowther village, which was pulled down in 1682 and the inhabitants were moved to a new site nearby.<sup>244</sup> Within the park pale, new woodland plantations were created, along with avenues to create pleasing walks and rides. Cattle and horses were also kept within the park, and some parts were improved and cultivated for oats and barley.<sup>245</sup>

The transformation of former medieval deer parks on the larger estates into polite landscapes was common, but the development of landscape aesthetics was also evident in new parkland creation around the houses of the gentry. A few miles away to the east of Lowther, at Brougham Hall, a contemporary process of designed landscape creation and deliberate settlement removal was being enacted. Brougham Hall is depicted by Jefferys as a gentleman's residence, with a designed landscape consisting of woodland, and an avenue of trees leading to the house (Figure 3.21). Brougham Hall was a manor house of late medieval origin.<sup>246</sup> The manor had been split into three moieties until 1676, when it was reunited and it was around this time that the park appears to have been created. The antiquarian John Machell visited Brougham in 1686, and drew a sketch map of the village of Brougham which had been recently demolished.<sup>247</sup> The settlement was located along two lanes which became the boundary roads to the small landscape park for Brougham Hall.

---

<sup>240</sup> Crowder 2005, 41-3

<sup>241</sup> National Heritage List n.d., list entry number 1000667

<sup>242</sup> Crowder 2005, 42

<sup>243</sup> Lancaster University Archaeological Unit 1997a, 16

<sup>244</sup> Lancaster University Archaeological Unit 1997a, 10

<sup>245</sup> Lancaster University Archaeological Unit 1997a, 16

<sup>246</sup> Perriam and Robinson 1998, 266

<sup>247</sup> CCA D/CHA/Machell/MSS1

New gentry-owned landscape parks were not all mapped as distinct features by Jefferys, Donald and Yates, but they can still be discerned by the presence of a country house or mansion, with areas of woodland and avenues of trees which hint at designed landscape. In Cumberland, to the west of Penrith, for example, the fourteenth century deer park of Dacre Castle<sup>248</sup> had gone out of use and the estate was absorbed into that of nearby Dalemain in 1715.<sup>249</sup> The woodland plantations shown by Donald (Figure 3.22) may have been remnants of woodland cover in Dacre Park, and may have been taken into the wider planting schemes for the landscape park at Dalemain which was created around the same time.<sup>250</sup> The whole planting scheme was then enhanced in the late eighteenth century.<sup>251</sup>

### ***The Progress of Enclosure: Cultivable Land***

By the late eighteenth century, the settled and cultivated areas of Cumbria were dominated by enclosed land. Only small pockets of open field cultivation remained and most of the medieval common arable fields had been sub-divided, allotted and enclosed (Figure 3.23). A few commonable fields survived until they were enclosed with common rights removed via parliamentary enclosure in the nineteenth century, but these were the exception, and were often quite small. Threlkeld townfield, in Cumberland, for example, was only 8.8ha, or 21 acres,<sup>252</sup> whilst the field in Great Langdale was 35ha, or 86 acres.<sup>253</sup> Without enclosure map evidence, these tiny former arable fields would not be recognisable, as they do not have particular physical characteristics of common arable farming, such as fossilised strips or boundaries with aratral curves. The common arable fields of Milburn and Milburn common were still open in the later part of the eighteenth century (Figure 3.24). Donald does not depict common fields explicitly on his map, but at Milburn, he does show the roads through the fields as unenclosed, suggesting that the fields had not been subdivided at that time. What cannot be determined from this was whether the process of piecemeal enclosure had begun, but certainly by 1819, the common fields had been completely enclosed.<sup>254</sup> Torpenhow's

---

<sup>248</sup> Information supplied by Harry Hawkins; see Chapter 4

<sup>249</sup> Nicolson and Burn 1777b, 383

<sup>250</sup> Information supplied by Harry Hawkins

<sup>251</sup> Newman and Hardie 2007, 134

<sup>252</sup> CCA QRE/1/93

<sup>253</sup> KCA WDX/1087/8

<sup>254</sup> KCA WPR/47/4/1

fields were not enclosed until a private inclosure act in 1814 (Figure 3.25),<sup>255</sup> but there is no indication from Donald's map of any common arable fields there in the late eighteenth century.

Piecemeal enclosure of townfields by agreement within upland regions had been ongoing since the sixteenth century. The common fields of Kentmere were not fully enclosed until 1850,<sup>256</sup> although some enclosure had already been ongoing by agreement (Figure 3.25). In individual townships, piecemeal enclosure could be a drawn-out process.<sup>257</sup> In Cumberland, it was widespread in many townships from the second half of the seventeenth century. The Rev. Graham documented evidence for this process in two articles for the *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society*,<sup>258</sup> A rare example of enclosure in progress is revealed at Murton and Hilton, on the east of the Eden Valley at the base of the Pennines. There correspondence and a sketch map of the common field in 1763 reveals something of how the process was achieved.<sup>259</sup> Castle Carrock, also at the base of the Pennines, was enclosed in a piecemeal fashion with about a third of its common fields enclosed by 1795.<sup>260</sup> It was not possible to distinguish which parts had been enclosed by the end of the eighteenth century. The former extent of the whole area of common arable fields is still legible on modern and historic Ordnance Survey maps, and it is this that has been mapped and verified by the mapped extent of the commonfields as shown on an early seventeenth century survey (Figure 3.26).<sup>261</sup> Not all Pennine edge townships experienced significant piecemeal enclosure before the late eighteenth century, at Cumrew, the common arable fields were still open in 1795, when it was described as being, '*cultivated in the old Cumberland manner. The grass ridges in the fields are from 20 to 30 feet wide, and some of them are 1,000 feet in length*'.<sup>262</sup> Most surviving common arable fields, or parts of common fields, were concentrated in the more fertile lowlands of the Eden Valley and its tributaries. The largest surviving areas of common arable fields were in Cumberland, the most extensive being the combined common

---

<sup>255</sup> Graham 1910, 128

<sup>256</sup> KCA WQR I/44

<sup>257</sup> Hey 2000, 200

<sup>258</sup> Graham 1910; Graham 1913a

<sup>259</sup> Tyson 1992

<sup>260</sup> Graham 1910, 128

<sup>261</sup> CCA DHN C713-011

<sup>262</sup> Graham 1910, 128

arable of Stainton and Newbiggin to the west of Penrith. These were enclosed together in 1775.<sup>263</sup> Apart from some modern boundary loss, the fields have retained the physical attributes of the former furlongs in the form of fossilised strips, and even without the enclosure map, the extent of the former arable fields are still legible in the modern landscape (Figure 3.27).

One area which is greatly under-represented in the documentary record is the enclosure of outfields. The infield/outfield system of arable farming seems to have been common in certain parts of Cumberland, particularly around the Solway Plain where the land was low lying and permanent arable was concentrated on the slightly higher land. Land of lesser quality, usually the lower, wetter clay lands, would be cultivated once every few years, in a system known as long-ley,<sup>264</sup> or managed as meadow, and these were the outfields. By the late eighteenth century, this system had largely disappeared, and only two neighbouring outfields in the parish of Dean, Cumberland, were still unenclosed into the nineteenth century.<sup>265</sup> The extensive outfield at Aspatria had been enclosed in 1758-9,<sup>266</sup> and the allocated shares were preserved in the field pattern of strips which are still legible on modern maps (Figure 3.28).

Even where open common arable fields had been largely enclosed, not all common rights were extinguished, and small areas remained in common and farmed in strips into the nineteenth or even the early twentieth century. This is shown by Dilley's analysis of common land in Cumberland.<sup>267</sup> In a number of townships, there is a documentary record of fragmentary common arable survival in the late eighteenth or nineteenth century, but no evidence for an enclosure award or enclosure by agreement. Amongst other places, there seems to have been surviving remnants of common arable farming at Arlecdon, Caldbeck, Drigg, Egremont, Glassonby, Seaton and Flimby, and Skelton in the late eighteenth century. It is not possible to map these in most cases, however, as they are not shown on contemporary maps and may have been so small as to be invisible at a county-scale. Small traces of surviving common arable field farming were also recorded by Graham in a number of settlements in Eden and along the Solway plain, including Melmerby, Wetheral, Rockcliffe and Thursby.<sup>268</sup> These were the

---

<sup>263</sup> CCA QRE/1/38

<sup>264</sup> Elliott 1960, 99

<sup>265</sup> CCA QRE/1/16; QRE/1/33

<sup>266</sup> Elliott 1960

<sup>267</sup> Dilley 1972, appendix C

<sup>268</sup> Graham 1913a

remnants of much larger fields within townships dominated by common arable fields in the medieval period. In Aldoth in the parish of Holm Cultram, in the early twentieth century there was still an enclosure farmed in three shares, or 'acre-dales', all owned by different people.<sup>269</sup> Most of these tiny remnants were too small to map.

Even so, evidence for these remnants can sometimes be found on enclosure maps for the common waste. In addition to the maps which show the allotments of the common waste, there are sometimes maps of the enclosed cultivated lands, particularly the common arable fields which had already been enclosed, and where tenants held enclosures by customary rights. Their holdings were coded to record which tenants had rights to which allotments on the newly enclosed commons, and they show not only where fragments of common field farming survived, but the distribution of land ownership throughout the enclosed fields. In Colby, for example, near Appleby in Westmorland, the common arable fields had been enclosed by the mid-nineteenth century, when the adjoining common was enclosed.<sup>270</sup> There appears to have been limited consolidation of strips, and there is a mixture of consolidated holdings and scattered holdings throughout the cultivated lands (Figure 3.29). One small area still survived to be held in common, shared between two landholders. In Newbiggin in the parish of Milburn, Westmorland the former common arable fields had been fully enclosed in both Newbiggin and Milburn by 1849 when Newbiggin Moor was enclosed.<sup>271</sup> The colour-coded map of Newbiggin also shows how ownership of fields has begun to be consolidated into blocks, but that some ownership was still fairly scattered (Figure 3.30).

Where fields were enclosed in the eighteenth century, the predominant method of piecemeal enclosure meant that they were enclosed as strips or consolidated strips. This resulted in the pattern of former common arable fields being preserved in the enclosures, a pattern which could still be seen on the nineteenth century Ordnance Survey maps and which, in some areas, is still legible in the modern landscape (Figure 3.31). It is more difficult to recognise former common fields in townships which experienced piecemeal enclosure at an earlier date. This was a problem for the HLC mapping because the earlier the enclosure, the greater the rationalisation and consolidation of former holdings which had taken place by the time of the nineteenth

---

<sup>269</sup> Graham 1913b, 22

<sup>270</sup> TNA MAF/1/41

<sup>271</sup> TNA MAF/1/416

century Ordnance Survey map coverage. These processes can obscure the strips of the former common arable fields. In Dalton township near Burton-in-Kendal, the common arable fields around the Old Hall are likely to have been enclosed in the late medieval period and in 1694,<sup>272</sup> when they were marked as ‘old enclosures’. The only surviving evidence of the former common arable fields is the preservation of cultivation terraces and ridge and furrow (Figure 3.32). Where arable cultivation continued later in a separate field to the north, however, the former open common strips were identifiable as enclosed strips on the map of 1694, and aratral field boundaries still survive (Figure 3.33).

The character of most of the farming landscape was predominantly one of enclosure, with the vast majority of the cultivatable land enclosed by the late eighteenth century. A large proportion of this can be considered to have been ancient enclosures, derived from steadings associated with individual farms of medieval or early post medieval origins.<sup>273</sup> Others were the result of the piecemeal enclosure of common arable fields or gradual intaking between steadings and along the edge of the common waste. These fields have been mapped simply as irregular enclosures, even though they had various origins, to distinguish them from the more systematic enclosure of common waste.

### ***Settlement***

The ‘long’ eighteenth century was a time of both population and settlement expansion, starting from around 1660. New settlements were created in Cumbria, particularly where major landholders like the Lowthers, the Curwens and Grahams invested not only in agricultural improvement, but also in the development of trade and industry. Of the 5,435 settlements of all types mapped for this study (Figure 3.34), 1,450, or 27%, cannot be dated earlier than 1750 (Figure 3.35). These figures should only be taken as a guideline, as they only record the first documented instance for each settlement. They do, however, give some impression of the new settlement which was being created in the second half of the eighteenth century. This increase in settlement was both a rural and urban phenomenon, with an increase in the numbers of new farms and cottages especially, but also the creation of new towns.

The influence of great estates on the landscape, and on settlement patterns, was a national phenomenon<sup>274</sup>, but it is particularly well exhibited in Cumbria. One of the key

---

<sup>272</sup> KCA WPR/10/Misc.; Newman and Newman 2009, 8<sup>273</sup> See Chapter 7

<sup>273</sup> See Chapter 7

<sup>274</sup> Finch 2007



families involved in the creation of both rural and urban new settlement was the Lowther family. In 1682, they had demolished the village of Lowther which sat in front of the hall, in order to extend the parkland around the house.<sup>275</sup> The original village was replaced soon after by a new planned settlement known as Lowther Newtown (Figure 3.36), which the Lowthers seem to have intended to become an urban centre of manufacturing for carpets and linen.<sup>276</sup> It did not develop into a town, however, and remained a village in size and function. In 1766-73, Sir James Lowther engaged Robert Adam to build a new model village on a nearby site, to a plan which was never completed.<sup>277</sup> Nevertheless, this new settlement of Lowther is shown as complete on Jeffery's map of 1770 (Figure 3.37).

These attempts to stimulate growth around Lowther Hall may not have been entirely successful, but the family's investment in the town and port of Whitehaven was a major contribution to the urban development of the west Cumberland coast. The motive for the development of a port and settlement here was linked to involvement with coal mining, and the opportunity to export coal to Ireland, where the family owned estates.<sup>278</sup> The earliest town and harbour development dated to the 1630s.<sup>279</sup> It was in the later seventeenth century and throughout the eighteenth century that Whitehaven developed into a rationally planned town with much-improved harbour facilities, driven largely by increasing exports of coal, but also a significant trade in tobacco (Figure 3.38). As a consequence it became the sixth largest port outside London by the early eighteenth century.<sup>280</sup>

The creation of Whitehaven inspired other local landowners to develop planned towns, leading the Senhouses to found Maryport and the Curwens, Harrington in the eighteenth century. Maryport was established over the course of just 30 years after 1750, by Humphrey Senhouse who founded the harbour and planned town based on coal mining, along with a glasshouse and blast furnace.<sup>281</sup> It was built on a much more modest scale than Whitehaven, as was Harrington, which was developed from the 1750s.<sup>282</sup> All three

---

<sup>275</sup> See section on parks, above

<sup>276</sup> Lewis 1821, 173

<sup>277</sup> Brunskill 1967

<sup>278</sup> Newman 2013, 288

<sup>279</sup> Collier and Pearson 1991

<sup>280</sup> Newman 2013, 293

<sup>281</sup> Berg and Berg 2001, 278

<sup>282</sup> Newman 2013, 297

towns, however, were related to the coal mining industry which came to dominate the west Cumberland coast.<sup>283</sup>

The more significant settlement expansion was in rural areas. Over 1,800 new settlements were recorded for which the first dating evidence is post-1700 (Figure 3.35). Amongst that number there will be some which have earlier origins, but for which no dating evidence was available. It is likely, however, that many will have been founded in the eighteenth century. Most of this new, rural settlement was in the form of individual farms or cottages, accounting for 27% of all discrete settlements in the late eighteenth century. New nucleated settlement also emerged, particularly small nucleations of between two and five dwellings, such as the small cluster of cottages at Low Houses near Garrigill which was extant by 1722.<sup>284</sup> Taking an average figure of three dwellings in each small nucleation, then it can be estimated that around a third of the total estimate of new dwellings outside villages were in these small hamlets. Around a quarter of the small nucleations mapped for the late eighteenth century cannot be dated to before 1700.

An example of earlier post medieval settlement expansion can be seen at Dalton, on the southern edge of Westmorland. The hamlet of Dalton, which was in Lancashire until 1895, has archaeological and cartographic evidence for settlement expansion and shrinkage from the medieval period onwards. It has the well-preserved earthworks of a settlement to the south of the modern hamlet, which are scheduled as the remains of a deserted medieval village.<sup>285</sup> Map evidence from the late seventeenth century, however, shows that it was still in existence in 1694 and the form of earthworks indicates multi-celled buildings with chimneys, suggesting buildings of post medieval origin.<sup>286</sup> On Yates's 1786 map of Lancashire, the area immediately to the north of the settlement is shown as unenclosed common. It would seem likely, therefore that the earthworks represent a settlement shift from an organised medieval core to the north, of crofts and tofts around a village green with common arable fields behind, to a less organised settlement encroaching onto an area of common by the late seventeenth century (Figure

---

<sup>283</sup> Wood 1988

<sup>284</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 178

<sup>285</sup> National Heritage List n.d., scheduled monument 1021249

<sup>286</sup> Newman and Newman 2009, 7-8

3.39).<sup>287</sup> By the late eighteenth century, however, this new settlement already seems to have been shrinking, a process which continued throughout the nineteenth century.<sup>288</sup>

One area which saw significant change in settlement structure was the border area with Scotland, comprising Nichol Forest, Bewcastle and the former Debateable Lands. Following the pacification of the Border in the early seventeenth century, and the removal of many members of the Graham family, the new landowners, the Cliffords attempted to improve their estate.<sup>289</sup> These improvements were partly to increase revenue from their estates, in order to recoup the costs of pacification and transplantation to Ireland.<sup>290</sup> The improvements involved the resettlement of tenants and the thorough reorganization of their holdings between 1607 and 1610, and led to an improvement in husbandry, judging by the increase in estate revenues.<sup>291</sup> The true extent of these changes is not known, and it is unclear what the impact was on the settlement pattern. Comparisons of the late eighteenth century county map with sixteenth and seventeenth century maps of the border indicate that there was some settlement abandonment and creation. The 1607 map of Nichol Forest, for example, has a number of settlements along the Liddel Water which appear on later maps to have been relocated or abandoned, as around Penton.<sup>292</sup> There was a second period of reorganisation from the 1750s, on the Netherby estates belonging to Dr Robert Graham. Apart from laying out the newly planned town of Longtown, he radically improved his estates. This included building hamlets of eight to ten houses, let to tenants rent-free until they could make a return on their lands.<sup>293</sup> As a result, there are many individual farms and cottages in the border area which are shown on Donald's map of 1774 but which cannot be dated any earlier (Figure 3.40).

The distribution of new settlement in Cumbria indicates that it was related to the piecemeal intaking and improvement of waste, in such areas as the upper Lune Valley, along the edge of Stainmore (Figure 3.41) and particularly in the far north of the region in Nichol Forest and Bewcastle. This process was happening in most English upland

---

<sup>287</sup> Newman and Newman 2009, 12

<sup>288</sup> Newman and Newman 2009

<sup>289</sup> Spence 1977

<sup>290</sup> Spence 1977, 82

<sup>291</sup> Spence 1977, 83, 86

<sup>292</sup> TNA MPC/1/80

<sup>293</sup> Britton and Brayley 1802, 103-4

districts with settlement expansion along the moorland edges.<sup>294</sup> There is also a general scatter of new settlement in the better quality agricultural lands of the Eden Valley, which would have resulted from the establishment of farms on the former common arable fields. New settlement appears to have been more prevalent in some areas than others. What is difficult to determine, is whether these represent genuine settlement expansion or whether they demonstrate a bias because of a lack of early dating evidence. This is especially true of Westmorland, where there appears to be a concentration of new settlement between the 100m and 200m OD contours in the low hills to the north of Kendal (Figure 3.42). If this was a real expansion of settlement, it may relate to the increasing enclosure rate of new pastures from the waste, and the development of more sophisticated grazing regimes, which became more common in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.<sup>295</sup> This meant that farms could become more productive as farmers had more control over when and how their fields were fertilized on more secure grazing land. Similarly, there is an apparent new rash of settlements on the north side of the Lake District fells, particularly in Lorton Vale and around Wythop to the north-west of Bassenthwaite Lake, but also within the formerly afforested areas of Inglewood and Westward (Figure 3.43). Here the spread of settlement was restricted mainly to the already enclosed lands, but large-scale, systematic enclosure and improvement had begun in the mid-eighteenth century, which expanded the area of cultivatable land significantly and would have increased the capacity of the area to support a growing population.

Industry played a major role in the encouragement of new settlement.<sup>296</sup> Industrial settlements grew around mills in the eighteenth century in Lancashire-over-Sands and Westmorland, as at Holme Mills, Westmorland.<sup>297</sup> In Cumberland, settlements developed and grew in the eighteenth century in relation to manufacturing, as at Dalston south of Carlisle, and to mining, as at Hewer Hill in the Forest of Inglewood.<sup>298</sup> This latter settlement appears to have originated as a medieval shieling, and become a small hamlet of five dwellings linked to coal mining in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, before shrinking to the two farmsteads which remain today.<sup>299</sup> In the valleys

---

<sup>294</sup> Hey 2000, 198-200

<sup>295</sup> Winchester 2000a, 68-73

<sup>296</sup> Newman 2009, 221

<sup>297</sup> Newman 2004, 31; Newman 2003

<sup>298</sup> R. Newman 2009, 226-8

<sup>299</sup> R. Newman 2009, 226

of the South Tyne and Nent around Alston settlement intensified, mostly in the form of discrete farms and cottages, developed with smallholders supplementing their agricultural income with employment in the lead mines.<sup>300</sup> Industrial expansion could also be seen on the west coast, particularly between Egremont and Whitehaven, where employment could be found in the rurally based coal and iron mines. There is little indication of the scale of industrial development by the late eighteenth century on Donald's Map of Cumberland in 1774, but the descriptions of the coal and iron industries provided by Angerstein suggests that the landscape must have been developing an industrial character in these areas.

Overall, the mapped distribution pattern shows areas of distinct settlement character. Nucleated settlement is concentrated in a broad band which extends roughly from Workington on the west coast, along the Solway Plain, and down the valleys of the Eden, the Eamont and their tributaries (Figure 3.44). This is a lowland area dominated by better quality agricultural land, and equates with the main zones of nucleated settlement mapped by Roberts and Wrathmell for the mid-nineteenth century.<sup>301</sup> Similarly, the concentration of nucleated settlement in Furness and around the Morecambe Bay coastline is also similar to that of Roberts and Wrathmell. The distribution of small nucleations and individual dwellings also appears similar to that shown by them for the mid-nineteenth century (Figure 3.45).<sup>302</sup> The areas which were dominated by dispersed settlement patterns were along the west coast, from Workington south, around the fringes of the high fells and along the valleys in the heart of the Lake District, and across most of Westmorland. The main area with a dispersed settlement pattern was the far north of Cumbria, beyond the valley of the River Irthing in Bewcastle and Nichol Forest, which appears to have seen a proliferation of new settlement in the eighteenth century.

### **The Character of the Late-Eighteenth Century Landscape**

The defined character of Cumbria's landscape in the late eighteenth century is based on the relationships between settlement pattern, enclosed land, unenclosed land and woodland. To an extent these reflect underlying geomorphological and ecological conditions as well as local societal and cultural factors. Character areas have been drawn from an analysis of the relationship of specific combinations of landscape types

---

<sup>300</sup> English Heritage n.d.

<sup>301</sup> Roberts and Wrathmell 2002, 5, figure 1.1

<sup>302</sup> Roberts and Wrathmell 2002, 9, figure 1.3

with a definable and distinct character. In distinguishing the areas, topography, geology and historical processes have not been taken into account explicitly. By providing boundaries to areas of distinct character, it is possible to look for correlations between the character areas and the underlying factors which helped to shape the development of landscape types. They can also be compared to other mappable bounded entities, such as perceived eighteenth century agricultural zones, forests and lordships. The late-eighteenth century character areas can also be compared and contrasted with the character areas defined for the medieval period<sup>303</sup> and with those created for the HLC project, providing a mechanism by which to assess change over time. Some detailed adjustments in the character area boundaries inevitably involved small alterations made from personal knowledge of the landscape. Where a boundary between areas was not well-defined, existing boundaries such as the parish or township have been followed where possible. The definition of character areas is a subjective process, but helps identify some of the principal aspects which gave a particular area its local distinctiveness. A total of 22 character areas were defined (Figure 3.46), ranging in size from Mallerstang, the smallest at 53 km<sup>2</sup> to the Lake District Valleys and Fells at 1,750 km<sup>2</sup>. Despite the range in size of the areas, each one has its own distinctive local character, and these are described below.

### **1. Nichol Forest and Bewcastle** (Figure 3.47)

Nichol Forest and Bewcastle lies across the most northern part of Cumbria, covering an area of 482 km<sup>2</sup>. The settlement pattern was dispersed, with Longtown the only nucleated settlement of any size. This was a planned town laid out in the late eighteenth century but based on a small pre-existing rural nucleation.<sup>304</sup> There were a few small nucleated settlements, particularly in the south around Kirklington, but most settlement in this area by the late eighteenth century comprised scattered farmsteads and cottages. A large area of higher land remained unenclosed waste, to the north and east, with other, lower-lying areas of unenclosed and unimproved moorland including Bolton Fell and Solway Moss. Much formerly unenclosed waste had been enclosed and improved in the eighteenth century, such as Kirklington Middle in 1735,<sup>305</sup> and parts of the moorland in Nichol Forest<sup>306</sup> and Solport parishes<sup>307</sup> in 1760 and 1761. Colonisation by individual

---

<sup>303</sup> See Chapter 6

<sup>304</sup> Britton and Brayley 1802, 100

<sup>305</sup> CCA QRE/1/145

<sup>306</sup> CCA D/MBS/1/29

<sup>307</sup> CCA QRE/1/144, D/MBS/1/40

dwellings and small settlement nucleations had taken place by 1770. The area had been subject to two periods of improvement and rationalisation by the late eighteenth century,<sup>308</sup> so that the overall pattern of field systems appears to have been fairly regular, though less so in the areas where the land rose to meet the unenclosed common wastes, where older settlements had been assarted from the moorland. Although some woodland survived, probably as wood pasture in Askerton Park and along the banks of the Liddel Water, this character area seems to have had very little tree cover in the form of either ancient woodlands or new plantations.

## **2. *Gilsland*** (Figure 3.48)

The Gilsland character area, covering 135km<sup>2</sup>, is based around the valley of the River Irthing and comprised a patchwork of enclosed land and unenclosed moor. It included part of the Pennine massif, where it meets the Tyne Gap, and so straddled the main communication route between Carlisle and Newcastle. It is focused on the town of Brampton, but also included other nucleated settlement at Walton, Milton and Farlam, with smaller nucleations scattered across the area. Hadrian's Wall, which runs through this area, does not seem to have had any noticeable impact on the settlement pattern by the late eighteenth century. Industrial activity was clearly taking place in this area, as coal pits and lime kilns are marked on Donald's map, but it does not seem to have had a major contemporary impact on stimulating new settlement creation and existing settlement growth. There was a little woodland cover, mostly in Walton Woods, in Netherby Park and along the banks of the Rivers Irthing at Denton and Gelt on the southern boundary.

## **3. *Anthorn and Wedholme Mosses*** (Figure 3.49)

This was a sparsely populated and small character area, dominated by unenclosed mosses and salt marshes, on the north western coast of Cumbria. The lower reaches and estuary of the River Waver formed the southern boundary, with Moricombe Bay to the north and west. The area was divided into two by the River Wampool, with the extensive mosslands of Glasson Moss to the north and Wedholme Flow to the south. The entire area is low-lying, between sea level and around 20m OD, with settlement largely located on ground at 10m OD or higher. The few settlements were mainly nucleated, either small clusters of farms or nucleated rows which indicate organised settlement. The enclosures associated with the nucleated settlements were dominated by

---

<sup>308</sup> Spence 1977, 83; Britton and Brayley 1802, 103-4

enclosed strip fields, some with slightly curving boundaries suggesting the enclosure of former common arable fields. There were also some discrete steadings, mainly on the western edge between the River Waver and Wedholme Moss, some of which had medieval origins and were associated with Holme Cultram Abbey.<sup>309</sup> Some individual steadings, such as Lawrenceholme, Wedholme, Brackenrigg and Rogersceugh, had clearly originated as assarts within the mosses.

#### **4. Carlisle and Burgh** (Figure 3.50)

This large character area covered much of the Solway Plain, around the Solway Firth and the estuaries of the Rivers Eden and Esk. It was largely low lying with a maximum elevation of around 70m OD. By 1770, it was a largely enclosed landscape, with settlement concentrated in nucleated villages and dominated by Carlisle. In the late eighteenth century, Carlisle was still largely confined within its city walls, although small suburbs had grown up as ribbon development to the west and south.<sup>310</sup> In the fields to the west of the city, however, the River Caldew and its flood plain were the focus of a burgeoning cloth industry which became the focus of the later industrial city.<sup>311</sup> West of the cloth-drying fields was a large area of common waste on low moorland, which was beginning to be enclosed and improved by the late eighteenth century. Other areas of low moorland were also being managed as common waste, further west between Oughterby, Wiggonby and Great Orton, at Kingmoor north of Carlisle, as well as in the low-lying lands between the Eden and Esk rivers. This area also included extensive salt marshes along the coastline of the Solway Firth. Settlement was highly nucleated, with one line of villages lying along the coast and another string of villages and hamlets around three kilometres inland on gently rising ground rising to a low ridge at an elevation of around 50m OD. Other villages were scattered inland, focused on the fertile river valleys of the Waver, the Wampool, the Caldew, the Peterril and the Eden. Although most of the cultivatable lands had been enclosed piecemeal by the late eighteenth century, there were three areas of common arable field still in use: at Thurstonfield,<sup>312</sup> Beaumont,<sup>313</sup> and a larger area between the coastal salt marsh and an

---

<sup>309</sup> See Chapter 5

<sup>310</sup> R. Newman 2011, 150-1

<sup>311</sup> C. Newman 2011a, 153

<sup>312</sup> Graham 1913a, 19

<sup>313</sup> Dilley 1972, appendix C



area of common waste at Rockcliffe.<sup>314</sup> This character area had very little woodland, despite some of it having been within the Forest of Inglewood in the medieval period.

#### **5. *Holme Cultram and Westnewton*** (Figure 3.51)

On the north-west coast of Cumbria, south of the River Waver and its estuary, this character area comprised low-lying agricultural land, with extensive areas of unenclosed moss. By the late eighteenth century, it had a mixture of dispersed and nucleated settlement within wholly enclosed cultivated land. Much of this area had formed part of the 'island' of Holme Cultram in the medieval period, which was the core holding of Holme Cultram Abbey, and one of the main settlements within the character area was Abbeytown which had developed next to the Abbey. Much of the cultivatable land was enclosed strip fields, representing both the gradual enclosure of common arable fields and the intaking and enclosure of moss doles. The area appears to have been completely devoid of woodland.

#### **6. *Westward and Inglewood*** (Figure 3.52)

This is the third largest character area, covering over 500km<sup>2</sup>. It includes most of the former Forest of Inglewood, including Westward. It stretches from the Eden Valley in the east to Blennerhasset on the Solway Plain to the west; from the Peterril Valley south of Carlisle in the north to Whinfell in the south. It extends south of the former forest to include Greystoke, Caldbeck and the Boltons. It retained extensive areas of unenclosed common waste in the late eighteenth century, including the Lazonby Ridge in the east, Whinfell Park and large areas of Westward parish. The common wastes were in the process of being enclosed and improved by the later eighteenth century, with Sebergham common enclosed in 1765,<sup>315</sup> and Castle Sowerby and Skelton by 1769.<sup>316</sup> Some areas of common arable fields were still extant in the later eighteenth century, a tiny field at Rosley,<sup>317</sup> at Nether Row in Caldbeck,<sup>318</sup> and at Nunclose and High Hesket,<sup>319</sup> but the cultivatable lands were mainly enclosed. The legacy of the royal forest was apparent in the extensive surviving woodland at Sowerby, Parson's Park,

---

<sup>314</sup> Graham 1913a, 19

<sup>315</sup> CCA QRE/1/4

<sup>316</sup> CCA QRE/1/41; QRE/1/71

<sup>317</sup> Dilley 1972, appendix C

<sup>318</sup> Dilley 1972, appendix C

<sup>319</sup> Graham 1913a, 12-13

Baron Wood and Westward Park, and a string of other small woodland areas along the valley of the River Caldeu.

There were several deer parks around the margins of this character area. On the eastern edge was Baron Wood, a deer park first recorded as woodland in the late fifteenth century, and as a lower and upper park in the mid-sixteenth century.<sup>320</sup> At the western end of the area was Westward High and Low Parks, which again seem to have been created from a well-wooded landscape. Whether the two Westward parks were functioning as deer parks by the late eighteenth century is questionable. They were clearly significantly wooded or wood pasture areas as shown on Donald's Map of Cumberland, but only Low Park seems to have had clear bounds. An eighteenth century map of the parks<sup>321</sup> notes that '*there is [sic] no fences kept regularly up, but the Fence that bounds the whole*', suggesting that the park may have at least originated as a hunting ground rather than agricultural closes and been surrounded by a pale. By the date this map was made sometime in the later part of the eighteenth century, however, the land appears to have been used for grazing, and was perhaps in the process of being converted to arable as one division was called New Riving. The largest park was Greystoke, on the southern edge of the area, which was created as a baronial park outside of the Forest. Of medieval origin, it was still a very large and significant deer park in the late eighteenth century, covering most of the low fell to the north west of Greystoke Castle.

Settlement within this character area was almost wholly dispersed, with individual holdings and small nucleations dominating. Nucleated settlement, in the form of villages or large hamlets, was confined mainly to the valley of the River Caldeu, for example Caldbeck, Sebergham, Raughton and Raughton Head. The same focus for nucleated settlement did not develop in the valley of the River Petteril, where Wreay was the only sizeable settlement. The Lazonby Ridge formed a large continuous block of unenclosed common waste along the eastern side of the character area. On its west side was a small cluster of nucleated settlement, at High and Low Hesket, Calthwaite to the south, Aiketgate and Nunclose. There was also a nucleated settlement at Edenhall, a discrete area of improved and enclosed land at the southern end of the character area, lying between Lazonby Ridge and the River Eden. The largest settlement was Wigton, on the north western edge of the area, a small town with a church and '*pretty large*'

---

<sup>320</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 219-20

<sup>321</sup> WCA D/Lec/Westward/1/11a

market<sup>322</sup> which would have been the main urban centre for much of the western end of this character area. Around 75% of the remaining settlement was farms and cottages. Their origins, for the most part, on land assarted from common waste and woodland is apparent in the place names. Older assarts include names such as Thackthwaite, Thornthwaite and Brackenthwaite. There are many woodland names, such as East and West Woodside, Sceugh and Middlesceugh, place names associated with hunting and forest status, such as Foxley Henning, Buckabank, Hartrigg and Forester Fold, and many names which suggest marginal agricultural land, including names with elements such as 'crag', 'sike' and 'mire'. Generally, this character area was one where settlement seems to have evolved organically, where clearance, enclosure and agricultural expansion was piecemeal, part of a lengthy continuum and still ongoing in the late eighteenth century.

#### **7. *Eden Valley*** (Figure 3.53)

This is one of the largest character areas, at over 650 km<sup>2</sup>. It includes almost the whole of the Eden Valley between the edge of the Pennines to the east and the Lazonby Ridge to the west. It includes part of the lower reaches of the River Eamont, and the gently rolling landscape to the west of Lazonby Ridge, up to the southern end of Inglewood Forest. In the later eighteenth century, this area had a mixed landscape of enclosed land, common arable fields and unenclosed common waste. The unenclosed wastes were mostly moorlands within the Eden Valley, lying around 150m to 200m OD, and concentrated in two main areas. The first of these was a linear band of moorland stretching from Melmerby in the north to Dufton in the south, and which was utilised by settlements on both sides.

The second area was in the northern part of the character area, with a detached area in Renwick and Kirkoswald to the south, extending to Castle Carrock and Hayton to the north. Whereas the southern moorland formed a single linear band within the Eden Valley, the northern expanse of moorland seems to have been more of an extension of the upland wastes of the Pennines and the enclosed and cultivated lands in many areas appear to have originated as assarts from the wastes, creating irregular boundaries. Cumwhitton, for example, was an island of enclosed land surrounded by a band of common waste. Hayton, the next settlement to the north, also seems to have originated in a similar way. In the early eighteenth century, however, its common wastes had been enclosed by agreement, so that by the later part of the century, new settlement in the

---

<sup>322</sup> Nicolson and Burn 1777b, 197

form of individual dwellings had colonized the areas of former waste.<sup>323</sup> The process of gradual enclosure of the common wastes could also be seen, on a smaller scale, in the south of the area, at Appleby which was enclosed in 1768,<sup>324</sup> and at Colby in 1765.<sup>325</sup> In the south and west of the character area, areas of common waste were less extensive, with smaller areas of moorland at Dacre and Newbiggin (Cumberland), Cliburn and Great Strickland and at Sleagill and King's Meaburn. The unenclosed wastes at Shap on the southern edge of the character area were the only ones which rose to above 300m OD, and which were characterised by Limestone outcrops.

The cultivatable land was a largely enclosed landscape, including the parks of Hutton in the Forest, Dalemain and Lowther in the south west section. These were all marked as deer parks by Donald, but by the late eighteenth century, the main function of all three was as ornamental landscape settings for country mansions. Woodland was scattered throughout the area, but mostly in small blocks, for example along the banks of the River Eden at Wetheral, Corby, Ainstable and Glassonby. Being situated in the relatively fertile river valleys, this character area had significant expanses of arable land, most of which had been enclosed piecemeal by the eighteenth century, for example at Maulds Meaburn. Some, however, was still being farmed as common arable fields in the late eighteenth century. These survived in the Eden Valley in the villages of Milburn,<sup>326</sup> Gamblesby<sup>327</sup> and Croglin<sup>328</sup> below the Pennine edge, but were concentrated in two areas. The first was in the north of the character area, where common arable fields were scattered across the plain formed by the confluence of the Eden and Irthing valleys. In the late eighteenth century, many of these were undergoing piecemeal enclosure by agreement, and so only remnants survived. At Crosby<sup>329</sup> and Warwick-on-Eden<sup>330</sup> the remnants of the common arable fields were enclosed in the 1770s, by agreement, whilst the fields at Castle Carrock were enclosed in 1795 and at Irthington in 1779.<sup>331</sup> The large common arable fields of Cumwhinton remained open

---

<sup>323</sup> Graham 1907

<sup>324</sup> KCA WD/HH/15

<sup>325</sup> KCA WQR/1 20

<sup>326</sup> KCA WPR/47/4/1

<sup>327</sup> Graham 1913a, 10-13

<sup>328</sup> CCA QRE/1/32

<sup>329</sup> CCA D/MBS/1/10

<sup>330</sup> CCA D/MBS/1/32

<sup>331</sup> Graham 1910, 128

until the nineteenth century. Apart from two small remnants of common arable field which survived at Lankaber north of Maulds Meaburn in the south of the character area,<sup>332</sup> the other main area for common arable farming was to the west of the Lazonby ridge. By the later eighteenth century, the common arable fields of Motherby and Penruddock had been partially enclosed piecemeal, whereas the fields belonging to the villages and hamlets in the valley of the River Lowther, at Bampton, Knipe and Whale, remained in common into the nineteenth century,<sup>333</sup> as did those of the villages of Ellonby and Blencow<sup>334</sup> on the southern edge of Inglewood Forest. The largest single area of common arable fields was at Newbiggin and Stainton, to the west of Penrith, which remained wholly open until enclosed by Act of Parliament in 1775.<sup>335</sup>

This area had a highly nucleated settlement pattern, distributed fairly evenly throughout the character area. It included two of Cumbria's major post medieval towns, Penrith and Appleby, but also many villages of medieval origin with regular layouts, sometimes with greens and associated with former common arable fields. At Lowther and Hutton-in-the-Forest, the influence of major landowners could be seen in the establishment of the new settlements of Lowther village, Newtown and New Rent. Small nucleations were largely absent from the southern part of the character area, and confined mainly to its margins below the Pennine edge and on the fringes of the Lake District fells. Small hamlets and farm clusters were more common to the west of Penrith on the southern fringes of the Forest of Inglewood, and particularly in the northern part of the Eden Valley where the landscape was dominated by moorland which appears to have been gradually taken in, enclosed and settled. Dispersed farms and cottages also proliferated around the edges of the common waste in the Eden Valley and on the fringes of the Lake District fells. Some of this represents post medieval expansion, and this can be seen at Salkeld, for example, where the single row hamlets of Salkeld Dykes grew up along the edge of the common to the west of the village of Great Salkeld, which had been established in the medieval period. Some of the elements of dispersed settlement pattern, however, appears to have its roots in the medieval period.<sup>336</sup>

---

<sup>332</sup> KCA DD/HH/38b

<sup>333</sup> CCA D/Lons/L5/3/1/3/8; D/Lons/L5/3/1/3/9; D/Lons/L5/3/1/3/10

<sup>334</sup> Graham 1913a, 2-6

<sup>335</sup> CCA QRE/1/38

<sup>336</sup> See Chapter 6, character area 8. Inglewood and the Lower Eden Valley

### **8. *The Pennines*** (Figure 3.54)

To the east of the Eden Valley, the Pennine uplands was a character area of almost wholly unenclosed fells, apart from large pasture intakes at Middle Tongue Murton and on Mell Fell. It stretched from Talkin Fell in the north down to the edge of Stainmore in the south. The Pennines form a dramatic scarp edge to the east of the county and would have formed a formidable obstacle to travellers going east. As today, there were few routes which climb the steep western edge, the main route being the road from Melmerby in the Eden Valley up to the summit of Hartside and on into Alston and Northumberland. This was crossed by the ancient track known as the Maiden Way, which was still marked as minor route on Donald's Map of Cumberland. On the southern edge, a road led over the hills from Appleby to Teesdale in County Durham, which was joined by a minor route, now only a bridleway, which traversed the lower slopes of the Pennines, and also linked villages in the Eden Valley. The area was almost entirely devoid of settlement in the late eighteenth century, apart from a dwelling in the upper reaches of Geltsdale in the north, and a couple of steadings which formed the small hamlet of Birkdale on the southern boundary with County Durham. Given its geographically marginal and remote location, and the local presence of lead mines,<sup>337</sup> Birkdale may have been established as a miner-farmer settlement, similar to those to the north around Alston.<sup>338</sup> This character area is almost wholly a result of topography and its western edge continues to form a distinctive boundary for any modern landscape characterisations.

### **9. *Alston*** (Figure 3.55)

Alston was an area relatively isolated from the rest of Cumbria, separated by the Pennines, with limited communications to the Eden Valley. The character was dominated by unenclosed fell, which was heavily exploited for lead and to a lesser extent coal. Settlement featured individual steadings with a few small settlement clusters, along the valleys of the South Tyne and its tributary the Nent. The largest settlement was the town of Alston, situated at the confluence of the two rivers, with other nucleations at Garrigill, in the South Tyne valley, and Blagill and Nenthead in the Nent Valley. All were involved in the lead mining and processing industries, as were the inhabitants of most of the scattered farms, cottages and folds.<sup>339</sup> The influence of

---

<sup>337</sup> Jefferys 1770

<sup>338</sup> English Heritage n.d.

<sup>339</sup> English Heritage n.d.

lead mining on the landscape can be seen in two maps of 1778 made for the Earl of Carlisle showing settlement and the location of lead ore veins in relation to the manor of Alston Moor.<sup>340</sup> The lead mines were spread along the fells above the enclosed lands along the length of both valleys, and mine workers' settlements spread in a dispersed pattern to both allow access to the nearest mine workings and to provide land to supplement income through farming.

#### **10. Workington and Broughton Moor** (Figure 3.56)

The Workington and Broughton Moor character area extends to just over 250km<sup>2</sup> along the west coast of Cumbria from Harrington in the south to Allonby almost in the north. It covers the coastal plain and stretches inland as far as Cockermouth, with the eastern boundary following the course of the River Derwent north to Blindcrake, then turning east to include the low lands between the hills of Westward to the north and the low fells of Bewaldath and Snittlegarth to the south. In the later eighteenth century, the settlement pattern was highly nucleated, with the centres of population in towns such as Cockermouth, Aspatria, Maryport and Workington. Between the towns, the settlement pattern featured nucleations, commonly in the form of two-row settlements, but some with more organic, less organised plan forms. The two-row settlement was commonly associated with enclosed strip fields, many originating as common arable fields, but also outfields.<sup>341</sup> By the late eighteenth century, however, only Torpenhow and Whitrigg to the south, Stainburn and Great Broughton had surviving common field systems, and Stainburn's arable fields had been enclosed by 1794.<sup>342</sup> The surviving field at Great Broughton was only a part of the original common arable, the rest of which seems to have been enclosed in the mid-eighteenth century.<sup>343</sup> Kirkmile Dales remained open until at least 1842. The location and extent of this common field could be mapped from its likely location on the track to the site of St Lawrence's Chapel, which served the townships of Broughton and Ribton. The chapel, which lies exactly one mile, or 1.6 km, from Great Broughton, was neglected and fell into ruin in the Civil War,<sup>344</sup> though its grave yard continued in use until 1799.<sup>345</sup> The physical attributes of the fields between the chapel and the village, as shown on the nineteenth century Ordnance Survey map, in

---

<sup>340</sup> TNA MR/1/252

<sup>341</sup> Gray 1915, 232

<sup>342</sup> Dilley 1972, appendix C

<sup>343</sup> Dilley 1972, appendix C

<sup>344</sup> Winchester 2003b, 151

<sup>345</sup> Pastscape 2007, monument number 9029

conjunction with the documentary evidence, indicates that this was the location of the surviving common arable field (Figure 3.55).

This character area is distinguished by its surviving outfields, although many had been enclosed by the late eighteenth century, those at Aspatria, for example, were enclosed by agreement in 1758-9,<sup>346</sup> and that at Gilcrux in 1754.<sup>347</sup> Deanscales and Eaglesfield had outfields which were still marked as such, even though enclosed, on the nineteenth century Ordnance Survey maps. The outfield at Oughterside was not enclosed until 1776, and the one at Blennerhasset remained open until 1792.<sup>348</sup>

This was a settled, largely enclosed landscape, with small areas of surviving unenclosed moorland. The largest area of surviving moorland in the late eighteenth century was to the south of Maryport and served as common waste to a number of surrounding villages, such as Great and Little Broughton, Camerton, Flimby and Ellenborough. The area appears largely rural on Donald's map, but the labelling of iron forges and furnaces along the River Derwent and the River Marron near Workington hint at an evolving industrial character. Maryport was developed as a town and harbour in the mid-eighteenth century with an industrial base, including a blast furnace, coal mining, glass-making and paper-making, whilst the developments at Workington Harbour and Bella Port (Harrington) were based on coal.<sup>349</sup> Although the Lowthers had been mining coal at Dearham from before 1750,<sup>350</sup> it was in the second half of the eighteenth century that coal production became more widespread in the coastal zone of this character area, with the development of land around Workington, Maryport and Flimby.<sup>351</sup> The small scale of coal mining in the post medieval period limited its impact on the landscape and it does not appear to have had any mappable characteristics until the nineteenth century.

### ***11. West Cumberland Coastal Plain*** (Figure 3.57)

This large character area extends along the west coast of Cumbria from Harrington in the north to the Duddon estuary in the south and includes the coastal plain inland as far as the foothills of the Lake District fells. In the late eighteenth century, this was an intensively settled area, with numerous individual farms and cottages mixed with large

---

<sup>346</sup> Elliott 1960, 97

<sup>347</sup> Dilley 1972, appendix C

<sup>348</sup> Dilley 1972, appendix C

<sup>349</sup> Newman 2013

<sup>350</sup> Wood 1988, 34

<sup>351</sup> Wood 1988, 73-83



and small nucleations. Most of the larger nucleated settlements were in the north, and included the post medieval planned town and harbour of Whitehaven, St Bees and the town of Egremont, which was the baronial centre of Copeland. The farming landscape was characterised by enclosed land, with small areas of common waste scattered throughout on coastal low moor and at the foot of the central Lake District massif. Only two areas of common arable field survived in the late eighteenth century, at Coulderton, near Egremont on the west coast, and at Haverigg, near Millom in the south.<sup>352</sup> Coulderton was eventually enclosed by agreement in 1792 and Haverigg in 1800. A dispersed settlement pattern was common across the enclosed landscape, even where nucleated villages such as Gosforth and Bootle had once had common arable fields. The influence of major landowners, the Lowthers, was evident in the north of the character area, where large-scale enclosure of the common waste had been carried out in Distington, Moresby and Hensingham in the 1760s, although this does not immediately seem to have been accompanied by new settlement.<sup>353</sup> The influence of other major landowners is evident in the presence of deer parks at Harrington, on the northern edge of the area, and at Muncaster and Millom in the south.

## **12. Lake District Fells and Valleys** (Figure 3.58)

The largest of the character areas, at 1,750 km<sup>2</sup>, this covers the whole of the Lake District high fells and the valleys which dissect them. The main landscape character type in the late eighteenth century was unenclosed fell and moor, with almost wholly enclosed lands held in severalty in the valleys. It was only in Longsleddale, the Kentmere valley and Great Langdale where fragments of common fields still survived into the late eighteenth century. All lay in the valley bottoms and may have at least partly operated as common meadow. Given the limited land available for cultivation in most of the valleys, common arable fields would have been small, and were generally enclosed at an early date. Settlement in many of the valleys was dispersed with a mixture of individual dwellings and small nucleations, particularly in the smaller valleys where the opportunities to expand holdings was topographically limited. Piecemeal intaking from the lower fellsides, in the form of pastures, was ongoing, but large-scale enclosures and improvements had yet to begin in the central Lake District. Villages and towns were mostly restricted to the larger valleys, around lakes or the confluence of valleys, where there was more space for settlement. In the very centre of

---

<sup>352</sup> Dillely 1972, appendix C

<sup>353</sup> CCA QRE/1/6; QRE/1/48; QRE/1/85

the Lake District, for example, where a number of valleys, including the Langdale and Rothay valleys join above Lake Windermere, nucleated settlement had developed at Ambleside, Rydal, Chapel Stile, Elterwater and Grasmere, with Troutbeck and Bowness on the east bank of Windermere. On the north side of the Lake District, nucleated settlement grew up in the broad valley between the central massif and the Skiddaw range, centred on the town of Keswick, but also including Threlkeld, Portinscale, Braithwaite, and Applethwaite and Millbeck at the base of Skiddaw. Even so, sizeable hamlets had developed in some valleys, such as Borrowdale, where settlement was concentrated in nucleations at Rosthwaite, Stonethwaite and Seatoller, and where there were relatively few individual farms and cottages.

The legacy of the Lake District's former status as afforested land was still apparent in the late eighteenth century. The deer parks of Troutbeck, Rydal and Ulpha, for example, all had medieval origins, and were still clearly identifiable as such even if, like Rydal, the deer had been removed from the park in the seventeenth century. They were reintroduced in the eighteenth century as a pastoral decorative element within a landscape park.<sup>354</sup> Ulpha, Troutbeck and Gowbarrow remained primarily medieval-style deer parks. Gowbarrow Park, on the north shore of Ullswater, originated in the fifteenth century, probably to provide a deer preserve within the Forest of Matterdale.<sup>355</sup> In the late eighteenth century, this rocky, upland park was said to be stocked with six or seven hundred fallow deer.<sup>356</sup> The popularity of the Lakes Counties for admirers of picturesque landscapes is evident in the interest in enhancement through design. This can be read in the character of the late eighteenth century landscape, for example, around Derwent Water with lakeside parks such as Castlerigg and Brandelhow, and the ornamental planting of woodlands. Although some of the woodland around Derwent Water can be documented from the medieval period,<sup>357</sup> much appears to have been felled between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries.<sup>358</sup> This was replaced by new planting, of both native trees and introduced conifers. When Thomas West visited the Lakes, his subsequent guidebook published in 1886 described Cockshut Hill, one of his viewing stations near Keswick, as being covered with '*young trees, both sown and*

---

<sup>354</sup> Newman 2007, 247

<sup>355</sup> See Chapter 6

<sup>356</sup> Hutchinson 1794, 435

<sup>357</sup> Ashness Wood on the south west bank is first recorded in 1211 (Armstrong *et al* 1950, 349)

<sup>358</sup> Hardie 2007, 263

*planted, oak, spruce, Scotch fir &c. all of which thrive wonderfully*'.<sup>359</sup> New woodland planting, and the extension of existing woodland was one of the side effects of the popularity of the Lakes for admirers of the Picturesque, as landscapes were enhanced to fit the scenic ideal. It was said that in the Barony of Greystoke, owned by the Duke of Norfolk, '*His Grace has, for these several years past, planted above 2000 trees annually upon his estates here*'.<sup>360</sup> Much of this new woodland was not on a scale to be mapped, but this character area had significant, and mappable, woodland in the valley of the River Brathay near Ambleside, around Derwent Water, and around and to the north of Bassenthwaite Lake, all areas which were important Picturesque landscapes.

### **13. Upper Eden** (Figure 3.59)

Although physically part of the Eden Valley, Upper Eden forms a distinct character area. Its primary settlement characteristic is nucleation centred on the small towns of Kirkby Stephen and Brough. There is a higher degree of dispersion than in the rest of the Eden Valley to the north, although around a third of the dispersed settlement cannot be dated any earlier than the eighteenth century and probably represents post medieval expansion, including a little common edge encroachment. An example of this may be the establishment of individual steadings around the edge of Asby Mask common. A line of individual dwellings along the line of the River Eden amongst enclosed strip fields, suggests the establishment of new steadings in enclosed common arable fields and former common meadow. Further evidence of this can be seen in the names of some of these settlements, such as 'Stripes', Trainriggs and Winton Field. All common arable fields had been enclosed by the late eighteenth century, and small areas of intaking had been taking place along the fell edges, as at Little Asby and Hartley. The open fell on the southern edge of the character area comprised limestone grasslands, whilst the common wastes in the valley were moorland. Woodland was scarce in this area, with only small remnants surviving from probable earlier origins within deer parks, for example at Flakebridge, Hoff Lunn and Hartley Castle.

### **14. Stainmore** (Figure 3.60)

East of the Upper Eden was the small character area of Stainmore, covering 100km<sup>2</sup>. It was dominated by unenclosed fell which formed part of the Pennines, but which incorporated a number of small river valleys flowing into the River Eden catchment. Within these valleys settlement was almost entirely made up of discrete farms and

---

<sup>359</sup> Hardie 2007, 267

<sup>360</sup> Hutchinson 1794, 406

houses, around 40% of which can only be dated to the post medieval period. The character of a sparsely populated area with a dispersed settlement pattern is reflected in its medieval origins in the Forest of Stainmore, where much of the settlement had developed from vaccaries.<sup>361</sup> The pattern of small irregular enclosures suggests it was cleared, parcelled up and improved from unenclosed waste. This can be viewed as a transitional landscape between the extensive grazing lands of the open high fells and the enclosed and cultivated lands of the Eden Valley, containing some of the characteristics of both. In the late eighteenth century, there were still significant areas of unenclosed moorland and low fell, nearly all above 200m OD, which physically linked the moors of the Pennines to the Eden Valley by means of open droveways, which would originally have led from the vaccaries onto the fells, but which in the post medieval period provided access from tenanted farms. At this time, the process of moorland enclosure was underway with pasture intakes on the fellsides at Kaber.

#### **15. Upper Lune Valley and Fells** (Figure 3.61)

An area defined by large areas of unenclosed fell and enclosed dales. The fells formed the northern end of the Howgill Hills and lay on the county boundary between Westmorland and Yorkshire. Lying above 300m OD, they served the valley communities as unenclosed common grazing lands. There are three main valleys: the Tebay Gorge to the west, the upper Lune Valley to the north, and the upper Rawthay Valley to the east, the last two being linked across the watershed below Harter Fell. By the late eighteenth century, the cultivatable lands were entirely enclosed, and small areas at the base of the fells were being taken in and improved as grazing pastures. Settlement was sparse and mostly dispersed, but with nucleations at Ravenstonedale, Newbiggin-on-Lune and Tebay. The western side of this character area was where the Howgill Fells met the Lake District mountains, and the Tebay Gorge was the main corridor through the mountains between south and north Westmorland. Likewise, the Lune Valley to the north of the Howgills provided access, by way of a turnpike road, across the Pennines via Brough, joining with a second turnpike road which ran from lower down the Lune Valley, via Sedburgh in Yorkshire and along the Rawthay Valley. The valleys, therefore, were key to communications in the far north of England, however this does not seem to have stimulated the development of settlement.

---

<sup>361</sup> See Chapter 6

**16. Mallerstang** (Figure 3.62)

Mallerstang was a remote and sparsely settled valley in the east of Westmorland, with even the lowest parts lying at over 200m OD. Situated within the Pennine uplands, it is defined by the steeply sided open fells which surround the enclosed lands of the valley. It was very sparsely settled in the late eighteenth century, mostly comprising single farms, some of which were the successors to the medieval vaccaries which had been scattered along the valley sides.<sup>362</sup> The only sizeable settlement was a hamlet, hardly bigger than most small nucleated settlements, at Outhgill in the centre of the valley. By the late eighteenth century, some valley sides had been taken in and improved for grazing, but the dominant characteristic was the surrounding open fell. At the north end of the character area, the valley opened up, and here the dominant feature was the large deer park for Wharton Hall, of sixteenth century origin, which occupied most of the flatter, more fertile valley bottom lands.

**17. High Furness** (Figure 3.63)

On the south side of the central Lake District massif, High Furness covered 170km<sup>2</sup> of the low fells between Windermere and Coniston Water. This sparsely settled area was characterised by a mix of unenclosed common waste, woodland with enclosed farmland between. Most of this area lies below 200m OD, and it was generally the higher land which remained open and unenclosed in the late eighteenth century. At the south end, the area includes some land below 10m OD, particularly along the Rusland Valley. The legacy of its medieval history was still highly legible in this character area, with around two thirds of the settlement known to have origins which pre-dated 1700. The main centres of nucleated settlement, at Hawkshead, Near and Far Sawrey, Satterthwaite, Oxen Park and Bouth, all originated as granges for Furness Abbey, which owned this entire area and administered it as private forest.<sup>363</sup> This was a pastoral landscape, with all settlement having access to unenclosed grazing on the low fells. By the late eighteenth century, enclosure of the fells was well underway, through private agreement. This did not lead to the reduction of woodland areas, however, but to an increase in tree planting. New enclosures were the subject of extensive planting

---

<sup>362</sup> See Chapter 6

<sup>363</sup> See Chapter 6

schemes by wealthy estate owners, who saw a profit in timber production.<sup>364</sup> New and existing woodland was also managed as coppices to provide charcoal for industry<sup>365</sup>

The pattern of settlement and enclosure in the Furness fells was very similar to that in the neighbouring character area of Crosthwaite and Windermere. This was likely an effect of topography where low fells with large areas of rock outcrops were interspersed with better quality land which could be enclosed and farmed. Arable farming potential in both areas was limited, and so farming was stock based. The key difference between the two areas was the wooded nature of High Furness. This was in part a medieval inheritance from monastic management of the land as Furness Abbey's hunting grounds.<sup>366</sup> As woodland cover was expanding by the later eighteenth century, however, this is not a complete explanation. The key factor in promoting woodland expansion in the area was the iron industry and its dependence on woodland for charcoal.

Archaeological survey and excavation has identified numerous small bloomery sites and charcoal pitsteads in the Furness fells.<sup>367</sup> Active management of coppiced woodland supplied other woodland based industries as well as charcoal making.<sup>368</sup>

#### ***18. Crosthwaite and Windermere*** (Figure 3.64)

The character of the landscape of the eastern shores of Windermere was one of sparsely dispersed settlement scattered within a wholly enclosed landscape largely devoted to stock rearing. The enclosed lands were broken up by extensive areas of unenclosed low fell, managed and exploited as common waste. The unenclosed fells were generally poor quality grasslands with areas of rock outcrops. There were very few nucleated settlements. Bowness, on the shores of Windermere, was the most substantial settlement, almost certainly beginning to prosper as a result of tourism, and Crosthwaite, or Crossthwaite Green, had developed as a small nucleation around the church. On the east side of Witherslack Fell, a string of mostly individual farms and cottages, also included the small settlement of Row, where a band of more fertile lands between the open fell and the wetlands of the Lyth Valley could be exploited for agriculture. Staveley, which had a market of medieval origin, was still a small village in the late eighteenth century. It was poised, however, to take advantage of the water

---

<sup>364</sup> Whyte 2003, 78-9

<sup>365</sup> Bowden 2000, 6

<sup>366</sup> See Chapter 4

<sup>367</sup> Newman 2006, 132-3

<sup>368</sup> Newman and Hardie 2007, 102-3

power from the River Kent to manufacture bobbins for the Lancashire cotton industry. It was also situated to serve the tourism industry, being close to one of the main routes into the Lake District. By the 1770s, however, these two growth factors had yet to make their mark substantially. Despite the later development of a bobbin industry, woodland was not plentiful in this area in the late eighteenth century. There was woodland on the eastern shore of Windermere, at its southern end, and there were small areas of coppiced woodland around Staveley. The largest well wooded environment were steep fellsides around Witherslack Fell

**19. North Kent Valley** (Figure 3.65)

Between the town of Kendal and the Lake District Fells was a band of enclosed farmland wholly dominated by dispersed settlement. On its fringes were areas of unenclosed fell, and in the valley of the River Mint near Kendal were a few patches of woodland, but the area largely comprised enclosed farmland with discrete farms, cottages and small hamlets. By the late eighteenth century, this area was quite densely settled, with over 200 discrete dwellings and small nucleations within an area of 115km<sup>2</sup>. Of these settlements, 53% cannot be dated to earlier than 1700. This scale of likely settlement expansion suggests an intensification of land use as well as the enclosure and improvement of new land from the common waste.

**20. Low Furness** (Figure 3.66)

This character area of 145km<sup>2</sup> occupies the whole of the lowland in the Furness peninsula, including the island of Walney. In the medieval period, this land included the estates of Furness Abbey, Conishead Priory and also the Manor of Aldingham, when there were relatively large areas of common arable fields.<sup>369</sup> By the late eighteenth century, these had all been enclosed. The settlement pattern was largely one of nucleation, and included the towns of Ulverston and Dalton-in-Furness. The area seems to have been intensively farmed in relation to most areas of Cumbria, and there were few areas of unenclosed common waste, aside from the coastal sand dunes and marshes. This was because most of the landscape was capable of cultivation, and it was only in areas of low fell, such as The Hoad north of Ulverston, and Birkrigg Common, as well as small areas of moss, which remained unenclosed and unimproved. Industry, which dominated the landscape in the nineteenth century, was already an important factor in the economy, with iron mines at Lindal, though this had no mappable expression in the

---

<sup>369</sup> See Chapter 6

landscape of the late eighteenth century, a reflection of its relatively small scale and low landscape impact.

**21. *Cartmel Peninsula*** (Figure 3.67)

One of the smallest of the late eighteenth century character areas, this covered the Cartmel peninsula to the south of the Lake District fells, from Staveley-in-Cartmel in the north, south to the sands and salt marshes of Cark, and defined on three sides by Morecambe Bay. Generally, this was a low-lying area, although with unenclosed stony low fell reaching up to around 180m OD. The two main unenclosed areas of fell were Hampsfell in the east and Bigland Scar in the west. There were also extensive areas of unenclosed coastal marsh and moss, both on the Leven Estuary to the west and on Winder Moor on the southern tip of the peninsula, with further salt marsh at Meathop on the east facing the Kent Estuary. The cultivatable lands had all been enclosed by the late eighteenth century. Settlement largely comprised nucleated villages, with the former priory settlement of Cartmel at its centre. To the north of the village of Cark, the estate of Holker Hall dominated the landscape with its landscaped deer park. Many of the settlements which could not be dated to earlier than 1700 appear to have been in the more upland areas, where settlement was more dispersed in nature. Like the character area of the North Kent Valley to the north of Kendal, this new settlement may reflect an expansion of population and an intensification of settlement.

**22. *Kendale*** (Figure 3.68)

This large character area stretches from the historic county boundary between Yorkshire and Westmorland in the east and the Lyth Valley in the west. The northern limit is defined by the edge of the unenclosed fells, and to the south it follows the county boundary between Westmorland and Lancashire. Kendale had substantial areas of unenclosed waste, on the Pennine edge in the east and across moorland in a band of glacial drumlins in the centre, as well as a swathe of unenclosed mossland within the Lyth Valley on its western boundary. The main settlement was Kendal, which was also the centre of the Barony of Kendale. Beyond the town, the late eighteenth century settlement pattern was fairly mixed, with a scattering of discrete farms and cottages spread across the enclosed landscapes between the unenclosed commons. Within the Lune and Kent Valleys, which were the two main areas of settlement, dispersed settlement was intermixed with nucleations, surrounded by an entirely enclosed fieldscape. Manorial parks were a significant feature of this character area, particularly



along the western edge between the Lyth and Kent valleys, which along with Arnside were the most wooded parts of the character area.

### **Characterisation Conclusions**

The characterisation of the eighteenth century landscape reveals some broad trends. The Lake District massif formed a highly discrete, distinctive and cohesive area within Cumbria. This was largely but not exclusively based on topography and geomorphology. The underlying effects of geomorphology are strongly revealed in eighteenth century mapping not only in relation to the Lake District but also the Pennine escarpment and in revealing the impact on settlement and land use of land over 200m OD in general. Areas of changing settlement pattern and land use below 200m OD, however, are often not obviously relatable to physical geographical factors and in some cases are clearly the results of local choices regarding land use strategies.

Across Cumbria, however, there is clear evidence for agricultural change, especially, as the older system of farming, based on medieval principles and practices of power relationships, land holding and farming, crumbled in the face of improving landlords. Agricultural improvement, fuelled by economic and population growth, is everywhere evident through the enclosure of common arable fields and common waste, as well as the planting of new woodlands and in some cases the development and spread of new settlements. Contemporary observers, however, noted that improvements in arable farming, with the introduction of turnips and wheat, were not found everywhere, and the old practices of continual sowing with peas, barley or oats was still common.<sup>370</sup> New crops had been introduced into parts of Cumberland, particularly around Penrith, but in Westmorland these innovations clearly remained a novelty.<sup>371</sup> In the more marginal parts of the county, cultivation remained a constant struggle, as evidenced by the ‘consumption’ walls in the valley bottom at Wasdale. These field walls, sometimes up to 3m thick, were repositories for field clearances, constantly added to with stones washed down from the fells by the Mosedale and Lingmell Becks and deposited onto the flood plain.<sup>372</sup> Even so, the impacts of the major improving landlords, such as the Lowther, Graham and Howard families, were mappable features of the eighteenth century Cumbrian landscape and were particularly evident in some areas such as the West Cumberland Plain and the Nichol Forest and Bewcastle area. Aside from

---

<sup>370</sup> Bainbridge 1942

<sup>371</sup> Bainbridge 1942, 59-60

<sup>372</sup> National Trust n.d., 43

agricultural improvement the impacts of some of these landowners were also evident in the establishment of planned towns and villages.

Whilst the seeds of industrial development were clearly evident from the earlier eighteenth century, and of interest to passing observers and early tourists, the enterprises remained strictly confined to small areas and small-scale. Consequently, their landscape impact was highly limited as would have been their general impact on the inhabitants of Cumbria. Although county-wide mapping, for reasons of scale, undoubtedly under-represents the spread and totality of industrialisation, it probably does give an accurate picture of overall landscape impact. The transformative effects of industrialisation were yet to impact upon Cumbria generally in the 1770s with regard to landscape, the economy or society. These effects would radically alter the character of some areas by the end of the nineteenth century and are visible on the later nineteenth century Ordnance Survey mapping.

Although post medieval changes are very evident in the mapped late-eighteenth century landscape, the place-name dating evidence for many of the settlements, the network of roads linking them, and the large areas of still unenclosed waste, indicate that the greater part of the structure of the landscape was of medieval origin. Some character areas clearly had a greater medieval legacy than others, and the legibility of that legacy also varied. Nevertheless, as demonstrated in this chapter, it is clear that the eighteenth century county maps, enhanced by other post medieval mapping evidence, provide a good baseline upon which to reconstruct elements of the later medieval landscape.

Using the late-eighteenth century landscape digital map as a baseline, enhanced with evidence from supplementary data sources, such as manuscript maps, published primary sources and secondary sources, it was possible to produce a digital map of the late medieval landscape. Although this map had some blank areas where no definitive evidence for medieval landscape character types was found, this map does provide an overview of the character of the late medieval landscape. The ensuing chapters set out the evidence used in enhancing the late-eighteenth century map for the compilation of a map of the late medieval landscape. This evidence has been divided into three sections. The first examines the structure of lordship, and how the large and powerful baronies of Cumbria influenced land use and the development of settlement within their bounds, particularly within the extensive areas governed as forest. Following this is an examination of the influence of religious houses on the development of the medieval landscape. Within the study area there were extensive lands, equal to some of the large

secular lordships, under the control of monastic houses. This chapter examines how they influenced the development of settlement, particularly through the management of granges. The final chapter on the medieval landscape takes an overview of the late medieval landscape and its development, bringing together the medieval data to inform an area based characterisation of the late medieval landscape.

## **Chapter 4. Landscapes of Power: Secular Lordship and Land-use in Late Medieval Cumbria**

*It was famed as a hunting ground that contained every manner of beast that the hunter could desire, it had a wide repute for its timber, and its area was so great that, if we judge by the extent of land which came within the bounds of the forest in Henry the Second's day, it may reasonably be doubted whether any other forest in England approached it in size.*<sup>373</sup>

The digital map of the late-eighteenth century landscape was used as the baseline mapping data for an interpretive map of the late medieval landscape. This was enhanced using additional primary and secondary sources for information on the origins of features and their earliest known date of occurrence. This allows certain features to be removed as definitely not having existed in the late Middle Ages, and others to be eliminated as highly unlikely to have done so. The majority of places excluded from the map of medieval Cumbria, however, simply lack evidence for a medieval origin, and this may be a reflection of an absence of evidence. The resulting map retains information which is relevant to the late medieval period. Even so, the occurrence of a place-name before the end of the sixteenth century does not necessarily imply that the place existed in the exact location shown on post medieval maps. For example, the modern village of Ainstable in the Eden Valley is now focused on the church which is some 500m to the east of the original site. The original location now comprises only a few houses scattered along the road, but in the late eighteenth century appears to have been an irregularly spaced two-row settlement.<sup>374</sup> In most cases, however, where there are nucleated settlements, it is possible to use the county maps to identify those with a likely medieval origin from their depicted plan form. This, along with their relationship to surrounding field systems, gives a good indication of likely medieval antiquity. Brian Roberts, in particular, used the plan form of Eden nucleated settlements and their relationship to the surrounding field systems, to investigate their medieval origins.<sup>375</sup> The relict field systems of strip cultivation, frequently preserved in the boundaries of later enclosures, give a sound indication of the incidence and form of common arable fields of medieval origin. This technique of recognising past farming practices is utilised in HLC projects. In this study, its accuracy has been improved by the wider use

---

<sup>373</sup> The Forest of Inglewood, taken from Parker 1905, 35

<sup>374</sup> See Chapter 3

<sup>375</sup> Roberts 1993a

of maps of post medieval date and a variety of primary and secondary documentary sources relating to common arable field cultivation in Cumbria.

The resultant map of Cumbria in the later medieval period has many blank spaces and lacks accurate information on the precise location and nature of dispersed settlement. These deficiencies can, in part, be addressed by consulting documentary sources relating to medieval land disposal and boundaries, such as occur in charters and land grants. In particular, it is possible to improve information on woodland cover, deer parks, vaccaries and granges. These topics are not comprehensively covered in this study, as to do so was beyond its remit. Rather, information was taken from readily accessible published primary sources and some secondary sources. In particular, there was a good range of sources available on monastic land holdings, especially granges, which could be plotted onto the map of the late medieval landscape, and which provided an illustration of an aspect of dispersed settlement expansion. In some instances, the landscape impact of particular examples was further elucidated from the results of archaeological investigations and ground truthing. The analysis of the digital map of the late medieval landscape is set out in this and the following two chapters. This chapter deals with secular lordship and the physical manifestations of power in the form of forests, deer parks and specialist settlements such as vaccaries. A large proportion of the study area was covered by forests and these, along with the other features of lordly power, appear to have had a significant impact on the late medieval landscape. These aspects are covered in some detail as there has been considerable research undertaken by Winchester amongst others,<sup>376</sup> the results of which were available to be mapped. Chapter 5 follows on the landscapes of religious lordship, based on mapped monastic holdings, and the distribution of monastic granges, which was aided by the publication of many of the cartularies and also by other research on monastic land holdings within the study area.<sup>377</sup> Chapter 6 forms an overview of medieval settlements, their associated field systems and the forces for change bringing together the results of chapters 4 and 5 and providing an area-based characterisation of the later medieval landscape.

In order to provide a context and structure for the later medieval landscape, it is necessary to review briefly its feudal divisions and the nature of its lordship. Within this structure, the great baronial forests of Cumbria developed and functioned. These forests covered much of Cumbria, especially the upland. They provided a different land holding

---

<sup>376</sup> Liddell 1966; Parker 1905, 1906, 1907, 1909, 1910, 1912; Winchester 1987, 2003a, 2004, 2006b, 2007, 2010b

<sup>377</sup> Atkinson 1888; Grainger and Collingwood 1929; Thorley 2004; Todd 1991; Wilson 1915

structure, legal framework and economic basis for settlement and agricultural development to that governing much of the lowlands. Certainly, it was different to that which related to most of the champion farming areas of England.<sup>378</sup> It is within this different tenurial structure that much of the settlement pattern of dispersed hamlets and discrete farmsteads evolved.

### **Lordships**

The Lake Counties were dominated by large and powerful baronies, reflecting their position as border counties. Alongside these secular barons, religious foundations had a considerable influence, controlling large areas. The most significant, like Furness, were comparable in influence and status to the most powerful secular lordships. The origins and development of the primary secular, territorial administrative units have been discussed in detail elsewhere including by Winchester and Phythian-Adams,<sup>379</sup> suggesting that there appears to have been some correlation between the boundaries of the great baronies and those of the wards and deaneries which, themselves, may have been based on earlier administrative units.<sup>380</sup> The correlation is far from perfect, however, and is more marked in Cumberland which until 1092 formed part of Scotland.<sup>381</sup> Even after it was conquered by William Rufus in 1092, it did not become a permanent part of England until the second half of the twelfth century having reverted to Scottish control from 1136 until 1157.<sup>382</sup>

Even so, many of the great baronies of Cumbria appear to have been established by William Rufus and Henry I soon after the initial conquest of 1092. In the area which was to become the county of Westmorland, there were two great baronies: Westmorland centred on Appleby, and Kendale, centred on Kendal. In what became Cumberland were the baronies of Copeland, centred on Egremont, and Allerdale, centred on Papcastle. Furness, which became part of the county of Lancashire, had been part of the pre-Conquest estate of Earl Tostig, known as 'Hougun'. Centred on Dalton-in-

---

<sup>378</sup> Williamson *et al* 2013, 234-5; Rackham 1986

<sup>379</sup> Winchester 1987, Chapter 1; Phythian-Adams 1996

<sup>380</sup> Winchester 1987, 15-16

<sup>381</sup> Phythian-Adams 1996, 26; Winchester 1987, 18

<sup>382</sup> Barlow 1972, 287

Furness,<sup>383</sup> this territory included much of the Cartmel peninsula, thus covering the area which was later known as Lancashire-over-Sands.<sup>384</sup>

The Barony of Allerdale included the smaller Barony of Wigton and the Honor of Cockermouth, whilst Copeland included the Lordship of Millom. Both Millom and Cockermouth were separated from Copeland and Allerdale respectively around 1100, and it has been speculated by Winchester that this may represent the re-establishment of pre-Conquest units. The Barony of Wigton was also granted away from Allerdale in the early twelfth century, followed by the Barony of Greystoke in the mid-twelfth century.<sup>385</sup>

The border baronies of Burgh and Liddel were established in the early twelfth century by Ralph de Meschin, who had been granted the lordship of Carlisle by Henry I.<sup>386</sup> Burgh lay to the west of Carlisle, to the north of the Barony of Allerdale. Liddel occupied much of the land north of Carlisle, including the modern parishes of Kirkandrews, Arthuret, Solport, Nichol Forest and Bewcastle.<sup>387</sup> Adjoining Liddel on its south-east boundary was the Barony of Gilsland, which was probably established at the beginning of the twelfth century. In 1158 it was granted to Hubert de Vaux<sup>388</sup> when the estate was described as having belonged to Gille, son of Bueth. The small motte at Irthington may have been the centre of the barony,<sup>389</sup> but if so the baronial centre had moved to Naworth Castle by 1335.<sup>390</sup> The western boundary of the barony is known as the Baron's Dyke, and it can still be followed preserved in modern field boundaries.<sup>391</sup>

The dominance of such large and powerful baronies had a significant effect on the development of the landscape from the medieval period. The land management strategies of these powerful landholders were influenced by the environmental nature of the landholdings including the presence of large areas of upland moorland and lowland mosses. The influence of topography can be seen in the patterns of landholdings within the baronies. Winchester has demonstrated that in the fertile lowlands, most land

---

<sup>383</sup> Winchester 1987, 18

<sup>384</sup> Farrer and Brownbill 1914, 254

<sup>385</sup> Winchester 1987, 16

<sup>386</sup> Winchester 1987, 16

<sup>387</sup> Graham 1913b

<sup>388</sup> Ferguson 1894, 160

<sup>389</sup> Ferguson 1894, 160

<sup>390</sup> Todd 1991, 140

<sup>391</sup> CHER monuments 210 and 482

holdings were let out as subinfeudated manors. Land controlled directly by the baronies, however, tended to be either close to the baronial seat, or in the less densely settled and extensive areas of upland.<sup>392</sup> Brian Roberts in examining cultural cores supported this view. He showed that the long-cleared and settled lowland areas of Cumbria were not the areas directly controlled by the baronial lords, but that they were concentrated along the lowlands of the west coast and in the Eden Valley.<sup>393</sup> The nature of these lordships is a key to the character of the landscape in the medieval period with the designation of large areas as forest or chases. Such extensive areas were subject to special laws for the promotion and protection of hunting by the seigniorial classes, and allowed the lords to tightly control the border lands. The forests were a physical symbol of a delegation of royal power to the barons as its Crown representatives.<sup>394</sup>

### **Forests and Chases**

The medieval forest was a legal definition, over which special laws held, specifically for the preservation of beasts for hunting but which also provided greater control over the land. Strictly speaking, a forest was a royal institution, under the protection of the king and subject to special courts and overseen by dedicated officers.<sup>395</sup> Chases were similar, in that they were areas over which there were rights to hunt but they were in the hands of private individuals. Certain activities were still restricted and were overseen by officials for the protection of hunting. In practice, however, the distinction between the two was much less definite, and the term 'forest' was often used interchangeably with 'chase' in contemporary documents. Some chases had begun as royal forests and were then granted away by the king and chases could also be taken into royal hands.<sup>396</sup> Although there was a very real legal difference between the two, in that forests were subject to forest laws, it has been argued that in operation they were very similar. It is only from the early sixteenth century that they become truly distinct legal entities.<sup>397</sup> An indication of the blurring in the definitions can be seen in Cumbria where Inglewood, a true forest remaining under royal control throughout the medieval period,<sup>398</sup> yet is

---

<sup>392</sup> Winchester 1987, 19-20

<sup>393</sup> Roberts 2008, 27

<sup>394</sup> Extensive areas of forests were also found in the Welsh Marches (Linnard 1982, 32-3)

<sup>395</sup> Grant 1991, 3-7

<sup>396</sup> Grant 1991, 30

<sup>397</sup> Langton 2010, 6-7

<sup>398</sup> Winchester 1987, 22



referred to as Inglewood Chase on the medieval Gough Map.<sup>399</sup> Other than Inglewood all other Cumbrian forests were baronial. For the sake of simplicity, all will be referred to here as forests, whether royal or baronial.

There can be some confusion in equating forest with woodland. In modern terminology, forest is commonly used to mean large areas of land covered in trees, and it is often believed that medieval forests must have been wooded. This is not true and there were many examples in England of medieval forests which were dominated by moorland and were almost totally unwooded, such as Exmoor.<sup>400</sup> This confusion in terminology can even be found in the medieval period, where the terms for wood (*sylva* and *boscus*) are sometime used interchangeably with *foresta*.<sup>401</sup> Although some of the Cumbrian forests were moorland in character, the mapping of the extent of woodland as shown on the late-eighteenth century county maps, supplemented by earlier manuscript maps, helped to identify areas of medieval woodland and its likely extent in relation to areas of forest.

### ***The Cumbrian Forests and Chases***

The historical sources are variable and contradictory in their definition of the locations, extents and uses of forests and chases in Cumbria. This is because the original documents themselves are unclear and inconsistent in their terminology and nomenclature. The baronial chase of Copeland was referred to as '*foresta de Coupeland*' around 1282, for example, and Geltsdale as '*forresta mea de Geltesdale*' around 1210.<sup>402</sup> As a result, the enumeration of forests has varied in other studies according to the definitions used and the period being examined.<sup>403</sup> Chancellor Ferguson writing in the late nineteenth century, for example, assumes that the Forest of Cumberland eventually evolved into the smaller Forest of Inglewood, but does not specify the process or his evidence.<sup>404</sup> Parker, writing in the early years of the twentieth century on Inglewood, also assumes that reference to the Forest of Cumberland must mean Inglewood at its greatest extent, but that it must originally have included the

---

<sup>399</sup> Langton 2010, 24

<sup>400</sup> Cantor 1982, 57

<sup>401</sup> Langton 2010, 7

<sup>402</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 37-8

<sup>403</sup> Langton and Jones 2010

<sup>404</sup> Ferguson 1894, 180-1

Forest of Copeland.<sup>405</sup> Older works pick up documented references from medieval sources to foresters of Cumberland, but do not address the specific subject of forests.<sup>406</sup>

Nationally, the extent of land covered by forest or chase fluctuated throughout the Middle Ages, and some forests were abolished in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, including in Cumbria. Many of their boundaries were not recorded and, in some cases, the only documentation relates to later boundaries following a process of disafforestation and the carving out of new estates in areas of free chases.<sup>407</sup> For many of the baronial forests, there appears to have been a general contraction of the areas covered by hunting rights to the uplands, with a process of settlement and subinfeudation on the lower lying, more fertile lands.<sup>408</sup> The extent of the forests and chases plotted here, however, is intended to show the areas covered at their greatest extent, and it includes areas which were later removed from forest law during the medieval period (Figure 4.1; Table 4.1). There is no one source for determining what areas were covered by forest and chase, and the extents plotted are based mainly on work by Angus Winchester, the recent national survey by Langton and Jones, the series of early twentieth century articles by Parker on Inglewood, but particularly his examination of Inglewood and Allerdale Forests and their later extensions, and Liddell's article on the private forests of south west Cumberland.<sup>409</sup>

### ***The Forest of Inglewood***

The Forest of Inglewood was established in the twelfth century<sup>410</sup> and with the addition of Allerdale Forest in the reign of Henry II, the royal forest eventually covered over 500km<sup>2</sup>. Although Allerdale originated as a separate forest, it is considered here as part of Inglewood, under its later name of Westward, so named because it became the West Ward of Inglewood and was administered through the forest courts of Inglewood.<sup>411</sup> Inglewood's bounds, and those of Westward, were transcribed and described by Parker.<sup>412</sup> Inglewood included all the land south and west of the River Eden and north of the River Eamont (Figure 4.2). Its western boundary approximately follows the road

---

<sup>405</sup> Parker 1905

<sup>406</sup> Nicolson and Burn 1777b, 73-4

<sup>407</sup> Winchester 2004, 22

<sup>408</sup> Winchester 1987, 22; Winchester 2004, 22

<sup>409</sup> Winchester 2000a; 2000b; 2004; Langton and Jones 2010; Parker 1905; Liddell 1966

<sup>410</sup> Higham 1986

<sup>411</sup> Liddell 1966, 107

<sup>412</sup> Parker 1905

from Eamont Bridge to Lamonby via Skirsgill, Pallet Hill, Little Blencow and Ellonby. From there, it crossed open land to Mabil Cross at the north end of Greystoke Park, and followed, first, the Gilcambon Beck, then the Caldbeck River, the Bowten Beck and the Chalk Beck to the River Wampool. From Crofton Bridge over the Wampool, the boundary then followed the old Roman road and King's highway (now the A595) to Carlisle and the River Eden. Within the bounds of the forest were the towns of Carlisle and Penrith. Westward shared its eastern boundary along the Chalk Beck with Inglewood Forest (Figure 4.2). Its northern extent was defined largely by the River Wampool and its tributary, the River Wiza, whilst the western boundary was defined by the River Waver and the Thornthwaite, or Thackthwaite Beck. Its southern edge probably ran in a straight line across the open fell between the headwaters of the Bowton Beck and Thornthwaite Beck, now marked by the boundary between the parishes of Westward and Caldbeck.

Bounded on the east by the River Eden, Inglewood also encompassed two of its major tributaries, the rivers Petteril and Caldew, along with the River Roe a tributary of the Caldew. The boundary between Inglewood Forest and Westward follows the west side of the watershed between the catchments of the Rivers Eden and the Wampool, at a height of around 150m to 200m OD. On the eastern side of Inglewood, is the Lazonby Ridge, an area of low fell stretching from Cumwhitton in the north to Penrith in the south, which reaches a maximum height of around 270m.

Allerdale forest was based on an existing area of royal demesne with pre-Norman origins. The boundaries of this estate were set out in the eleventh-century Gospatrick's writ, and these coincide closely with the bounds of Westward as described in a perambulation of 1300.<sup>413</sup> The name Inglewood, meaning the 'wood of the Anglians',<sup>414</sup> implies that when named it was under the control of the English within, or on the border of, a British or Scottish polity. The limits of medieval woodland within Inglewood Forest cannot be determined with any accuracy, though it has been possible to map those areas most likely to have been wooded, from place name and documentary evidence (Figure 4.2).<sup>415</sup> Others have defined the core area of woodland of Inglewood as either the land on both sides of the River Petteril running south from Carlisle to

---

<sup>413</sup> Phythian-Adams 1996, 38-9

<sup>414</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 38

<sup>415</sup> See below, 'The Landscape of the Forest'

Penrith,<sup>416</sup> or more widely to the land between the Rivers Chalk (the western boundary of the forest) and Petteril.<sup>417</sup>

### ***Baronial Forests or Chases***

The other Cumbrian forests were all baronial creations (Figure 4.1). They were located mainly in the uplands, particularly areas of high fell, dominated by open moorland occurring in two main groups along the Pennines and in the Lake District fells. Nichol Forest and Furness Forest, however, should be considered more lowland in character and similar to Inglewood and both have evidence of extensive medieval woodland. Along the Pennine uplands on the eastern edge of the Cumbria boundary were three separate forests adjoining each other, Askerton North Moor, Bruthwaite and Geltsdale. All three belonged to the Barony of Gilsland and were in existence in the thirteenth century. Askerton was described as a great waste in 1295, and Bruthwaite and Geltsdale as baronial forest in the early thirteenth century.<sup>418</sup>

The northernmost forest was Askerton North Moor, covering an area of 56 km<sup>2</sup>, and lying between 200m and 330m OD. It lies in the parish of Kingwater, with the River Irthing forming its eastern boundary, and two of its tributaries, the Butterburn and Kingwater, draining the moorland centre. South of the Tyne Gap, in the Pennine uplands, were two neighbouring small forests, Bruthwaite and Geltsdale, covering just over 19km<sup>2</sup> and 21km<sup>2</sup> respectively. Like Askerton North Moor, both almost wholly comprise upland moorland and the eastern boundary of both became the county boundary with Northumberland. The limits of these two forests can be plotted with some accuracy, as all or parts of them are shown on the maps accompanying the early seventeenth century Gilsland Survey.<sup>419</sup> These show that the boundaries followed the line of the modern county boundary, and were marked by a series of stones. Both forests were bounded by a forest wall, apparently dividing the forests from the settled and cultivated lands to the west and north. Bruthwaite covered most of what is now the modern parish of Midgeholme and includes the Tindale Fells as well as Tindale Tarn on its northern edge. The southern and western boundary of Geltsdale Forest was defined by the New Water, with the Old Water and its numerous small tributaries, forming the

---

<sup>416</sup> Phythian-Adams 1996, 41-2

<sup>417</sup> Higham 1986

<sup>418</sup> Winchester 2004, 28-9

<sup>419</sup> CCA DHN C713-007; DHN C713-008; DHN C713-011; DHN C713-012; DHN C713-013

main watercourse of the forest and draining into the New Water. The forest comprised mainly upland moorland on the east side of the valley of the River Gelt.

Further south, also on the eastern boundary of the county in the Pennine uplands, was the Forest of Gilderdale. Documentary evidence for the location and extent of the forest is sparse, but the forest is thought to have covered the manor of Alston, where an area of fell to the west of the town of Alston is still called Gilderdale Forest.<sup>420</sup> It was known for producing silver from the medieval period,<sup>421</sup> and the miners of Alston were granted protected rights to mine at various times in the thirteenth century.<sup>422</sup> Mining continued to dominate the economy of this area until recently. The area likely to have been included within Gilderdale Forest is that covered by the modern parish of Alston Moor; defined by the county boundaries with Northumberland and Durham to the north and east, the Cash Burn and Shield Burn to the west, and the River Tees to the south and covering around 149km<sup>2</sup>. The principal rivers within the forest are the South Tyne, which rises in the southern part of the area at Tynehead Fell, and its tributary, the Nent. Settlement is confined mostly to these main valleys, focused on the town of Alston at their confluence, with surrounding areas of high moorland. The topography ranges from 245m OD in the South Tyne valley north of Alston to around 750m OD at Burnhope Seat in the south of the area, on the watershed between the Rivers South Tyne and Tees.

Adjoining Gilderdale Forest on its south western boundary was the Forest of Milburn which lies on the northern boundary of Westmorland. Granted away as forest in 1201,<sup>423</sup> the boundaries of the forest follow the historic parish of Milburn, stretching from the Milburn Beck on the west, up onto the Pennine massif and across the moorland to the River Tees, covering an area of around 32km<sup>2</sup>. Its lowest point, along the banks of the Milburn Beck, lies at around 170m OD, the topography sloping up to the Pennine edge, where it rises sharply to the highest point on Great Dun Fell at almost 850m OD.

The two southernmost Pennine forests were Stainmore and Mallerstang. Stainmore, covering an area of more than 91km<sup>2</sup>, straddles one of the main cross-Pennine routes (now the A66) and, like Milburn, runs from close to the River Eden, following the valley of the River Belah and its tributaries, up to and across the Pennine massif. The forest was roughly wedge-shaped, with its narrowest point in the valley bottom, at

---

<sup>420</sup> Langton and Jones 2010, figure 1; Winchester 2004, 29

<sup>421</sup> Jones 2010, 40

<sup>422</sup> Sopwith 1838, 19-20

<sup>423</sup> Winchester 2004, 29

around 150m OD. From there, the afforested area widened out to take in a number of tributaries of the River Eden as it rose up onto the moorlands of South Stainmore and North Stainmore to a height of around 560m OD. Established by the barons of Westmorland in the thirteenth century, the lowland end of the forest lay close to their manorial centre at Brough.<sup>424</sup> The presence of areas of ancient woodland in valleys<sup>425</sup> and the character of the modern landscape may suggest that less elevated areas of this Forest did have a significant, if fragmented, woodland cover in the Middle Ages.

Mallerstang Forest was established around the headwaters of the River Eden, from the watershed between the Eden and the Ure in the south, down to the southern boundary of the parish of Nateby. The Upper Eden valley formed the spine of the forest, centred on Pendragon Castle, with steeply sloping valley sides rising sharply to the surrounding moorland. The entire forest, which covered nearly 34km<sup>2</sup>, rose from around 220m OD at its northern end to nearly 400m OD at the southern end in the valley bottom, whilst the surrounding moorland rises to over 700m on Wild Boar Fell to the West and to High Seat, above Mallerstang Edge, to the east. The role of hunting in Mallerstang is attested by the record of the appointment of three foresters in 1323, whose job would have been to watch over the forest and safeguard the woodland and deer.<sup>426</sup> The exploitation of Mallerstang Forest was not confined to hunting, as vaccaries operated in the valley bottom.<sup>427</sup>

The second main area of private forest was in the central Lake District fells, including much of the central massif and associated valleys. On the north side of the Lake District fells was the smallest forest, Skiddaw, situated right in the centre of the Skiddaw/Blencathra massif. Its bounds are recorded in a survey of 1578<sup>428</sup> and on a map of 1707.<sup>429</sup> These show that its western boundary ran along the ridge of Skiddaw Fell, at a maximum height of 931m OD, encompassing the head of the River Caldew, dropping to around 360m OD on the north-west boundary. East of this was the Forest of Greystoke, at nearly 128km<sup>2</sup>. In 1291, the boundaries described how it covered all the land between Ullswater and the River Caldew within the Skiddaw range. Greystoke had two divisions, which became known as the Forest of Grisedale to the north and the

---

<sup>424</sup> Winchester 2004, 29

<sup>425</sup> MAGIC 2013, ancient woodland inventory

<sup>426</sup> Winchester 2004, 24

<sup>427</sup> See below, section on stock farming

<sup>428</sup> Liddell 1966, 110

<sup>429</sup> WCA D/Lec/Derwent Fells/plan 42

Forest of Matterdale to the south.<sup>430</sup> The forest covered high fell, low fell and the valleys in between. The highest points were in the west, with Bowscale Fell in the Skiddaw massif at 703m OD, and Great Dodd in the main Lake District range at 857m OD. To the south of Greystoke, in Westmorland on the south side of Ullswater, were the Forest of Grisedale and Glencoyne, and the Forest of Martindale, measuring nearly 22km<sup>2</sup> and 30km<sup>2</sup> respectively. Both covered upland fells, centred on steep-sided, settled river valleys draining into Ullswater. The fells within Grisedale and Glencoyne Forest rise to a height of 950m OD at Helvellyn on its western boundary, whilst Martindale's southern boundary was its highest point at nearly 800m OD.

On the western side of the Lake District was the large forest of Derwentfells, sometimes known as the Forest of Cockermouth and 'Between Coker and Derwent', this chase belonged to the lord of Cockermouth and was established by 1170.<sup>431</sup> Covering an area of nearly 241km<sup>2</sup>, it extended southward from the River Derwent east of Cockermouth, down to the county boundary with Westmorland in the south. Its eastern boundary followed the Derwent Valley and included Bassenthwaite Lake and Derwent Water, and the western side ran down Lorton Vale, taking in Crummock Water and Buttermere. Hills and mountains formed the spine of the forest, from Embleton High Common and Ling Fell in the north at around 373m OD, to Dale Head in the south at over 750m OD. The highest parts of Derwentfells, however, were on the southern edge which included the central mountain massif, rising at Great End to 911m OD, on the boundary with Copeland Forest. Whilst high fells dominated the Derwentfells landscape, the Forest also included the Lorton Vale, Borrowdale, the valley on the west side of Bassenthwaite Lake and the Wythop valley. Derwentfells was subject to the granting away of lands from the thirteenth century, Borrowdale in 1211 and Wythop around 1260.<sup>432</sup> Lorton, too, contained a number of freehold estates, and High Lorton was granted to the Priory of Carlisle.<sup>433</sup> The Forest along with the free chase of Skiddaw was subdivided in 1247, following a dispute between the de Multon and de Fortibus families, and the area which functioned as hunting grounds continued to shrink until 1578, when it was restricted to the area around Gatesgarth,<sup>434</sup> a settlement which had been established as a vaccary.<sup>435</sup>

---

<sup>430</sup> Winchester 2004, 29

<sup>431</sup> Liddell 1966, 119

<sup>432</sup> Winchester 1987, 84-5

<sup>433</sup> Winchester 1987, 146

<sup>434</sup> Liddell 1966, 120-2; Winchester 2010b, 118-9

<sup>435</sup> Winchester 2003a

Between the forests of Greystoke and Derwentfells was the forest between 'Caltre and Greta' which was granted to the lords of Castlerigg in the twelfth century.<sup>436</sup> Little is known about this forest, but it is thought to have encompassed St John Castlerigg and Wythburn parishes. It probably stretched from the River Greta in the north, down to the county boundary with Westmorland in the south, taking in the Naddle valley and St John's in the Vale. It probably included the land under Thirlmere reservoir, as there are references to forest there in the seventeenth century.<sup>437</sup> If this extent is correct, its area was about 72km<sup>2</sup>, and comprised valley lands from 140m OD to high fell at over 900m OD on Helvellyn.

On the west side of the Lake District massif was the great baronial forest of Copeland, or free chase of Egremont, which belonged to the Barony of Egremont, and which was a private forest from the early twelfth century.<sup>438</sup> It was partitioned between three heiresses in 1338, creating three wards; Ennerdale Forest, Middleward (Kinniside and Netherwasdale) and Eskdale Ward (Eskdale and Wasdale).<sup>439</sup> It has been argued that the lords of Copeland may have included the whole of their barony within the free chase, but particularly the land along the coast west of the baronial centre at Egremont. It is not possible to accurately define the area covered, but it may have been the whole area between the Rivers Derwent and Esk down to the sea.<sup>440</sup> The coastal strip appears to have been disafforested in the thirteenth century, however, and the bounds of the forest are thought to be those described for the three divisions in 1578. This boundary was defined by the River Ehen as far as Ennerdale Bridge then followed the Croasdale Beck up onto the fells. Below the peak of Gavel Fell, the boundary turned north to take in the whole of Loweswater. From there, Copeland Forest shared a boundary with Derwentfells southward to Great End. Its southern boundary ran from the heart of the central mountain massif along the line of the River Esk as far as Eskdale Green. From there it turned north, crossing low fells such as Bleng Tongue and Cleator Moor, where it rejoined the River Ehen. These bounds covered an area of over 240km<sup>2</sup>, dominated by high fell, with the highest point on Scafell Pike at 978m OD. It included three valleys, that of Ennerdale in the north, Wasdale and Eskdale, which formed the southern

---

<sup>436</sup> Wilson 1915, 492

<sup>437</sup> Winchester 2004, 29

<sup>438</sup> Winchester 1987, 20; Liddell 1966, 110

<sup>439</sup> Winchester 1978, 69

<sup>440</sup> Liddell 1966, 112



boundary. As in Derwentfells and Mallerstang Forests, the lords took the opportunity to establish vaccaries in the forest.

In south west Cumberland was the Forest of Ulpha, which belonged to the lordship of Millom. Little is known about this forest, and extents which have been mapped previously just include the parish of Ulpha.<sup>441</sup> Yet it is clear that Furness Abbey's vaccary of Brothwick was in the Forest of Millom in 1292, and this lay adjacent to the boundary of Copeland Forest, in the Esk Valley.<sup>442</sup> It has been assumed for this study, therefore, that Millom Forest probably extended as far as the boundary with Copeland Forest on its north side. Its south eastern boundary appears to have followed the line of the county boundary with Lancashire and its north eastern boundary was co-terminus, with the Westmorland boundary. It is possible that the original extent was much larger, perhaps covering most, if not all, of the Millom lordship, but the Forest as mapped covers about 78km<sup>2</sup>. It was largely upland, rising to 830m OD at its northern end, but also including part of the Duddon and Esk valleys on its south eastern and north western fringes.

In Westmorland, there were three areas of forest within the central Lake District massif; Fawcett, Ralphland and Kendal. The smallest of these was Fawcett or Bannisdale forest, covering only 16km<sup>2</sup>, mostly on Bannisdale Fell on the eastern edge of the Lake District mountains, generally at a height of 300m to 500m OD, rising to 637m OD on Harrop Fell. The whole was granted to the monks of Byland in the second half of the twelfth century, and it is first referred to as a forest in a complaint of 1251.<sup>443</sup> To the north was the forest of Ralphland, or Thornthwaite Forest, which was more than 56km<sup>2</sup> in extent. Again, dominated by high fells, rising up to a height of 828m OD along High Street, it was bounded on the north west and south east by valleys. On the north-west was Mardale and Haweswater whilst to the south east was Wetsleddale. The north eastern side ran along the base of the fells, where it shared a boundary with the lands of Shap Abbey and the township of Shap. In the centre of the forest was the small valley of Swindale.

The largest of the Westmorland forests at 130km<sup>2</sup> was Kendale, which belonged to the barony of Kendale, centred on Kirkby Kendal.<sup>444</sup> It included the whole chapelry of

---

<sup>441</sup> Winchester 2004, 28, 30; Langton and Jones 2010, figure 1

<sup>442</sup> Winchester 2010b, 120

<sup>443</sup> Farrer 1923, 231

<sup>444</sup> Now Kendal

Grasmere and part of the chapelry of Windermere (Figure 4.3). It is first referenced in 1190, when it was granted to Gilbert son of Roger Fitz-Reinfrid.<sup>445</sup> The forest was in the heart of the Lake District fells, bounded to the north by Cumberland and the forests of Derwentfells, Castlerigg and Grisedale and Glencoyne. Although mountains would have dominated the topography of the forest, its location at the head of Windermere, and the inclusion of Grasmere, Rydal Water and Loughrigg Tarn within its bounds, meant that it had a significant proportion of valley lands. On the west side, there were the valleys of Great and Little Langdale, to the north the Rothay Valley and the settlement of Grasmere, directly north of Windermere was Ambleside and Rydal, and on the east was the Troutbeck Valley. These areas mostly lie at a height of between 50m to 150m OD. The surrounding fells rise to around 900m OD.

Outside the two main groups of forests in the Pennines and the Lake District massif was the Forest of Liddel, or Nichol Forest, situated on the border between England and Scotland (Figure 4.4). Recorded in 1276, it belonged to the Barony of Liddel, which was centred on the castle known as Liddel Strength,<sup>446</sup> positioned on a low cliff overlooking the River Liddel into Scotland. It is thought Nichol Forest was probably named after Nicholas de Stutevill, the tenant-in-chief. Its extents are shown on a map of 1607,<sup>447</sup> and at 101km<sup>2</sup> it occupied a swathe of land around 5km wide along the Scottish border. Following the Rivers Esk and Liddel, the border formed its north western boundary. The southern and eastern boundary ran along the Roe Burn and a number of small streams between the Rivers Lyne and Liddel. Although considered an upland forest by Winchester,<sup>448</sup> its topography would not have been dissimilar to that of Inglewood. The upland areas of Nichol Forest rose to a maximum height of 400m OD, but most of it lay around 200m to 300m OD. The landscape decreased in height and became more gently rolling towards the south and west, where the southern end was around 50m OD.

Also set apart from the two main groups of upland forests was Whinfell, which shared its northern boundary with the southern edge of Inglewood. It was a small forest, at 26km<sup>2</sup>, and its status as a free chase is not definitive, as in 1314-15, it is referred to as an enclosed park. It was first granted by the king to Robert de Veteripont in 1202-3,

---

<sup>445</sup> Farrer 1923, 2

<sup>446</sup> Winchester 2004, 28; Pastscape 2007, list number 11686

<sup>447</sup> TNA MPC/1/80

<sup>448</sup> Winchester 2004, 27-8

with Appleby and Brough. It is not referred to as a forest at this time, but the grant includes the instruction not to waste the woods of Whinfell, and Veteripont's servants were not to hunt there without him. Nicolson and Burn interpreted this as meaning that Whinfell should be considered as free chase.<sup>449</sup> In 1230-1, however, it is referred to directly as the forest of Whinfell.<sup>450</sup> It is likely that Whinfell, which made up the majority of the township of Brougham, was considered a free chase, but that a deer park was established within its bounds (Figure 4.5). This is made clear in the division of the land between the two daughters of the last Robert de Veteripont, where one daughter was given half the forest of Whinfell, and the other daughter the half of the forest outside the park and the 'coney' warren towards Winderwath. The boundary of the park probably followed the line of the Roman road (now the A66), alongside which was the Hartshorn Tree, and which was one of the division markers for the forest.<sup>451</sup> This may be an example of the privatisation of grazing that has been noted elsewhere in the thirteenth century.<sup>452</sup> The creation of deer parks in forests was an aspect of the privatisation of the forests that took place in the late medieval period and part of the wider process of landscape enclosure that began impacting upon the wastes and the common fields.<sup>453</sup>

The Forest of Furness was in Lancashire-over-Sands (Figure 4.6). It was granted by King Stephen to the monks of Furness Abbey as part of their extensive initial endowment in 1127.<sup>454</sup> The forest occupied all the land between Coniston Water and Windermere, with its northern edge being the county boundary between Lancashire and Westmorland. Altogether, the forest covered 161km<sup>2</sup>. The area was known as High Furness in contrast to Low, or Plain, Furness, but within the bounds of the forest, it comprised mostly low fell, lying at a height of less than 50m OD at the Lake shores up to just over 300m OD. Although dominated by fell, in character it should be considered a lowland forest like Inglewood and Nichol forests. Like those forests, it also appears to have been well settled in the medieval period, and Furness Abbey administered the area through a series of bailiwicks or manors, of which the chief *caput* was Hawkshead.<sup>455</sup>

---

<sup>449</sup> Nicolson and Burn 1777a 1, 267, 269

<sup>450</sup> Nicolson and Burn 1777a 1, 272

<sup>451</sup> Nicolson and Burn 1777a, 398

<sup>452</sup> Dyer 2006, 27

<sup>453</sup> Jones 2010, 53

<sup>454</sup> Farrer and Brownbill 1914, 286

<sup>455</sup> Farrer and Brownbill 1914, 370

### ***Extensions to the forests***

There were considerable extensions to the royal forest of Inglewood in the reign of Henry II, following its initial afforestation.<sup>456</sup> These included a small area to the south, which stretched from Pallet Hill in the east to Uldale in the west. The extra land taken in measured 61km<sup>2</sup> and included a strip of land below the Caldbeck fells, and the village of Johnby. The western end of this addition, at Uldale, included the moorland of Aughtertree Fell. To the east of the Forest of Inglewood, a further large swathe of land was afforested. Although Langton and Jones record this on their national map of medieval forests<sup>457</sup>, they show only a strip of land restricted to the Pennine uplands. The description makes it clear, however, that the newly afforested area included all land east of the Eden to ‘Crosstirn’ (Cross Fell), from the Gelt River in the north to ‘Boblincarn’ (Crowdundale Beck) in the south.<sup>458</sup>

West of the Forest of Inglewood and Westward, Henry II afforested huge areas, including the whole of the Barony of Burgh and the Barony of Allerdale. This land was generally well settled and farmed, though with extensive areas of unenclosed lowland moss. It also included the extensive land holdings of Holme Cultram Abbey, and in the reign of Edward I, the Abbey petitioned to have the island of Holme Cultram disafforested.<sup>459</sup> A perambulation of the bounds of the forest in 1315-16 specifically exempted much of this land from the forest. These included a number of settlements and their lands; ‘*Brumfield* [Bromfield] *with its outskirts, woods and open ground, .. Ucmanneby* [Upmanby] *with its open ground; .. Aspatrik* [Aspatria] *with its open ground; [and]. Kirkbrid*’ [Kirkbride].<sup>460</sup>

### ***The Forest Landscape***

It has generally been accepted that the forests of Cumbria, apart from Inglewood, were largely upland in character.<sup>461</sup> Here, however, it has been argued that both Nichol Forest and Furness Forest should be considered similar to Inglewood. To test this, a comparison of the landscape can be made, both between the forests and between the forested areas and the rest of the county, by examining the extent to which these areas

---

<sup>456</sup> Parker 1905, 43

<sup>457</sup> Langton and Jones 2010, figure 1

<sup>458</sup> Parker 1905, 41, 43

<sup>459</sup> Parker 1905, 56-7

<sup>460</sup> Parker 1906, 160

<sup>461</sup> Winchester 2004

were covered by unenclosed waste. To do this, unenclosed land has been mapped from the enclosure maps of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, along with data taken from earlier estate maps (Figure 4.7). These figures are a conservative estimate, as they are calculated from areas known to be unenclosed only in the post medieval period. It has not been possible to map with any accuracy the piecemeal enclosures which were made before the later eighteenth century. It has been assumed that post medieval enclosure would have taken place approximately at a similar rate across the whole of Cumbria, and that the relative proportions of unenclosed land would have remained the same across the county.

As might be expected, the forests which include the high fells have the largest proportion of unenclosed land, including Skiddaw and Geltsdale, which were wholly unenclosed, and Bruthwaite and Askerton North Moor which were over 90% unenclosed. Most of the forests had between 60% and 90% of their area unenclosed, in the form of wood pasture, rocky fell or high moorland. These include all those forests in the Lake District massif, apart from Furness, and all the forests along the Pennine edge. They divide into two main types; high fell surrounding one or more deeply-cut, steep-sided valleys, such as Ulpha, Castlerigg, Martindale, Ralphland, Derwentfells and Mallerstang, or forests where the boundaries have been drawn to include a block of high unenclosed land and some low land. This latter category includes Stainmore, Copeland, Fawcett, Milburn, Kendal and Greystoke.

The four areas into which forest law was extended by Henry II have generally low rates of unenclosed land, though with considerable variation which is probably a reflection of topography. The lowest percentage of unenclosed waste, at 30% was in Burgh Barony, on the Solway Plain, which is a low-lying but fertile area, with unenclosed waste concentrated in the mosses around Bowness-on-Solway. Conversely, at 62%, the land east of Eden had a similar percentage of unenclosed waste, to some of the other forests which straddled the upland/lowland zones. Allerdale Barony (43%) and the land between Pallet Hill and Uldale (44%), which were largely lowland in character, had similar percentages of unenclosed land to the lowland forests.

Of the three forests which can be considered lowland in character, less than 50% of the land was unenclosed in Inglewood and Furness Forests. Inglewood had around 44% of its total area as unenclosed land, most of which was low moorland but also included the low hills of the Lazonby Ridge to the east. The unenclosed land counted for 64% of the total area of Nichol Forest and lay mostly at its northern end, where the land rises to

moorland hills. The forest with the least recorded area of unenclosed land, at only 38%, was Furness. It is likely that this does not reflect the real extent of unenclosed land in the medieval period, and the relatively low extent mapped may be reflective of a lack of evidence concerning piecemeal enclosure of the common waste in the late medieval or early post medieval period.

Unenclosed common waste in Furness was undoubtedly reduced in comparison to most other Cumbrian forests because of the wooded nature of the low fells between Windermere and Coniston Water from at least the early post medieval period. A higher degree of woodland cover was a characteristic shared by all three of the lowland forests in the medieval period (Figure 4.8), however, most of this seems to have gone by the post medieval period in both Inglewood and Nichol Forests. That woodland survived in the Furness Fells is probably the result of a demand for wood from a number of wood-related industries and crafts, such as bark production for tanning, potash-making for soap, wood turning, cooperage and basket-making. These all required a regular and reliable source of wood, much of which would have come from dead wood and underwood.<sup>462</sup> Archaeological evidence, too, indicates that there was a bloomery industry here in the late medieval period,<sup>463</sup> and Furness Abbey had the sole right to make iron in the district by 1273, which would have needed a regular supply of charcoal.<sup>464</sup> The active management of woodland through coppicing dates from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.<sup>465</sup> Consequently, it would appear that local need ensured the survival of woodland in Furness and that this was not so prevalent in Inglewood and Nichol Forests, where woodland cover shrank during the later Middle Ages and early post medieval period.

Nichol Forest now has large areas of modern forestry, but in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries there seems to have been very little tree cover, apart from a few areas of gill woodland. There is evidence, however, for woodland having been much more widespread, at least outside of the higher moorland, in the medieval period and into the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The 1552 map of the debateable land (Figure 3.13)<sup>466</sup> and the 1607 map of the Forest (Figure 3.14)<sup>467</sup> show woodland across

---

<sup>462</sup> Newman and Hardie, 2007, 102-3

<sup>463</sup> Heritage Gateway 2012, Lake District National Park HER

<sup>464</sup> Bowden 2000, 6

<sup>465</sup> Winchester 1987, 105

<sup>466</sup> TNA MPF/1/257

<sup>467</sup> TNA MPC/1/80

large areas of the northern parts of the forest, in the vicinity of the Raeburn on the south side, and along the line of the River Liddel around Penton on the north side. Some of this survives as gill woodland and this has been mapped where extents can be defined in relation to known contemporary settlement, however, it is likely to be an underestimate of the original extent. Some place names, too, indicate that the area was once much more wooded, although not all have documented medieval origins. The name of the parish, Solport, has a British second element, *perth* meaning thicket, and other names include *Wood*, *Woodside*, *Stubb*, *Ridding*, *Hagg* and *hirst*, all hinting at woodland clearance.<sup>468</sup>

The royal forest of Inglewood, with the addition of Westward, is considered to be one of the most wooded of the Cumbrian forests during the medieval period, and has been seen as an anomaly to the rest of the region.<sup>469</sup> It is difficult, however, to plot the extent of the wooded areas of Inglewood, and there are no detailed early maps showing the distribution of woodland, though some areas of woodland are shown on Saxton's map of Cumberland and Westmorland from 1576.<sup>470</sup> Hints of the extensive area of woodland can be gleaned from the 1292 inquisition into the disafforestation of Holm Cultram, which refers to the 'great covert of the forest'.<sup>471</sup> The archaeological record, however, lends some clues to the traditionally wooded nature of this area. The Carlisle Millennium Project excavations recovered large quantities of preserved wood from the Roman fort. Analysis of the timber revealed that initial buildings were constructed with wood taken from the immediate vicinity of the fort, and comprised alder and ash. Later, however, timber was being taken from large, straight-grained mature oaks, some over 400 years old.<sup>472</sup> This indicates the presence of ancient woodland which was close enough to the fort to be exploited for timber. Whether this resource was eventually depleted is unknown, but there are indications that good-quality timber was still available into the second century and that some active woodland management was being carried out, in the form of coppicing. Pollen evidence indicates a significant amount of woodland in the Carlisle vicinity in the sixth century,<sup>473</sup> and it seems likely that was still so when Inglewood Forest was created in the twelfth century.

---

<sup>468</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950

<sup>469</sup> Winchester 1987, 22

<sup>470</sup> Saxton 1576

<sup>471</sup> Parker 1905, 58

<sup>472</sup> Howard-Davis 2009, 803

<sup>473</sup> Stallibrass and Huntley 2011, 31

An attempt has been made to map possible woodland areas from documentary and place name evidence (Figure 4.9), though this is almost certainly an underestimate of the woodland cover within Inglewood and Westward. Saxton's map shows Baron's Wood on the west bank of the Eden, and also woodland between Newbiggin and Wreay on both banks of the River Petteril. An estimate of the extent of this latter area of woodland can also be made from place name evidence. A farm called Scalescogh (now Scalesceugh) lies in the middle of this stretch of woodland. The name means the shieling in the wood,<sup>474</sup> and is first documented in 1270, when it was said to be the wood of the Prior of Carlisle.<sup>475</sup> Brisco, to the north of Newbiggin, also contains the 'sceugh' element in its name,<sup>476</sup> again suggesting a former wooded landscape. South west of Carlisle, Saxton's map shows an area of woodland near Dalston. This was Sowerby Wood, known to be in existence in 1285<sup>477</sup> and named in various forest court documents. Sowerby Wood had a woodward to protect the King's interests.<sup>478</sup> The other significant area of woodland within Inglewood, for which a mappable area can be estimated, is Skelton Wood. This was documented in 1285<sup>479</sup> and although not shown on Saxton's map of 1576, fragments still survived into the late eighteenth century.<sup>480</sup> Using Donald's map in conjunction with place-name evidence, it can be estimated that the wood stretched from Skelton Wood End northward, along the valley of the Roe Beck. On the east side was the dispersed settlement of Middlesceugh, meaning 'middle wood',<sup>481</sup> the Roe Beck suggests there must have been wooded cover here for deer, and one of the streams running into the Roe is called Oaker Gill. There are surviving areas of gill woodland along the Roe and its tributaries, and a small area of ancient woodland, called Low Wood, at Middlesceugh. At the north end of the wood are settlements called The Ashes and Thackwood which appear to have assarted from the woodland in the post medieval period, and an earlier medieval assart, Thistlewood, which was almost certainly the settlement named as Thistlethwaite in 1241.<sup>482</sup>

---

<sup>474</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 149

<sup>475</sup> Parker 1907, 11

<sup>476</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 148

<sup>477</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 135

<sup>478</sup> Parker 1907, 11-12

<sup>479</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 239

<sup>480</sup> Donald 1774

<sup>481</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 225

<sup>482</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 246



The wooded character of Inglewood is reflected in the records of grants of timber, particularly oaks, for building and repairs. In 1292, for example, 16 oaks were given to repair the bridge of Carlisle Castle, then two years later 20 oaks for the repair of St Mary's, Carlisle, followed by 20 more to the Prior and 30 to the bishop in 1296.<sup>483</sup> Gifts of oaks to Carlisle continued throughout the fourteenth century, particularly in 1391 when 500 oaks were granted following a fire in the city which destroyed 1500 buildings.<sup>484</sup> Westward, too, seems to have been well-wooded, even though the actual extent is difficult to determine with any accuracy. Saxton shows two areas, in the south around Brocklebank and north around Woodside. Apart from the Woodside settlement place names, there is no surviving evidence of the exact size and extent of the woodland here, so it has been estimated in the mapped data. The woodland around Brocklebank has been mapped from the evidence of an eighteenth century map of High Hall and Deer Park.<sup>485</sup> That there was a considerable area of woodland in Westward, however, is clear from Thomas Denton's account of 1677-8, when he describes 1,000 acres of wood, along with 1,000 of land, 1,000 acres of meadow and 500 acres of pasture in the parish.<sup>486</sup>

The more wooded area of Cumbria appears to have continued further west, into the Barony of Allerdale and the lands granted to the monastery at Holm Cultram (Figure 4.10), an area which was afforested under Henry II. From an inquisition of 1292, held in response to a petition by the monks of Holm Cultram to disafforest their 'island', the reason for the extension of the forest into this area becomes apparent:

*'If the island were disafforested it would be a loss to the King, and a nuisance to the forest of Inglewode, by causing destruction and damage to the deer in many ways. For there are two marshes thick with alders which join at the said island, namely, Brimselmire and Swalebymire, and these marshes extend from the island right up to the great covert of the forest, so that hinds and other of the King's deer can come and go under the covert and the main cover of the forest as far as the island, and back again; and there is another marsh there called Ellerby. So that the King's deer commonly frequent and go about in these marshes, especially about mowing-time, and all the deer*

---

<sup>483</sup> Parker 1909, 26-7

<sup>484</sup> Parker 1909, 28

<sup>485</sup> WCA D/Lec/Westward/1/11a

<sup>486</sup> Winchester and Wane 2003, 182

*which frequent those marshes go upon the island to the grass and wood contained within Holm Cultram, namely Leaholme, Bronewra, Aykesom, Kyngesetemire*'.<sup>487</sup>

From this passage, it is clear that where there were marshes around and within the island of Holm Cultram<sup>488</sup> they were well-wooded with alder, linking Holm Cultram and Inglewood and forming game corridors. This area is now almost entirely devoid of woodland and even in the late eighteenth century, only a small area survived within Wedholme Flow.<sup>489</sup> From the description, there was also a considerable quantity of woodland on the island, too, though it is not possible to map its extent. Some of the places mentioned can be located from later place-name evidence, for example *Aykesom* is Aikshaw and *Kyngesetemire* is Kingside, areas which were unenclosed until the nineteenth century. *Bronewra* is more problematic. Grainger and Collingwood<sup>490</sup> suggest this might be Brunshaw Moss, near New Mawbray. Leaholme cannot be located, but might be Lessonhall, just outside the island. Aikshaw, on the edge of the island, means 'oak woods' and lies next to the expanse of mossland which marked the edge of the island, so it is likely to have been next to the stretch of alder woodland mentioned in the inquisition.

It has been suggested in this study that the lower parts of Stainmore were wooded though there is insufficient evidence to be confident of defining its extent. Other forests had very little woodland cover, and there is no evidence for any woodland in the upland forests such as Askerton North Moor, Milburn, Skiddaw, Ralphland and Fawcett. Even so, there must have been small areas of woodland which would have provided cover, and some of these have been mapped for other upland forests. These would probably have been restricted to gill, or valley, woodland, or on the steep valley sides above the lakes. Around Derwent Water, in Derwentfells Forest, for example, Ashness Wood was in existence in 1211, the name meaning 'ash headland'.<sup>491</sup> North along the lake shore was Isthmus Wood, recorded in 1220 and deriving from 'aspen',<sup>492</sup> and on the western shore was Overside Wood, recorded in 1578.<sup>493</sup> The woodland shown around the valley sides of Borrowdale, too, is probably of medieval origin, though the only evidence for it

---

<sup>487</sup> Parker 1905, 58

<sup>488</sup> See Chapter 5 for a description of the island of Holm Cultram

<sup>489</sup> Donald 1774

<sup>490</sup> Grainger and Collingwood 1929

<sup>491</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 349

<sup>492</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 302

<sup>493</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 373

has been taken from Donald's late eighteenth century map. The lack of cover for game, however, would not have mattered, and many of the upland private forests became more valuable for the revenues they generated from grazing grounds.<sup>494</sup> Where there were areas of woodland in the private forests, they are often associated with deer parks, for example, in Whinfall, in Great Wood in Castlerigg Park, Derwentfells, and Wanwood in Gilderdale. Rydal Park in Kendal Forest still has an area of ancient woodland used as wood pasture, as well as a number of veteran trees scattered around its lower slopes (Figure 4.11).<sup>495</sup> Significant areas of woodland outside the forests and chases also seem to have been largely associated with parks (see below), but in general across Cumbria, the known sites of surviving medieval woodland are restricted to small areas, often in valleys.<sup>496</sup>

In general, it can be seen that the upland forests of Cumbria had extensive areas of land unsuitable for settlement and cultivation. In the three lowland forests of Inglewood, Nichol and Furness, there were still large areas of unenclosed land. In Nichol and Furness, this took the form of low fell, and in Inglewood with Westward there were large areas of moorland, fringed by the mosses of the Solway Plain. What set these three apart from the other Cumbrian forests, and from much of the rest of Cumbria, was the high proportion of woodland. The only area outside the main forests which had a comparable level of woodland cover was around Holm Cultram, which was in any case afforested by Henry II. By taking in Allerdale and Burgh Baronies, Henry was able to exercise greater control over land which attracted deer from the forests. In extending the royal forest across the north of Cumbria, he increased his control of the border area with Scotland which featured powerful baronies far from the centre of royal power.

### **Deer Parks**

One of the most recognisable features of the medieval hunting landscape is the deer park (Figure 4.11). They were physical manifestations of lordly control, managed to preserve game and excluded all except the owners or their guests. The deer park was a symbol of wealth, status and power. They were clearly set apart from the rest of the medieval environment, separated by the park pale and their resources managed for exclusive and distinct purposes. Within the upland afforested areas particularly, deer parks developed as game reserves, where the animals were encouraged to enter through

---

<sup>494</sup> Winchester 2010b, 109

<sup>495</sup> Newman 2007, 242

<sup>496</sup> Newman and Hardie 2007, 98

deer leaps and where they would be managed and exploited for their meat, skins, antlers and bones.<sup>497</sup> As well as providing resources for the elite, they were there for sport and recreation. Even though they covered a tiny percentage of the landscape, they had a disproportionate influence on the countryside.<sup>498</sup> Islands of privilege and exclusivity, they created areas from which settlement was largely absent, within which woodland was conserved, and their post medieval legacy sometimes provided a focus for the development of mansions and landscaped grounds.

Although referred to here as deer parks, in order to distinguish them from later ornamental parks, they ranged greatly in size and function, and individual parks could have both practical and symbolic roles, including that of providing pleasure grounds for recreation. Some parks were indeed large enough to host chases, although probably in the form of a drive towards the hunters, whilst others were so small as to suggest they may have acted more as farms, or protective enclosures, where animals could be taken as required.<sup>499</sup> There is evidence that later in the medieval period, deer parks took on a significance for their landscape value, enhancing the setting and privileged status of the manorial hall.<sup>500</sup> At Cunswick, in Westmorland, for example, the hall was set in centre of its park, below the wooded scarp of Cunswick Scar (Figure 4.12).<sup>501</sup> The outline of the park is still well preserved and was mapped in the early nineteenth century.<sup>502</sup> The character of the park survived then, and still does today, in the small blocks of woodland which are still scattered across the modern farm holding.<sup>503</sup>

There is a huge range in the size and function of deer parks in Cumbria, (see Table 4.2) from the two hectare deer pound of Buck Park in Martindale<sup>504</sup> to the 1,473 hectare Whinfell Park in north Westmorland (Figure 4.5). Although Cantor<sup>505</sup> recorded fewer parks in the uplands, including Cumbria, than in lowland England, the work of Winchester and Hawkins has shown that the picture was more complex and influenced

---

<sup>497</sup> Higham 2007, 166

<sup>498</sup> Liddiard 2007, 2

<sup>499</sup> Liddiard 2007, 4-5

<sup>500</sup> Liddiard 2007, 3

<sup>501</sup> Saxton 1567

<sup>502</sup> KCA WQR/3/22

<sup>503</sup> KCA Wdy/321 1716

<sup>504</sup> National Heritage List n.d., scheduled monument 1007592

<sup>505</sup> Cantor 1982, 79

both by the terrain of high fells and moorland, and by the patterns of lordship.<sup>506</sup> The large areas of unenclosed upland, over which the baronial overlords had rights of free chase, meant there was less motivation to create hunting preserves in the form of fenced parks, even though much of the upland was, over time, let out as pasture or colonised by settlement. Winchester defines three types of park; baronial castle, forest and manorial, as well as a category of other enclosures associated with hunting, such as hays, fences and friths.<sup>507</sup> Frith derives from an Old English word, *fryhð*, which can mean woodland, but often refers to brushwood, scrubland or marginal land.<sup>508</sup> It is often synonymous with park, and is regularly associated with hunting forests in northern England.<sup>509</sup> In particular, it may be associated with enclosed hunting grounds, rather than unenclosed forest, especially enclosed and wooded sections of a forest.<sup>510</sup> All of these enclosures were identified in the mapping of medieval parks, but they are not identified as a separate category. Instead four categories of park are identified: baronial, forest and manorial parks as defined by Winchester, plus monastic parks.

### ***Baronial Parks***

Large baronial parks existed at Greystoke (1381ha), Kendal, (562ha) Brampton (541ha), Flakebridge near Appleby (441ha), Millom (308ha) and Cockermouth (287ha).

Brampton Park was probably supplanted by Naworth Park, which was created when the baronial seat of Gilsland moved from Irthington to Naworth Castle towards the end of the medieval period (Figure 4.13). Naworth Park was also large, covering 222ha. The two smallest baronial parks were Egremont (129ha) and Brough (around 80ha). Only Kendal Castle, the later park at Naworth and possibly Brough surrounded their baronial seats. The others either lay a short distance away or were attached by a narrow neck, and given the earliest known dates of these parks, it is likely that most were created in the thirteenth or fourteenth century.<sup>511</sup>

---

<sup>506</sup> Winchester 2007, 165; the parks have been mapped from information kindly provided by Harry Hawkins, based on his personal research

<sup>507</sup> Winchester 2007, 168-73

<sup>508</sup> Gelling and Cole 2000, 224-5

<sup>509</sup> Frith occurs elsewhere in Cumbria, not associated with parks, for example in Mallerstang (see below, section on extensive stock farming). This may indicate the existence of other, unrecorded parks

<sup>510</sup> Winchester 2007, 172

<sup>511</sup> Winchester 2007, 168

Cockermouth Park lay to the east of the town and castle, stretching north eastward and rising over low, rolling hills (Figure 4.14).<sup>512</sup> On its north side it was bounded by the River Derwent and to the south by the road from Cockermouth to Bassenthwaite, and the unenclosed Cockermouth Moor. The park was in existence by 1259,<sup>513</sup> when it was said to have had 100 deer.<sup>514</sup> Its bounds were marked by a pale made of wooden rails and planks, and it seems not to have been actively used for hunting as sport, but rather as a deer preserve, from which animals were taken when required.<sup>515</sup> It also had other uses from an early date, with income from grazing rents in the form of pannage and agistments, and from the sale of wood, timber, bark, honey, bracken and rushes. Indeed, after 1277 it was divided into enclosures and for a time was used as demesne farming for cattle and horses before the income returned to grazing rents and wood sales.<sup>516</sup>

Even following diversification, the park was still used to keep deer, and by the mid-fifteenth century, the wooden pale had been replaced by a stone wall.<sup>517</sup> The division of the park into closes is shown on a map of around 1638 (Figure 4.15),<sup>518</sup> with enclosures called Horse Close, Wheate Close, with The Parke and Howfoote Frith or Highside. The use of Frith as the name of an enclosure in a deer park was used elsewhere in Cumbria<sup>519</sup>, and may represent an attempt to create a pasture for the preservation of deer. Friths seems to have been commonly associated with wooded enclosures, and here there was a band of woodland called Howfoot Wood which may once have been more extensive. The process of enclosure continued, and by 1721 the lower end of the park had been divided into closes, leaving only High Frith as a large area of pasture (Figure 4.16).<sup>520</sup>

Brampton Park was even larger than Cockermouth. It belonged to the Barony of Gilsland, and was thus attached to the original baronial seat at Irthington across the River Irthing. It seems to have covered all the land bounded by the River Irthing to the north and the River Gelt to the south, their confluence marking the western limit of the

---

<sup>512</sup> WCA D/Lec/Cockermouth/2/1

<sup>513</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950 363

<sup>514</sup> Winchester 2007, 173

<sup>515</sup> Winchester 2007, 173-4

<sup>516</sup> Winchester 2007, 174

<sup>517</sup> Winchester 2007, 175

<sup>518</sup> WCA D/Lec/Cockermouth/2/1

<sup>519</sup> Winchester 2007, 173

<sup>520</sup> WCA D/Lec/Cockermouth/2/2; D/Lec/Cockermouth/2/3

park, and the town of Brampton the eastern extent (Figure 4.13). The exact line of the eastern boundary is difficult to follow because of later landscape change, but it may be echoed in modern boundaries and footpaths. Its extent can also be plotted from the 1603 map of Brampton.<sup>521</sup> Within Brampton demesne, the hunting reserve appears to have comprised two parts, with Brampton Park itself to the north and a larger area of woodland, known as Brigwood, to the south. In 1603, these two areas formed two discrete blocks of land. It is not clear whether Brigwood was part of Brampton Park, as in 1295 and 1486 it was described as a wood, but in 1383 as a park with deer.<sup>522</sup>

### ***Forest Parks***

The parks in the forest varied greatly in size, including both the smallest and largest of those mapped across the county. The parks developed as game preserves, especially as the use of the forests diversified to allow more stock farming and underwent a gradual process of enclosure. A relationship has been noted between some of these upland parks in the private forests and the baronial centres to which they belonged,<sup>523</sup> so that the lowland park next to the baronial seat might be matched with an upland park within the forest, for example at Kendal and Troutbeck, and Millom and Ulpha.

Within Inglewood Forest, the greatest park was Plumpton Park, which covered 1,414ha. It was originally referred to as Plumpton Hay in the late twelfth century,<sup>524</sup> and was perhaps already a distinct deer enclosure within the forest before it was imparked in the reign of Henry III.<sup>525</sup> Hay, or *haga*, comes from the Anglo-Saxon word meaning a hedged enclosure. It is commonly associated with parks and can be considered an interchangeable term in Domesday Book.<sup>526</sup> The boundaries of the park are not described in any document, but the line of the park pale can be reconstructed from the location of the farms which were established within its bounds in the sixteenth century,<sup>527</sup> and from an examination of modern boundaries which follow its likely course (Figure 4.17). Like Cockermouth, it appears that Plumpton Park began to be used for stock grazing during the later medieval period. A stone wall was built to

---

<sup>521</sup> CCA Robinson 1983

<sup>522</sup> Winchester 2007, 168

<sup>523</sup> Winchester 2007, 169-70

<sup>524</sup> Winchester 2007, 172

<sup>525</sup> Boynton 2003, 1272-81, 69

<sup>526</sup> Winchester 2007, 171; Liddiard 2003

<sup>527</sup> Hope 2011, 150-1

enclose the park between 1332 and 1335, and it was leased out for horses and cattle.<sup>528</sup>

There are two farms of possible medieval origin on the western edge of the park; Lamsceugh and Thornbarrow. Lamsceugh, meaning Lamb's Wood, is first recorded in 1285, and Thornbarrow, meaning 'hill of the thorn bushes', is recorded in 1380.<sup>529</sup> Lamsceugh seems to lie within the likely north-west boundary of the park, though the south-west boundary, where Thornbarrow is situated, is less certain. The eastern boundary may have run along the western side of the Roman road (now the A6), and it has been postulated that the name Plumpton Wall, given to the settlements along this road, derives from the park wall.<sup>530</sup>

Within the private forests, deer parks developed as estates and were partitioned, leading to a process of manorialisation.<sup>531</sup> This can be seen in Rydal, which had been granted as a manor out of the Barony of Kendale in 1275<sup>532</sup>. The deer park at Rydal was a privately owned, manorial park within Kendal Forest. Like the baronial parks, it was large, covering 341ha, from the valley bottom next to the River Rothay on to Rydal Fell (Figure 4.18). Even though Rydal was granted as a manor, it was still considered part of the forest and is described as such in the confirmation of the grant<sup>533</sup>. The boundaries of the manor were described as follows,

*Beginning at Dove Crag by way of the top of the ridge between Rydal and Scandal, along the watershed, following the top of the ridge as far as Scandendestay in le Swythene; and thus descending to Swythene, by way of the footpath called le Waythesti, as far as Amelsate [Ambleside] park, and thus follows the right side of the park as far as Scandelbec; and thus follows Scandelbec as far as Routha [Rothay]; and thus follows the Routhay, ascending as far as Routhemere [Rydal Water]; and so following Routhemere as far as opposite le Brokestay, and along a line as far as le Brokestay, and from le Brokestay to the top of the Nab, and thus ascending to the top along the watershed, as far as Laverdkrag [Lords Crag]; and from Laverdkrag by the higher ascent along the top as far as le Ernekrage [Heron Crag?]; and thence along the top of the mountain as far as the boundary of Westmorland; and thus*

---

<sup>528</sup> Winchester 2007, 176-7

<sup>529</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 203, 206

<sup>530</sup> Hope 2011, 150

<sup>531</sup> Winchester 1987, 84

<sup>532</sup> Collingwood 1930, 1

<sup>533</sup> Farrer 1923, 10



*from the boundary of Westmorland as far as the summit of Dovecrag  
aforesaid*<sup>534</sup>.

The manor thus included the estate of Rydal, but excluded Loughrigg within the same township but which, with Ambleside and the rights to common of pasture in Grasmere, formed a separate part of the grant. Although there were existing hunting rights through its status as a baronial forest, a charter for the establishment of a large deer park at Rydal is said to have been granted in the reign of Edward I,<sup>535</sup> possibly following the manorial grant. The bounds of the manor, and thus probably of the deer park, were fixed by means of a physical fence, 160 perches (just under one kilometre) long in 1277, following a dispute over straying livestock.<sup>536</sup> The fence ran along the top of the ridges marking the watershed on both sides of the Rydal Water valley, and it probably took the form of a bank and ditch, and the remains of such an earthwork can still be seen on Nab Scar ridge. This earthwork boundary would have been insufficient to keep out animals, and probably a dry hedge of brushwood would have been built on top. This would have been constructed by driving in stakes and filling the gaps with wattles and brushwood<sup>537</sup>. Parts of the bank and ditch had been replaced by a wall by 1581 between Rydal and Grasmere, and around 1565 between Rydal and Ambleside, above Scandale Beck.<sup>538</sup> The boundary wall above Scandale survives, and is distinctive by its height, and the large boulders used in its foundation (Figure 4.19). By the late sixteenth century, the deer park was still in existence, even though all the deer had been removed.<sup>539</sup>

### ***Manorial Parks***

Manorial parks were the most common type of park, making up 54% of the total. Most were relatively small, with 68% under 300ha in extent, and 71% under 400ha. The largest park was Askerton, at 543ha, which in character was more like an upland chase. The existence of the 56 mapped parks have not all been proven definitively. Some are known only from a licence to impark, and doubt has been cast over whether they

---

<sup>534</sup> An approximate translation in Newman 2007; aimed at a modern meaning. Where known, modern names are in square brackets

<sup>535</sup> Collingwood 1928, 86

<sup>536</sup> Collingwood 1930

<sup>537</sup> Collingwood 1930, 6-7

<sup>538</sup> Winchester 2000a, 29-30

<sup>539</sup> Collingwood 1928, 86

actually existed as physical parks,<sup>540</sup> therefore, only those with identifiable boundaries have been mapped. These boundaries take the form of either a relict or standing park pale, or later boundaries and landscape features which appear to follow the line of a park boundary in areas where there is documentary evidence to support the presence of a deer park. Some, like Walton near Brampton, and Wanwood near Alston, involved the imparking of woodland, elsewhere a mixture of upland and wood were enclosed, such as at Isel or Middleton in the Lune Valley. In the Kent valley, south of Kendal, a series of lowland parks were created around their manorial centres, including Heversham, Levens, Natland and Sizergh (Figure 4.20).

The difficulty of establishing a definitive list of medieval parks is illustrated by the possible deer park at Arnside (Figure 4.21). Arnside was in the parish and manor of Beetham, centred on Beetham Hall, which is documented as the '*Hall of Bethum with other houses within the court*' in a survey of 1254-5. This survey also lists 33 acres in demesne in Arnside, as well as '*honey of the wood*' of Arnside and Beetham<sup>541</sup> The lord of the manor, Ralph de Bethum, was granted free warren in his demesne lands in Beetham in 1334<sup>542</sup>, although not a licence to impark his lands. By 1517, the demesne lands in Arnside were 20 acres, but there was also 200 acres of wood, worth nothing because it was '*not wood for cutting down*', 100 acres of moor and a '*toure*' called Arnside Tower, also worth nothing yearly.<sup>543</sup> Arnside Tower, now greatly ruined, was a true tower house thought to date from the fifteenth century.<sup>544</sup> Clearly by 1517, both the tower and the woodland were not being actively managed either by the manor as demesne holdings, nor were they rented out to tenants. In 1655, the lands include Arnside Park, a name still in use for the woodlands below Arnside Knot, and Arnside Tower was referred to as a capital messuage, or mansion house.<sup>545</sup> It appears that the tower, woods and moor were retained directly in the hands of the manor, as no income was derived from them, and it is tempting to interpret this as the area over which the right of free warren was exercised, though there is no evidence that it was ever formally imparked.

---

<sup>540</sup> Winchester 2007, 170

<sup>541</sup> Farrer 1924, 217; McIntire 1937, 135

<sup>542</sup> Farrer 1924, 220

<sup>543</sup> Farrer 1924, 231

<sup>544</sup> National Heritage List n.d., scheduled monument 1007142

<sup>545</sup> Farrer 1924, 237

There is clearer evidence for the creation of a park in Dalton, near Burton in Kendal. Here, the manor was granted a licence to impark 300 acres of wood and 200 acres of arable in 1372.<sup>546</sup> Although the park was still in use in 1498, it had gone by the time Dalton was depicted on a map of 1694,<sup>547</sup> making the bounds very difficult to trace on late eighteenth or nineteenth century maps, even though a large area of woodland is still called Dalton Park Wood. Using a combination of historic Ordnance Survey maps and fieldwork, however, has allowed a reconstruction of the boundary (Figure 4.22).<sup>548</sup> On the ground a bank with a partially surviving internal ditch can be seen, which encompasses Dalton Park Wood. This continues beyond the south-western edge of the wood where, in some places there are also the remains of a substantial stone wall, or a kest bank. Dalton Old Hall, the site of the original manor house, lies against the northern boundary, which in part follows a natural stream course and elsewhere survives as a bank and ditch. The creation of this deer park not only enclosed some of Dalton's arable lands within the park pale, but archaeological evidence and map evidence indicates it led to the abandonment of at least four messuages which were included within the park pale.<sup>549</sup> At Wharton the creation of a park in the sixteenth-century park appears to have led to the abandonment of the tower house at Lammerside<sup>550</sup> and other dwellings in the vicinity.<sup>551</sup>

### ***Monastic Parks***

The major monastic institutions in Cumbria were all significant landowners, and acted like secular lords in creating deer parks. Fourteen deer parks were identified as the creations of monastic institutions. Of these, nine belonged to Furness Abbey, and one each for Shap Abbey, Holme Cultram Abbey, Lanercost Priory, the Gilbertine cell at Ravenstonedale and Cockersands Priory in Lancashire which owned Hutton Roof.

The park for Lanercost Priory was set within its demesne lands around the precinct (Figure 4.24). It was created following disputes over hunting rights with the neighbouring Barony of Gilsland. This was settled in 1256, when the Priory was granted the right to enclose their part of Warth-colman with a ditch and low hedge.<sup>552</sup> The

---

<sup>546</sup> Farrer and Brownbill 1914, 184

<sup>547</sup> KCA WPR/10/Misc

<sup>548</sup> Newman and Newman 2009b

<sup>549</sup> Newman and Newman 2009b, 9

<sup>550</sup> Hoyle 1995, 117

<sup>551</sup> Pastscape 2007, list number 14756

<sup>552</sup> Wilson 1905; Todd 1991, 75-77

bounds of the park are not given, but to the north of the priory is an area of woodland still called Abbey Park. From this, and from an 1804 map of the demesne lands of Lanercost, it seems likely that Hadrian's Wall formed the northern boundary of the park,<sup>553</sup> although it is more difficult to define the western extent of the park. On the 1804 map, park-related field and wood names are limited to the eastern block of demesne land, with a field called West Park in the centre of the block. It is possible, however, that this represents a later shrinkage of the park area, as there is no clear park boundary on the western side. Conversely, there is a potentially coherent park boundary if land further west is included, as far as Abbey Gill Wood. This would have enclosed an area of 93ha, larger than those of Shap Abbey and Holm Cultram Abbey at 43ha and 63ha respectively. Without the lands in the western half, the park would have covered up to 50ha. A larger park would allow the canons of the Priory to have a wider control of hunting on their demesne lands, as the Lord of Gilsland's hunt and game were allowed to pass freely over the Canons' land, except for their park of Warth-colman. The Canons, however, also had the right to hunt deer on their land outside their park.<sup>554</sup>

The Forest of Furness had been granted, with Walney Island, to Furness Abbey in the reign of Henry I.<sup>555</sup> Evidence for the establishment of medieval, enclosed deer parks within the forest is difficult to tease out from the surviving documents. Even though antiquarian writers had stated that an abbot in the time of Edward I was granted a licence to enclose large tracts of the Furness Fells, this was dismissed by Cowper in his study of Hawkshead parish.<sup>556</sup> There is only fragmentary evidence for the establishment of deer parks within Furness Forest. In 1338 a licence is recorded in the Patent Rolls "*for the abbot and convent of Fournays to impark their woods of Ramesheved, Soureby, Ronheved, Grenescogh, Hagge, Milnewod, Clayfe and Fournaisfell*".<sup>557</sup> Other than Claife and Furness Fell, these woods lay outside the Forest, in Low Furness. It was assumed by Cowper that the 1338 licence to create parks was to make enclosures, rather than deer parks, and in a footnote he lists the principal settlements with park names,<sup>558</sup> many of which were later recorded as granges of the Abbey in Abbot Roger's rental of

---

<sup>553</sup> TNA MPE/1/659

<sup>554</sup> Todd 1991, 76

<sup>555</sup> Langton 2010, 33-4

<sup>556</sup> Cowper 1899, 91

<sup>557</sup> Boynton 2003, 1338-40, 12; *Ramesheved* is Rampside, but the park boundaries could not be identified

<sup>558</sup> Cowper 1899, 91

1535.<sup>559</sup> The use of park, to mean enclosure, was a common local practice, however, Furness Abbey would not need a licence to enclose its own lands and the licence specifically refers to permission for the monks to impark their woods.

The two emparked woods in the forest were named as Claife and Furness Fell. The likely bounds of the Claife deer park can still be discerned around Claife Heights in the boundaries of later intakes (Figure 4.24). Whilst the location of Claife is clear, the reference to the emparking of woods at 'Furness Fell' is unspecific. A likely candidate for this park is an area known as Hawkshead Hall Park, sited on ground that rises up onto low fells overlooking the Hall (Figure 4.25). A deer park, close to Hawkshead Hall which was the manorial centre for Furness Abbey's estates in High Furness from the late twelfth century,<sup>560</sup> makes sense. The likely presence of a deer park here lies mainly in place-name and Ordnance Survey map evidence. There is a clear continuous boundary, enclosing an area of 151ha. The whole area is still known as Hawkshead Hall Park, even though it is divided into three large enclosures: High Park, Low Park and Frith. These divisions are shown on the first edition Ordnance Survey map of 1851, and probably represent the later division of the park into separate pastures. The existence of an enclosure named 'Frith', however, is significant, as it suggests an enclosed hunting park or deer enclosure.<sup>561</sup> Altogether, the evidence suggests that this may be the location of the deer park of Furness Fell, licensed in 1338.

Another reference to deer park creation by Furness Abbey dates to 1513, when Abbot Banke made "*another park*" at Grisedale "*to put deer into, which park is about five miles in compass*".<sup>562</sup> This is thought to be Dale Park, an extensive area of land encompassing the valley of Dale Park Beck and the holdings of three farms, Low Middle and High Dale Park, which appear to have been established in the post medieval period within the bounds of the park.

### **Extensive Stock Farming**

One of the results of having large areas like forests controlled by powerful lordships, whether secular or religious, was the availability of extensive tracts of relatively uncolonised and untenanted land which could be used for specialised exploitation. In particular extensive stock rearing could be undertaken either controlled directly by the

---

<sup>559</sup> West 1805

<sup>560</sup> Farrer and Brownbill 1914, 7-16

<sup>561</sup> Winchester 2007, 173

<sup>562</sup> Cowper 1899, 50-1

lords, or through land and grazing rights (agistment) rented to tenants.<sup>563</sup> During the later Middle Ages, the waste was increasingly put over to grazing livestock<sup>564</sup> as a means of generating income for the lordly estates. Grazing could either be done directly as demesne farming, through the manorial system and common rights, or through agistment.

Demesne stock farming of cattle in vaccaries left a recognisable physical expression, in the form of definable farm holdings. Vaccaries were demesne cattle farms which generated income through the sale of draft animals, meat, leather and dairy products.<sup>565</sup> The arrangement was usually one of a lease to tenants, who earned income through the sale of dairy produce and from whatever they could grow, but the stock remained in the ownership of the lord.<sup>566</sup> Vaccaries were found throughout the north of England, though they were especially concentrated in the central Pennine uplands, and in Cumbria most were located along the western Pennine edge with a smaller number in the Lake District high fells. Care has to be taken with the use of the term vaccary, however, as in medieval documents it could be used to refer to a range of features from buildings to house cattle, to cow pastures or to the whole cattle farm.<sup>567</sup> Documentary evidence for vaccaries dates mainly from the late thirteenth century, though some appear to have had earlier origins, at least as pastures.<sup>568</sup> Nor can it be assumed that vaccaries always remained as demesne farms, as most seems to have been let to tenants at a later date.<sup>569</sup>

As farms, however, they varied in form. In general, most would have had a central settlement in the form of a hamlet, with enclosed, or in-bye, land around the farm. The settlement would have required houses for the head stockman (*instaurarius*), the cowherds, specialists such as the geldherd, and all their families.<sup>570</sup> The settlement would have had some arable land to support the small community and hay meadows to provide winter fodder, and it was where cattle could be kept over winter for security. Woodland and wood pasture may also have featured, with the trees, especially holly,

---

<sup>563</sup> Winchester 1987, 42

<sup>564</sup> Winchester 2010b, 109

<sup>565</sup> Winchester 2010b, 111, 115

<sup>566</sup> Higham 2007, 166

<sup>567</sup> Winchester 2010b, 114

<sup>568</sup> Winchester 2010b, 115

<sup>569</sup> Winchester 2010b, 115

<sup>570</sup> Higham 2007, 166; Atkin 1994, 16

providing winter browse for the cattle.<sup>571</sup> Finally, the summer grazing would have been in the extensive upland pastures. Parts of the unenclosed summer grazing grounds were often enclosed as cow pastures from the early post medieval period. As vaccaries were sub-divided into smaller tenanted farms, the stock farmers could develop more sophisticated grazing systems, with areas of the lower fellsides enclosed as cow pastures allowing closer control of when and where the stock could graze.<sup>572</sup> In general, it is the vaccary farmstead with its in-bye closes which have been mapped, as these are reflected in later farm holdings and field boundaries. In most cases it has not been possible to map the wider pasture lands as most of them were unenclosed and remained so until enclosure in the late eighteenth or nineteenth centuries. In some places, however, the boundaries of post medieval cow pastures do survive, even where reorganised by parliamentary enclosure.

A total of 31 vaccaries have been recorded in Cumbria (Table 4.3 and Figure 4.26).<sup>573</sup> Of these, 21 were in the Pennine forests of Stainmore and Mallerstang. The remaining vaccaries were within the forests of the Lake District Fells, apart from one within Inglewood Forest. The one vaccary which lay outside the fells was on land granted by King John to Holm Cultram Abbey in 1215.<sup>574</sup> This was described as ‘*the hermitage of St Hylda in his Forest of Englewode with the clearing*’ (*landa*). The grant allowed the monks to cultivate it or use it as pasture, and to have a vaccary for 40 cows and calves, with pasture in the forest and as many horses and oxen as may be needed for cultivation. This grant was confirmed by Henry III in 1227. Although described as being in Inglewood, the site of the hermitage and vaccary was at Islekirk, which lay on the southern edge of Westward. The centre of the vaccary would have been on the site of Islekirk Hall,<sup>575</sup> a sixteenth century building which was also the site of the hermitage. It had a coherent block of land on either side of the River Waver which would have provided cultivatable ground and meadow pastures. To the north were areas of unenclosed waste which would have provided summer grazing, and to the east was woodland, which was enclosed as a park by the eighteenth century.<sup>576</sup>

---

<sup>571</sup> Atkin 1994, 17

<sup>572</sup> Winchester 2000b, 68

<sup>573</sup> Winchester 2010b; National Trust n.d., Oxford Archaeology North 2003, 2007 and 2009

<sup>574</sup> Grainger and Collingwood 1929, 76

<sup>575</sup> National Heritage List n.d. listed building grade II\*

<sup>576</sup> WCA D/Lec/Westward/1/12a

The vaccary at Gatesgarth in Buttermere was been studied in detail by Winchester, and has been the subject of an archaeological excavation.<sup>577</sup> Gatesgarth, documented as a pasture in 1260, but a vaccary by the 1280s,<sup>578</sup> was located at the head of Buttermere (Figure 4.28). Accounts between 1267 and 1269 provide some idea of the constituent parts of the vaccary, including a cow house (*vaccaria*) to house the cattle in winter, a house for hay and calves, an enclosure around the meadow, the wood of Gatesgarth and a park (meaning enclosure). A large enclosure on the fellsides to the north-west of Gatesgarth is thought to be the park,<sup>579</sup> whilst the outer boundary around the low-lying flat lands at the head of the lake would have enclosed the meadow and arable fields. There is little evidence for the vaccary's woodlands. Small woodlands are shown on nineteenth century Ordnance Survey maps, but these were mainly plantations. It is quite likely that these were replantings of older woodlands, and that these small areas may have been sufficient to supply winter browse. There are, however, also some scattered trees on the lower fellsides to the north of Gatesgarth Farm particularly around Hartley Burn and these may have been more extensive in the medieval period. Evidence for the physical structure of the vaccary settlement at Gatesgarth was revealed through archaeological investigations on the site of a new agricultural building in 2007-8.<sup>580</sup> These revealed the remains of a longhouse with pottery dated to the thirteenth or fourteenth century, a trackway, and a timber building.

Gatesgarth shares a common feature with other vaccaries in the Lake District fells, with its location at, or close to, the head of a lake. This would have provided level ground with fertile, alluvial soil for the cultivation of crops and the production of hay for winter fodder.<sup>581</sup> The vaccaries at Gillerthwaite and Wasdale also took advantage of the low-lying lands in the valley bottom to maximise the agricultural potential of the farm. Little now survives at Gillerthwaite in the form of surviving settlement. There are two former farmhouses, Low and High Gillerthwaite, which may mark the general area of the original vaccary steadings, however, extensive field work has demonstrated that there was considerably more settlement here in the medieval period (Figure 4.28).<sup>582</sup> The remains of building complexes and enclosures have been identified both along the

---

<sup>577</sup> Winchester 2003a; Railton 2009

<sup>578</sup> Winchester 2003a, 113

<sup>579</sup> Winchester 2003a, 114

<sup>580</sup> Railton 2009

<sup>581</sup> Winchester 2010b, 115

<sup>582</sup> Oxford Archaeology North 2003



valley bottom and on the lower slopes of the northern valley sides. This certainly supports the idea of vaccaries being made up of several habitations along with housing for cattle, other ancillary buildings as well as folds, pens and enclosures to manage and control the cattle.

Like Gillerthwaite, the vaccaries at Wasdale Head were also in the Forest of Copeland. There is very little documentary evidence for the origins and evolution of the vaccaries, but an archaeological landscape survey of the valley allows some interpretation to be made (Figure 4.29).<sup>583</sup> Vaccaries are first documented in the area in 1322, and these are almost certainly the same as those specifically recorded at Wasdale Head in 1344.<sup>584</sup> The survey discusses the history and development of the settlements along the valley, and it also identified distinct medieval elements of the valley landscape. It does not, however, try and locate the vaccaries which formed the basis for the later settlement pattern and fieldscape of Wasdale Head. From work on vaccaries elsewhere,<sup>585</sup> it is evident that it would not be unusual for them to become post medieval hamlets. They originated as small nucleations, rather than individual steadings, with houses being necessary for vaccary workers and their families. If this is the case in Wasdale Head, then it helps to identify the sites of the vaccaries as Bowderdale, Burnthwaite, The Row and Down in the Dale. Apart from Bowderdale, each had developed into hamlets by the early post medieval period<sup>586</sup> and were grouped around the edge of the ring garth which enclosed a common arable field. There are indications that Burnthwaite may have been an earlier settlement.<sup>587</sup> From the 'thwaite' element of its name, meaning a clearing, and its position at the head of the valley on the highest part of the valley floor, it may have been the first settlement. If so, the settlement would later have been turned into a vaccary. There is also a small set of fields which form a distinct block and could have been the common arable field for Burnthwaite. Most of the valley floor appears to have been farmed as common arable, perhaps shared by all the vaccaries in the valley. Woodland at the southern end would also have been useful for providing winter fodder. That all three settlements became post medieval hamlets may also suggest that they developed from the small nucleations which formed vaccary centres. Bowderdale,

---

<sup>583</sup> National Trust n.d.

<sup>584</sup> National Trust n.d., 44

<sup>585</sup> Lancaster University Archaeological Unit 1997b

<sup>586</sup> They were considerable settlements by the sixteenth century, with eight houses at The Row, six at Down in the Dale and four at Burnthwaite. Evidence for settlement shrinkage can be seen in the stone-fast footings of buildings and garths at Down in the Dale and The Row (National Trust n.d., 46-9)

<sup>587</sup> National Trust n.d., 47

further down the valley, is an exception as it is now an individual farm with a discrete set of fields on the valley sides. Its lower slopes, however, would have been cultivatable. Bowderdale may have become a discrete farm by the later medieval period when it was tenanted out. Its name certainly supports the suggestion that it originated as a vaccary, probably deriving from Old Norse, *búð* and *dalr* meaning ‘the valley with the hut’.<sup>588</sup> Booth is a name is commonly associated with vaccaries, particularly in areas like the Forest of Bowland.<sup>589</sup>

The Lake District vaccaries which do not fit the model of a farm complex on fertile land at the head of a lake could be found at Brotherikeld, Stonethwaite and Iselkirk (Figure 4.27). Two were located at the heads of valleys, whilst Iselkirk was slightly further down a valley. Both Iselkirk and Brotherikeld were on the immediate periphery of a baronial forest. Hence, all three were somewhat marginal, in terms of lordship and environment. Brotherikeld was at the head of the Esk valley, which provided limited cultivatable land, but plentiful access to summer grazing on the open fells. Stonethwaite was in a similar location near the head of the valley of the Stonethwaite Beck, which runs into the River Derwent above Derwent Water. Iselkirk was in the valley of the River Waver. All three vaccaries belonged to monasteries; Holm Cultram owned Iselkirk, Furness Abbey owned Brotherikeld and Fountains owned Stonethwaite. The liminal location of these three vaccaries is likely to be a consequence of baronial estates granting land away to outside institutions, and not wishing to grant away core holdings.

The largest clusters of vaccaries were in two main groups, in the Forests of Mallerstang and Stainmore. There were eleven vaccaries recorded in Mallerstang,<sup>590</sup> strung out along the sides of the upper reaches of the River Eden valley (Figure 4.30). Most now survive in the names of individual farms, though Outhgill and Castlethwaite are small nucleated settlements. The enclosures which can be mapped with the vaccary sites vary, and mostly relate to the in-bye lands in the valley bottom. At Sandpot, near Pendragon Castle, however, is an area on the side of the fell called The Friths. Given that ‘frith’ usually refers to woodland, and is often associated with parks,<sup>591</sup> it would seem possible that this area may have begun as a deer park, probably associated with Pendragon Castle, but like many other parks soon acquired an alternative role providing grazing,<sup>592</sup>

---

<sup>588</sup> Whaley2006, 41

<sup>589</sup> Lancaster University Archaeological Unit 1997b

<sup>590</sup> Winchester 2010b, 122

<sup>591</sup> Smith 1967b, 252

<sup>592</sup> Winchester 2004, 175-7

becoming the lower fell pastures for a vaccary at Sandpot. Further up the valley was another vaccary called Hanging Lund, meaning ‘wooded hillside’.<sup>593</sup> There are also later intakes which were once the vaccary pastures, for example Aisgill pasture was a large enclosure on the fellside above the vaccary of Aisgill. All the settlements in Mallerstang with place-name evidence for a medieval origin were recorded as vaccaries, apart from Pendragon Castle.

Stainmore, too, had 11 vaccaries (Figure 4.31), with eight clustered around the southern slopes of the valley of the Argill Beck, Seavy Gill on the northern boundary of the forest in the valley of the Swindale Beck, Heggarscales to the south on the valley sides of the Coldkeld Beck, and Knollow, at a site now lost.<sup>594</sup> The remaining eight, however, were located on small streams or gills, on the south side of the valley of the Argill Beck. Where they have survived as settlements, all the located Stainmore vaccaries have become discrete farms. With the development of other farms in the valley in the post medieval period, it was difficult to map the extent of the in-bye land which each of these vaccaries would have held. All, however, would have had access to extensive areas of unenclosed upland grazing for their summer pastures. It is difficult to identify significant areas of woodland within the Stainmore vaccaries, though the gills around which they developed would have had woodland on their valley sides in the medieval period as they do today.

The place name evidence suggests that these were new settlements, breaking and enclosing new ground in the forests.<sup>595</sup> ‘Thwaite’, meaning a clearing, is found in several vaccary names, implying that new ground, possibly wooded, was taken to establish the farms. Heggarscales, in Stainmore, suggests that it was first established as a seasonal dwelling. Winchester has demonstrated that such names can have more complex meanings<sup>596</sup> and ‘scale’ here may originally have just meant a lower status building. Its location, however, on the southern edge of the forest a little distance away from the main grouping of vaccaries, might mean that it began as a seasonal dwelling for the summer pastures, but perhaps later became a vaccary in its own right. It is close to the head of a small side valley on a tributary of the River Belah, and would have

---

<sup>593</sup> Smith 1967b, 272

<sup>594</sup> Winchester 2010b, 122

<sup>595</sup> Winchester 2012, 115-116

<sup>596</sup> Winchester 2012, 132

formed an island of enclosed and improved land within a wider area of unenclosed moorland up until the post medieval period.

The settlement pattern of vaccaries tended to be irregular, rather than planned, and those in Lancashire were often found scattered around the periphery of the arable ground or, where that was not possible, then arranged around an irregular green<sup>597</sup>. In Cumbria, there is little in the surviving settlement patterns which provide information on the original vaccary layouts, indeed many appear to have been subject to settlement shrinkage leaving only single farms. Excavations at Gatesgarth have revealed that there was once more widespread settlement,<sup>598</sup> perhaps around an irregular green, whilst archaeological survey at Gillerthwaite in Ennerdale has shown there was once a much more widespread complex of buildings,<sup>599</sup> which is still not fully understood. The vaccaries in Stainmore and Mallerstang survive only as farms scattered along the valleys sides, and there is little in the modern landscape which reveals their original size and layout. It is only in Wasdale, where detailed landscape survey has been carried out by the National Trust, that the settlement pattern of the vaccaries can be read in the modern landscape. Even here, many of the hamlets which made up each individual vaccary has now shrunk, sometimes to a single farm.<sup>600</sup>

All the vaccaries would have required access to the open pastures, and would have needed to have controlled stock as they were taken on and off the fells. The outgangs or driftways would have funnelled down into narrow tracks as they wound their way down and descended off the fellsides.<sup>601</sup> Evidence for these stock funnels does not always survive, particularly where there have been extensive landscape changes such as at Gillerthwaite in Ennerdale. At Brotherkeld in Eskdale and at Gatesgarth in Buttermere, however, there are hints of a funnel leading up the fellsides alongside the river, which, if fenced, would have provided the kind of meandering boundary suited to a droveway. In Stainmore, access onto the open grazing is perhaps reflected in the road routes across the fells which had surviving funnel-shaped swathes of unenclosed land running right into the heart of the anciently enclosed areas up until the later post medieval period (Figure 4.32). There are hints, too, in some of the Mallerstang vaccaries. For example, Castlethwaite clearly has a finger of unenclosed fell running into the modern-day farm

---

<sup>597</sup> Higham 2007, 167

<sup>598</sup> Railton 2009

<sup>599</sup> Oxford Archaeology North 2003

<sup>600</sup> National Trust n.d.

<sup>601</sup> Higham 2007, 167

of Keld Hole and which continues on as an enclosed track into the heart of the steading. Similar features can be seen at Aisgill, Angerholme and Shoregill. At Southwaite, the most northerly of the Mallerstang vaccaries, the remains of the enclosed track survives as it enters the steading. Outgangs were not peculiar to vaccaries, and were common across Cumbria where access was needed to bring stock off the summer grazing lands to fold them onto the common arable fields for the winter, particularly in areas of nucleated settlement. Where outgangs can be discerned for vaccaries in Mallerstang and Stainmore, however, they were serving a more dispersed settlement pattern of small hamlets, many of which now survive only as individual farms.

### **Lordship and Land-Use**

The medieval forests and chases of Cumbria have been plotted at their greatest extent. They were not all extant and operating at the same time. The mapping, however, demonstrates the extent of lordly control over more upland and marginal areas. That the barons were permitted to hold so much of Cumbria as forest is indicative of the need for strong baronial control along the border with Scotland. England did not gain control of the whole of Cumbria until 1092, and it remained a contested area until it became permanently English in 1157.<sup>602</sup> The need for continuing strong control was reiterated in 1296, when war broke out between England and Scotland, which then continued intermittently into the sixteenth century.<sup>603</sup> The need for strong lordship was reflected right across the border with Scotland, and Northumberland, too was overseen by powerful barons.<sup>604</sup>

The baronial forests were also important for controlling key resources, especially minerals. The Alston Moor silver mines, in the Forest of Gilderdale were being worked by 1130, and the farm, or profits, of the mine were granted to the burgesses of Carlisle, where a royal mint was established.<sup>605</sup> Silver was also exploited from the Lake District forests, for example at Silver Gill mine in Caldbeck,<sup>606</sup> which was part of the forest extension into the Barony of Allerdale made by Henry II, and at Goldscope Mine, in Derwentfells Forest where gold, silver, copper and lead were mined from the thirteenth

---

<sup>602</sup> Barlow 1972, 287

<sup>603</sup> Winchester 2006b, 158

<sup>604</sup> Lomas and Muir 2006, 57

<sup>605</sup> Summerson 1993, 27-8

<sup>606</sup> Pastscape 2007, list number 1341397

century.<sup>607</sup> As a counterbalance to the powerful baronial landholdings, the king had control of the Forest of Inglewood. Placed in the heart of Cumberland, across a large swathe of lowland immediately south of Carlisle, the main urban centre, it gave the king a visible presence in the region.<sup>608</sup> Inglewood also gave the Crown control over much of the western border's timber resource.

Forests were a land-use type suited to an area with large swathes of agriculturally marginal upland. The upland forests were exploited for stock rearing, in the form of cattle and sheep, the only viable form of agricultural and commercial activity. One manifestation of this was the vaccary. Lowland forests, however, could be exploited through the normal system of demesne and tenant farming. The lowland forests of Cumbria were, nevertheless, still symbols of lordly power and it is likely that they were also necessary to conserve valuable woodland resources.

Deer parks were, to some extent, forests in miniature. They were a reflection of privilege and status. By enclosing and restricting access to land, especially in forests, the creation of deer parks can be seen as part of the later medieval and post medieval process of closure and privatisation of space.<sup>609</sup> The greatest concentration of parks in Cumbria lay outside the forests in the Barony of Kendale, perhaps an indication that deer parks fulfilled a similar function to forests but at a lesser scale and in a local context. Forests, deer parks and vaccaries in Cumbria, were well suited to the exploitation of agriculturally marginal upland environments. In such situations stock rearing could be undertaken on a commercially viable scale. Only the major estate holders had the resources to do this. Amongst these were the monasteries, which owned and managed deer parks, vaccaries and, in the case of Furness Abbey, a forest. The next chapter will examine the extent of the monastic holdings which could be identified and mapped. It will examine their influence and the effect they had on the development of the late medieval landscape.

---

<sup>607</sup> National Heritage List n.d., scheduled monument 1019945

<sup>608</sup> Summerson 1993, 29

<sup>609</sup> Johnson 1996, 77-9

## Chapter 5. Landscapes of Power: Religious Lordship and Land-use in Late Medieval Cumbria

*They began to build a cite of the priory and church anno domini 1116, and in process of time they moved the gentlemen to give much land and revenues to have their bodies buried there and for their souls' health. ... & many others in divers parts of the country gave lands to this church, until they had got a considerable stipend for every person in that priory to defray their extraordinary charges.<sup>610</sup>*

### Monastic Institutions (Table 5.1)

By the time of the Dissolution, a significant proportion of land in Cumbria was under the control of the Church. Like any other important landholder, the church had an influence on the development of the medieval landscape. Many of the land grants from secular lords to ecclesiastical establishments had been made by the thirteenth century, when the Statutes of Mortmain were enacted to try and control the transfer of land to the Church and thus limit loss of income to the Crown.<sup>611</sup> Grants continued to be made, but not on the same scale as in previous centuries. Land under the control of the Church, and particularly the monasteries, could take various forms: directly farmed land including granges, lordships of manors, common rights or grants of individual parcels of land. Income from these holdings would either come directly from produce or in the form of rents from tenants.

Information on land holdings was available for all the major houses in Cumbria. This took the form of published cartularies andoucher books or, where none survive, published works analysing original documents. From these and other secondary sources, it has been possible to reconstruct and map the core holdings for all the houses. It was also possible to extract and map information on the granges, verified by information from monastic documents. Like the holdings of many discrete farms, the land associated with the granges could be mapped, because they usually formed easily identifiable blocks of land, often with a continuous boundary. The greater level of detail available for monastic granges allows them to be used to provide insight into the processes of dispersed settlement formation. Other holdings, such as grants of villis, parcels of land and common rights could not be mapped without further work beyond the scope of this study, as information was not consistently recorded. In this chapter, the descriptions of

---

<sup>610</sup> The foundation of Lanercost Priory by Thomas Denton, 1687-8 (Winchester 2003b, 367-8)

<sup>611</sup> Richardson 1986, 24

the monastic houses and their core holdings are set out by historic county, rather than by monastic order. This allows differences between the counties to be highlighted and explained and is consistent with a study based on county maps. Conversely, a discussion of monastic granges has been arranged by the houses which owned them, which allows an analysis of the sphere of influence exercised by the houses over the medieval landscape of Cumbria.

***Westmorland*** (Figure 5.1).

In comparison to some other regions, Cumbria had relatively few monastic foundations, but some had very extensive land holdings and wielded considerable influence on the landscape. There was only one significant monastic house in Westmorland, the Premonstratensian abbey at Shap. This was established around 1200 on land granted by Thomas de Workington.<sup>612</sup> The bounds are given in the foundation grant and they describe a relatively small area of around 176 ha lying mainly on the east side of the valley of the River Lowther, including the area of the precinct and a later deer park. The bounds can be followed and mapped from modern boundaries which follow the same line as the precinct, and where the original boundary survives as an earthwork (Figure 5.2). Shap was a re-establishment of the abbey from its original site on the southern boundary of Westmorland, at Preston Patrick. It was not unusual for monasteries to be moved for any one of a number of reasons, such as to a more isolated site or for a better water supply,<sup>613</sup> but the reason for the move to Shap is not known. The original was a short-lived foundation, established in 1191 on land granted by the lord of the manor of Preston Patrick. The initial grant to the mother house of Cockersands Abbey in Lancashire may have been to establish a hospital, as a subsequent grant of sometime between 1191 and 1200 refers to a chapel of the infirm.<sup>614</sup> This later grant appears to subsume the original gift of land and was made specifically to the canons of the Premonstratensian order of Preston; that is Preston Patrick, suggesting that they had already set up the chapel for the infirm. The new grant specified land upon which they could erect a 'dwelling house', and this is likely to have been the new monastery. The boundaries for land for the new dwelling are given, plus a separate block of land granted along the boundary with the neighbouring manor of Farleton, but these are difficult to locate accurately as the landscape has undergone radical changes from the nineteenth

---

<sup>612</sup> Curwen 1932, 359

<sup>613</sup> Aston 2000, 89-90

<sup>614</sup> Farrer 1924, 298



century onwards. An approximate extent can be plotted from fixed points such as the hamlet of Wath Sutton and the Peasey Beck which are named in the grant, along with the deer park for Preston Patrick's manorial caput. It appears to define a block of land stretching from Park End in the north to Farleton Bridge in the south (Figure 5.3). The Canons retained this land when they moved to Shap, and it is likely to have become a grange.

At Ravenstonedale, there was a minor monastic foundation next to the church. It was established following the gift of the church to the Gilbertine Priory of Watton in the East Riding of Yorkshire during the reign of Henry II, although possibly not before 1336.<sup>615</sup> The manor went with the church and included the vill of Ravenstonedale and part of the vill of Newbiggin,<sup>616</sup> which provided a large holding of over 6,600ha. Even so, the priory cell does not seem to have been successful as in 1405 an enquiry found that there had been no canons in residence for some time. This fits with the evidence from excavations which, in 1928-9 suggested a substantial monastery, in contrast to more extensive excavation in 1988-9, which revealed that there had been a reduction of the accommodation in the late thirteenth to fourteenth century.<sup>617</sup>

There were four known hospitals in Westmorland, including two next to the baronial seats of Kendal and Appleby. A possible fifth hospital was at Preston Patrick, where the initial grant of land to Cockersands Abbey may have been for the establishment of a hospital for the infirm.<sup>618</sup> North of the town of Kendal was St Leonard's Hospital, an establishment given to the Augustinian Canons of Conishead Priory in Lancashire-over-Sands in 1246, with grants of land to support it.<sup>619</sup> The hospital, now a farm called Spital, lay alongside the main road between Kendal and Appleby. St Nicholas, next to the town of Appleby, was a leper hospital given to Shap Abbey on its foundation, along with a parcel of land.<sup>620</sup> It was kept isolated and apart from the town and its inhabitants by being sited in a loop of the River Eden on the far bank. A hospital is documented at Gilswath near Bampton, but very little is known except that it was in existence around

---

<sup>615</sup> Curwen 1932, 214

<sup>616</sup> Nicholls 1877, 9

<sup>617</sup> Turnbull and Walsh 1992

<sup>618</sup> See above, section on Shap Abbey

<sup>619</sup> Curwen 1926, 176

<sup>620</sup> Curwen 1932, 359

1286, when a gift of 20 wagon-loads of peat per year was made to the fraternity there, ‘*whole as well as leprous*’.<sup>621</sup>

The fourth hospital was on or close to the parish boundaries between Hutton Roof, Lupton and Kirkby Lonsdale. A farm called Great Spittal was marked here on the nineteenth century Ordnance Survey maps, and a cottage (now a barn) called Little Spittal sat on the other side of the road. This was a leper house known as St Leonard’s Hospital of Tearnside, first documented in 1467 and which belonged to the chantry of St Leonards in Kirkby Lonsdale.<sup>622</sup> Although the hospital was at the meeting place of three parishes, its lands all seem to have been in Kirkby Lonsdale (Figure 5.4). Tearnside (now called Tarnside), with which the hospital was associated, lay just inside the Kirkby Lonsdale parish boundary adjacent to the hospital, and had been granted to Cockersands Abbey by the late thirteenth century.<sup>623</sup> At this time, Tearnside also had a chaplain, who is recorded as holding other land from Cockersands Abbey nearby in Newbiggin.<sup>624</sup> The Abbey had substantial holdings in both Kirkby Lonsdale and Hutton Roof,<sup>625</sup> and it seems likely that Tearnside may have been a grange of the Abbey, with its own chaplain, perhaps serving the needs of the adjacent leper hospital. The hospital’s position, right at the margins on the junction of three parishes would be expected for a leper house. As it had its own chaplain, it is also likely that Tearnside was the site of the chantry of St Leonard’s.

There is also a ‘Spital’ farm at Kirkby Thore, close to the township boundary with Temple Sowerby, but this may be named in association with Temple Sowerby rather than being the site of a hospital. The whole manor of Temple Sowerby belonged to the Knights Templars until 1312, when they were suppressed and the manor was eventually granted to the Knights Hospitallers in 1323. They also held the manor of Acorn Bank,<sup>626</sup> in the township of Temple Sowerby, which was probably a grange.

---

<sup>621</sup> Curwen 1932, 251

<sup>622</sup> Smith 1967a, 37-8

<sup>623</sup> Farrer 1924, 307

<sup>624</sup> Farrer 1924, 344

<sup>625</sup> Farrer 1924, 304, 313, 350

<sup>626</sup> Curwen 1932, 156

**Cumberland** (Figure 5.1)

In contrast to Westmorland, Cumberland had a number of monastic houses varying in size and wealth. One of the smallest was Seaton, or Lekeley, Nunnery in Bootle on the west coast. This Benedictine Priory was small and held very little land. Much of the land around it was held by other monastic foundations, particularly Holm Cultram, but also St Bees, Conishead and Cockersands.<sup>627</sup> So poor were the nuns that they were granted the lands of St Leonard's Hospital, Lancaster, and in 1450 Holm Cultram let their lands in Seaton to the nuns.<sup>628</sup> There were three other Benedictine foundations in Cumberland at Wetheral, Armathwaite and St Bees. Wetheral was established as a cell by St Mary's in York with a land grant from Ralph de Meschin.<sup>629</sup> Included in the grant was the manor of Wetheral with all its lands, which stretched from the Eden in the north to nearly as far south as Armathwaite, and from the River Eden in the east to the main road south from Carlisle in the west (Figure 5.5). Although there was some unenclosed low moorland in the south, much of the land granted to Wetheral was of good quality, and included planned villages such as Scotby and Cumwhinton. In contrast, the Benedictine nunnery at Armathwaite, said to have been founded in the late eleventh century, had relatively little land, its core holdings being in fields around the nunnery itself and a short distance away at Nunclose.<sup>630</sup> There is little known about this nunnery, and even its foundation charter is a forgery, as the original documents were destroyed in one of the Scottish raids which devastated the nunnery. On the west coast of Cumberland was the other main Benedictine house at St Bees, which, like the smaller nunneries, was founded as a cell of St Marys Priory in York, probably around 1125.<sup>631</sup> With the endowments from the founder, William de Meschins, lord of Copeland, and other knights holding land off him, St Bees was second only to Holm Cultram in terms of revenues.<sup>632</sup> Their core holdings included Hensingham and Keekle as well as the whole parish of St Bees '*from Whitehaven to the river Keekle (Chechel), and as the Keekle falls into the Egge, and as the Egge flows to the sea*' (Figure 5.6).<sup>633</sup>

---

<sup>627</sup> Wilson 1905, 192-4

<sup>628</sup> Grainger and Collingwood 1929, 31-2

<sup>629</sup> Wilson 1905, 184

<sup>630</sup> Wilson 1905, 189-92

<sup>631</sup> Wilson 1905, 179; Winchester 2010a, 47

<sup>632</sup> Wilson 1905

<sup>633</sup> Wilson 1905

The order with the largest holdings in Cumberland was the Cistercians, who had Abbeys at Calder and Holm Cultram. Calder Abbey was first established in 1135 by Savignac monks from Furness Abbey but only lasted three years when they were driven out by a Scottish raid. Following disputes over the independence of Calder from Furness, it was re-established in 1143 by the abbot of Furness, and in 1148 it became a Cistercian abbey following the Savignac and Cistercian merger.<sup>634</sup> There is no surviving cartulary for Calder,<sup>635</sup> so it is difficult to define a central demesne around the precinct. From the records which do survive and from place name evidence, however, a likely extent of their main holdings can be reconstructed (Figure 5.7). Many of the places mentioned in the documents are distant from the abbey, but Bemerton and Hologate appear to be within their immediate demesne holdings, although the location of Bemerton is not known. Hologate, however, is thought to be the area of low fell called Stords to the north east of the Abbey,<sup>636</sup> an area where granges are known from the thirteenth century (see below). Their core holding, probably granted on the abbey's foundation in 1134, was known as Calder Lordship in 1535, and seemed to comprise most of the parish of St Bridget Beckermeth, except for an individual holding called Godderthwaite,<sup>637</sup> which dates back to at least the late thirteenth century.<sup>638</sup> The abbey precinct stretched out along the banks of the River Calder to the south west, with the boundaries widening as they rose up onto the low fell of Swainson Knott and also as the parish crossed the coastal plain. It included land and farms operating as granges and the settlement known as The Farmery, which is thought to be the Abbey Infirmary.<sup>639</sup>

The largest monastic house in Cumberland was also Cistercian. This was Holm Cultram, founded from Melrose Abbey in 1150 by Prince Henry, son of King David of Scotland, when this part of Cumbria was under Scottish rule. The grant was then confirmed by Henry II, once it was back under English rule.<sup>640</sup> The foundation included the grant of a large area of land, known as the island of Holm Cultram, which was a discrete block of land along the coast defined by watercourses and mosses (Figure 5.8).

---

<sup>634</sup> Thorley 2004, 135

<sup>635</sup> Thorley 2004, 133

<sup>636</sup> Thorley 2004, 142; Winchester 1987, 156-7

<sup>637</sup> Winchester 1987, 152

<sup>638</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 339

<sup>639</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 338

<sup>640</sup> Wilson 1905, 162

The bounds are easy to follow, for the most part, though in the area of Wedholme Flow later changes have obscured the line of the boundary. The grant was as follows:

*‘Richard, king of England, etc. confirms to God and St. Mary of Holm Coltran, etc. the whole island of Holm and Rabi [Raby] by the bounds which his father granted, i.e. by the beck under Kyrkebride between the outer dyke of the monks and the vill of Kyrkebride as it falls into the Wathepol [Wampool]; up by the same beck outside the said dyke to Cockelayc following the junction of solid ground and moss; thence straight up to the middle of the moss between Waytheholm [Wedholme] and the island of St. Lawrence [Lawrenceholme]; thence across the moss and wood to Antrepot; down by the Waver to its meeting with the Cromboc [Crummock beck]; up by the Cromboc to the place where the stream from Wytheskeld falls into the Cromboc; up by that beck to Wytheskeld; straight west to the sike [Holme Dub] that goes round Midelrig [Mealrigg] on the north and west, and falls into Polneuton [Black Dub]; down by Polneuton to the sea; thence along the shore and up by the Wathepol to the place where the said beck under Kyrkebride falls into the Wathepol’.*<sup>641</sup>

The Monk’s Dyke still exists, running west from the village of Kirkbride, however there is no evidence for ‘Cockelayc’ but it is likely to have been uncultivated land on the edge of the moss at the end of the dyke. This would place it at the end of Longlands Head. The charter then describes the boundary following the edge of the solid ground and moss, and so the boundary has been plotted following the land which remained unenclosed into the nineteenth century. The route taken by the boundary across Wedholme Flow is difficult to follow, but it has been assumed that the reference to Wedholme is to the Hill rather than the moss itself, and the boundary ran up the middle of the moss between Wedholme Hill and the island of St Lawrence. There is no longer any woodland on the moss, but it was still in existence in the late eighteenth century in the vicinity of Wedholme House.<sup>642</sup> It seems unlikely that the boundary continued straight west to the south of the wood as this would have taken it into Raby which was included in the grant. It seems more likely that it turned south, perhaps following the line of the later parish boundary, to Ellercarr. This may have been the location of ‘Antrepot’. At Ellercarr, the boundary would have followed the River Waver, thus including the vill of Raby. The land grant thus placed the Abbey in the centre of an

---

<sup>641</sup> Grainger and Collingwood 1929, 73

<sup>642</sup> Donald 1774

extensive area of mossland and wet woodland, with low ridges of higher ground providing land which could be farmed, as well as access to the estuary of the Waver.

One of the earliest monastic foundations in Cumbria was the Augustinian Priory of St Mary in Carlisle. It was founded by Henry I on the site of a pre-existing church of St Mary, which was demolished and relocated to within the west end of the nave of the new priory church.<sup>643</sup> Its endowments were concentrated around Carlisle itself, including the parish of the old St Mary's church, the parish church of St Cuthbert, St Michael, Stanwix and land in Linstock, Rickerby, High and Low Crosby, Walby, Brunstock Carleton and Little Carleton.<sup>644</sup>

The Augustinian priory at Lanercost was established by Robert de Vaux, the lord of Gilsland, sometime between 1165 and 1174.<sup>645</sup> The siting of the Priory was significant. It lay next to the River Irthing, close to the main route across the Tyne Gap between Carlisle and Newcastle, and was also close to routes into Scotland. It was therefore well placed to provide hospitality and prayers to travellers of all rank, as well as serving the needs of its patron, the lord of Gilsland.<sup>646</sup> The bounds of the precinct are not defined in documents, but are still legible in the modern landscape from surviving features such as the gatehouse and sections of the precinct wall, as well as modern features which follow the line such as roads and field boundaries (Figure 5.9). To the south and east, a slight bank marks the course of the boundary, along the edge of a terrace of slightly higher land within the flood plain of the valley. Roads define the northern and western sides of the Priory, with a gatehouse on the west side and a length of precinct wall along the north side. The Priory's deer park is also clearly identifiable, adjacent to the precinct<sup>647</sup>. The endowments of the priory were centred on a substantial block of land on the north side of the Irthing Valley, stretching northward at its western end to include the vill of Walton. This provided the Priory with a considerable area of land which could be cultivated or leased. It was an area of better quality, low-lying land on the edge of an area dominated by unenclosed fell, lowland moorland and moss. Within this block of

---

<sup>643</sup> Weston 2011, 104

<sup>644</sup> Weston 2011, 104

<sup>645</sup> Todd 1991, 31

<sup>646</sup> Todd 1991, vi

<sup>647</sup> See Chapter 4

land, there was an area of moorland to the north but excluding Walton Wood which was retained by the barony,<sup>648</sup> whilst to the west was Walton Moss.

As with other monastic foundations, most of its estate was acquired before the Statutes of Mortmain in the thirteenth century, but Lanercost Priory seems to have sold off much of its land in the fifteenth century.<sup>649</sup> Lanercost suffered for its position close to the Scottish border and was destroyed or damaged in raids on more than one occasion in the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.<sup>650</sup> The resulting negative economic impact of such raids may have created the need to raise money through the sale of its main assets, land.

Within the diocese of Carlisle, which included the town of Appleby in Westmorland, friaries were established which represented all four mendicant orders.<sup>651</sup> In Appleby, a house of Carmelite, or White Friars was established in 1281, and in Penrith the Austin Friars were established before 1300. Carlisle had two friaries, one Dominican and the other Franciscan. Both were located within the city walls, close to the southern gate.<sup>652</sup> Under their rules of poverty, the friaries held no land and their main physical impact was on the towns in which they were located.

As well as the main abbeys, priories and friaries, there was also a number of hospitals in Cumberland, which had landholdings scattered across the county. In Carlisle there were two hospitals. Near Botchergate was the Hospital of St Nicholas, founded as an Augustinian house around 1156 by Hugh de Morville, and which seems to have been a leper hospital.<sup>653</sup> There was also the Holy Sepulchre Hospital established by 1220 but about which little is known.<sup>654</sup> Its functions may have been taken over by St Nicholas's Hospital, as in 1250 brothers are recorded as belonging to both, and it is likely that St Nicholas's became an infirmary rather than a leper hospital by the end of the thirteenth century.<sup>655</sup> Outside of Carlisle, four hospitals are known; St Leonard's in Wigton, 'Lennh' in Bewcastle, Hospital House in Caldbeck and the House of St John in

---

<sup>649</sup> Moorman 1948, 105

<sup>650</sup> Todd 1991, 189

<sup>651</sup> Wilson 1905, 194-9

<sup>652</sup> Weston 2011, 114-6

<sup>653</sup> Weston 2011, 116-8

<sup>654</sup> Summerson 1993, 166-7

<sup>655</sup> Weston 2011, 118

Keswick.<sup>656</sup> The location of the hospitals at St John and Bewcastle are not known. Finally, Cumberland also had two colleges, at Kirkoswald and Greystoke. These were parochial institutions, established with the support and endowments of the lord of the manor. Greystoke College was granted a licence in 1374, though formally founded in 1382, and it was the richest parochial institution in the diocese of Carlisle.<sup>657</sup> Little is known about Kirkoswald College, but it appears to have been founded in the early sixteenth century and lasted only about 25 years before it was dissolved.<sup>658</sup> Even so, it left a clear legacy in the modern landscape, and its bounds can still be traced within the property boundaries of the modern settlement.

#### ***Lancashire-over-Sands*** (Figure 5.1)

In Lancashire-over-Sands there were only three monasteries, but between them they controlled most of this part of Lancashire and were amongst the most powerful landowners in the region. There was another house belonging to the Knights Hospitaller, but there was insufficient evidence to locate it exactly. According to West, there had been a hospital of the Knights of St John of Jerusalem in Bardsea, but which had gone by the date of the establishment of a hospital at Conishead, as the land on which it stood was given to Conishead Priory.<sup>659</sup> It is possible that Conishead was founded on the site of the old hospital, however, Bardsea and Conishead are in different though neighbouring parishes, so this seems unlikely.

On the Cartmel peninsula, an Augustinian priory was established around 1189-90 by William Marshall. It was endowed with his whole fief of Cartmel between the rivers Leven and Winster, making it a significant temporal lordship (Figure 5.10). It was established on the site of an existing church, dedicated to St Michael, but this was pulled down and replaced with the new priory church, dedicated to St Mary.<sup>660</sup> The smallest of the Lancastrian houses was the Augustinian priory of Conishead, which was founded as a hospital before 1181.<sup>661</sup> The land granted to Conishead formed a strip stretching from the Priory itself on the coast, inland to the town of Ulverston, including Trinkeld, which was referred to as a manor in the seventeenth century (Figure 5.11).<sup>662</sup>

---

<sup>656</sup> Wilson 1905, 204

<sup>657</sup> Wilson 1905, 204-8

<sup>658</sup> Wilson 1905, 208

<sup>659</sup> West 1805, 247-8, 252-2

<sup>660</sup> Tait 1908b, 143

<sup>661</sup> Tait 1908a, 140

<sup>662</sup> Farrer and Brownbill 1914, 355



Most of its Furness holdings seem to have been in the parish of Ulverston, concentrated in one block around the priory. Its other holdings lay outside of Furness as the result of its powerful neighbour, Furness Abbey.<sup>663</sup> Its original status as a hospital may also have been down to Furness Abbey, as the Duchy of Lancaster had forbidden the establishment of a second house within Furness at the insistence of the Abbey. Even so, Conishead's patron, William de Lancaster II provided it with further gifts and raised it to priory status before his death in 1184.<sup>664</sup>

The largest of all the monastic houses in Cumbria was Furness Abbey. It was founded in 1127 by the future King Stephen. The grant was to monks at the Savignac abbey in Tulketh, near Preston, who moved to the new location in a valley referred to at the time as '*Bekansesgill*',<sup>665</sup> but later known as the Valley of Nightshade. Although a railway line was cut through the valley in the nineteenth century, the precinct boundary is mappable as much of the wall itself survives, along with northern and southern gatehouses. The endowment included the whole of the Forest of Furness and the demesne of Furness, Walney Island and the manor of Ulverston (Figure 5.12). This comprised the whole of the Furness Fells between Coniston Water and Windermere, and the whole of Low Furness, apart from the land of Michael le Fleming, who held Aldingham and Urswick. This vast estate made the Abbey one of the main feudal lords in North West England.<sup>666</sup>

### ***Cumbria's Monasteries***

The monastic houses of Cumbria varied widely in the size of their core holdings. From the mapped extents of the holdings for each of the main monastic houses which were given endowments, there were three tiers of estate size (Table 5.2). The smallest areas were held by the smaller houses, including Armathwaite Nunnery in Cumberland (164ha) and Conishead Priory (265ha) in Lancashire-over-Sands. Shap held land covering only 176ha around its precinct, but it did also hold the Preston Patrick land (134ha) as well as extensive areas of unenclosed upland which it could use for grazing. Even though these were the smallest of the monastic estates, they were still considerable holdings comparable to secular manorial demesnes.

---

<sup>663</sup> Tait 1908a, 141

<sup>664</sup> Tait 1908a, 140-1

<sup>665</sup> Powicke 1908, 114

<sup>666</sup> Powicke 1908, 126

The second tier of monastic estates comprised Calder Abbey, and the priories of St Bees, Lanercost and Wetheral with land holdings between 2,000ha and over 6,500ha. These were mostly in Cumberland, apart from Ravenstonedale Priory in Westmorland, which had the largest estate in this category, at 6,632ha. The estates around St Bees and Ravenstonedale included the small villages next to the monastic houses, along with their common arable fields. Settlement within these core holdings, however, tended to be dominated by discrete farms and their associated enclosures. The main exception was Wetheral Priory's estate which included several villages, with extensive areas of common arable fields.

The final category of monastic estates was those houses which had core holdings of over 10,000ha. There were three of these, Holm Cultram Abbey in Cumberland, whose estate, known as the 'island' was 11,090ha. The estate of Cartmel Priory, in Lancashire-over-Sands was of similar size, at 10,000ha. The largest estate of all belonged to Furness Abbey, also in Lancashire-over-Sands, which held 30,250ha. These three houses held lands which were equivalent to large secular estates, and indeed Furness Abbey's estate can be considered the equivalent of a barony.

### **Granges**

The land forming the home demesne of the monasteries, close to the monastic centre, could be vast and beyond this they were granted whole manors and townships, as well as individual plots of land and shares in common fields and pastures. Although Edward I forbade the gift of land to the clergy and religious houses through the Statute of Mortmain in 1279,<sup>667</sup> he made an exception for the abbey at Holm Cultram, possibly because of its importance to his plans for control of Scotland,<sup>668</sup> and they were allowed to receive further lands in north Cumberland.

Before 1279, much land was granted out of secular control by feudal lords, Examples include the vill of Muncaster which was granted to Furness Abbey by William de Lancaster,<sup>669</sup> and Sir John Wake's grant of land in Drigg to Calder Abbey.<sup>670</sup> St Bees alone was granted, amongst other gifts, four carucates between the Esk and Duddon consisting of the townships of Kirksanton, Haverigg and Thwaites, the vill of Annaside,

---

<sup>667</sup> Moorman 1948

<sup>668</sup> Grainger and Collingwood 1929, 1-4

<sup>669</sup> Wilson 1915, 533

<sup>670</sup> Thorley 2004, 146

two bovates of land each in Lorton, Ellenborough and Harrington.<sup>671</sup> Their land included the vill of Seaton, where they held all the land other than the small area which went with Seaton Nunnery.<sup>672</sup> The nature of the monastic landholdings varied, and they held manors, vills, common rights, shares in common fields, or they were given land outright which they farmed either directly as granges, or they let to tenants. It has not been possible to map most of these landholdings, and the discrete areas of land granted either could not be identified, or were indistinguishable from secular landholdings. An attempt has been made to map the land farmed as granges. The sites of some granges were not identifiable, and there were other holdings which could not be reliably interpreted as granges. In some cases, granges were identified from place names on historic maps but have not been plotted because they could not definitely be said to have been monastic in origin. The term grange was also used for secular holdings to describe discrete demesne farms at a distance from the manorial caput. The monastic granges which have been mapped have an identifiable set of fields around the steading, but in character most do not appear any different on later maps than any other discrete farm holding.

In total, 134 granges have been identified (Figure 5.13; Tables 5.3 and 5.4).<sup>673</sup> Of these, it was possible, using later maps, to plot the extent of 127. Most of the granges belonged to the larger and more influential houses in Cumbria. The smaller houses and those outside Cumbria generally had fewer granges. Of the houses based in Cumbria, most had fewer than ten, including Armathwaite Nunnery and Wetheral Priory which had only one and two granges each, respectively. In Cumberland, St Bees Abbey held 17 granges and Holm Cultram Abbey had 19, but by far the largest number of identified granges was held by Furness Abbey in Lancashire, which had 46. Of those monastic institutions outside Cumbria, Cockersands Abbey had the most granges with four. Byland Abbey had three and St Leonard's Hospital in York had two. Fountains Abbey had a grange at Watendlath, whilst Whitby Abbey and Gisborough Priory held a single grange each at Crosby Ravensworth and Tallentire respectively.

Both the Knights Templar and the Knights Hospitaller had one mappable holding each in Cumbria. There is no evidence that either order had anything more than a grange, though it was possible that there was a preceptory at Temple Sowerby, where the

---

<sup>671</sup> Wilson 1915, 56, 69, 84-5

<sup>672</sup> Wilson 1915, 470-1

<sup>673</sup> See Table 5.4 for a full list of granges belonging to each monastic house

Knights Templar had first been granted the entire manor.<sup>674</sup> After the suppression of the order in 1312, the manor passed to the Knights Hospitaller in 1323, who held it until the dissolution.<sup>675</sup> Their holding would probably have been centred on Acorn Bank, which was the later manorial caput. As a discrete demesne farm, the holding was at least a grange. It is possible, however, that it was a preceptory or commandery, as these were operated in a similar way to secular manors, where the produce and revenues of their estates could be collected.<sup>676</sup> The land belonging to the Knights Templar at Tindale, however, was more likely to have been operated as a grange. Documentary evidence is scarce, but the confirmation of a grant to Lanercost Priory in around 1244 makes reference to a boundary between the land of the Temple and Lambertgarth.<sup>677</sup> The grange centre is likely to have been at Temple Garth, where a structure is marked on a map of 1603<sup>678</sup> and today a post medieval barn is surrounded by the earthwork remains of earlier occupation (Figures 5.14 and 5.15). In addition to these two identifiable holdings, the Knights Hospitaller also held the vill of Lindale as a member of the preceptory of Newland in Yorkshire. This was granted before 1191 when the Hospitallers granted out a moiety of their holding, and it seems highly likely that it was a pre-existing estate that predated the endowment of Cartmel Priory, which excluded Lindale.<sup>679</sup>

The grange for Armathwaite Nunnery was at Nunclose, and comprised their largest single holding; the rest of their land being scattered in small parcels in Ainstable, Kirkoswald, Cumwhitton, Blencarn, Kirkland, Glassonby, Crofton and Carlisle.<sup>680</sup> Nunclose was 216 acres, and by the end of the medieval period it had been split up into several tenements, indicating that the nuns moved from farming in demesne to renting to tenants. This led to the creation of the small settlement of Nunclose. The land appears to have been arable, and the enclosed strip fields were still clearly legible on the nineteenth century Ordnance Survey maps (Figure 5.16).

It is noticeable that most of the granges held by institutions from outside Cumbria were in Westmorland. Only three such granges were recorded in Cumberland, one belonging

---

<sup>674</sup> Nicolson and Burn 1777b, 381

<sup>675</sup> Curwen 1932, 152, 156

<sup>676</sup> Aston 2000, 93

<sup>677</sup> Todd 1991, volume 2 56

<sup>678</sup> CCA DHN/C713-007

<sup>679</sup> Farrer and Brownbill 1914, 269

<sup>680</sup> Wilson 1905

to the Knights Templar at Temple Garth in Tindale; a grange of Gisborough Priory at Tallentire and a grange of Hexham Priory at Priorsdale near Nenthead<sup>681</sup>.

Westmorland's monastic holdings, conversely, were largely held by monastic institutions from outside that county. This may be a reflection of the generally underdeveloped nature of the county or simply reflect the ecclesiastical allegiances of the secular grantors. St Mary's Abbey in York was one of the richest abbeys in the country<sup>682</sup> and was particularly well endowed with holdings in southern Westmorland in the early twelfth century, thanks largely to lavish grants at the end of the eleventh century from Ivo Talebois.<sup>683</sup> During the twelfth century for whatever reason St Mary's reduced its holdings and Cockersands Abbey seems to have filled the void. There was no connection between St Mary's, a Benedictine abbey, and Cockersands, which was Premonstratensian.

#### *The Granges of Cockersands Abbey* (Figure 5.17)

Cockersands Abbey in north Lancashire was given many grants of land in Westmorland. It held large areas along the county boundary between Lancashire and Westmorland, with a number of parcels of land in Preston Patrick, Farleton, Hutton Roof, Mansergh, Kirkby Lonsdale and Barbon.<sup>684</sup> It also had land in Whinfell<sup>685</sup>, a moiety of the manor of Sedgwick,<sup>686</sup> and land in Meathop 'next to their saltern'.<sup>687</sup> The abbey's four granges were all in south Westmorland, with three close to the county boundary between Westmorland and Lancashire. These were at Preston Patrick, Hutton Roof and Kirkby Lonsdale. The smallest was a tenement at Wind Yeat which they held in 1451.<sup>688</sup> This was under the fell and is likely to have originated as an assart or ridding. Some of the other land grants to the Abbey in this area suggest that they were involved in a considerable degree of taking in and breaking ground for new settlement. The fourth grange was further north, at the southern end of the Tebay Gorge which bisected the fells that separated the Barony of Kendale from the Barony of Appleby.

---

<sup>681</sup> Raine 1865, 20-1; Jessop and Whitfield 2010, 6; this was not definable as a holding

<sup>682</sup> York Museums Trust n.d.

<sup>683</sup> Farrer 1923, 377

<sup>684</sup> Farrer 1924, 293, 306-7, 358, 366-7, 370, 377

<sup>685</sup> Farrer 1923, 222

<sup>686</sup> Farrer 1924, 177

<sup>687</sup> Farrer 1924, 250

<sup>688</sup> Farrer 1924, 349

The first grant at Preston Patrick to Cockersands Abbey was made sometime between 1184 and 1190 by Hutred, son of Osof. This land was associated with Oskill's Head and its boundaries are described as,

*'lying next the great brook which is the boundary between the two Prestons, below the highway which leads to Wathsuthenan, ascending that way to the head of the great tillage which crosses the tillage of Hoscal-hofeh, as the peat-moss meets the hard land in going round to the spring below Hoscal-houet, and by the syke of the spring to the said great brook'.*<sup>689</sup>

The great brook is the Peasey Beck which is the parish boundary between Preston Patrick and Preston Richard (the two Prestons). 'Wathsuthenan' is Wath Sutton, and 'Hoscal-hofeh' is the small drumlin hill known as Oskill's Head. The landscape is now much altered by the building of the Lancaster Canal, the M6 motorway and the A590 Kendal bypass. The boundaries of this grant can be followed, however, with some confidence for most of its circumference. The highway to Wath Sutton, which formed the eastern boundary, still survives, as does the line of the Peasey Beck, and the long field boundary at the base of the drumlin would have followed the line where the peat-moss met the hard land. It is only on the north-east side, where the canal was later built, where the location of the spring and the syke has gone.

It would have included the settlement that became known as Milton and Preston Richard mill, and thus it almost certainly operated as a grange for Cockersands Abbey. It also lay next to a larger block of land on which Cockersands Abbey established the short-lived Preston Patrick Abbey.<sup>690</sup> The neighbouring grants appear to have been made around the same time, although by two separate individuals in separate parishes. Whether the grange in Preston Richard was intended initially to support the hospital at Preston Patrick is difficult to say, but it continued in the hands of Cockersands Abbey after the establishment of the new house at Preston Patrick, and after that house was transferred to Shap. A similar situation may have existed nearby on the parish boundaries between Hutton Roof, Lupton and Kirkby Lonsdale. There, the leper house of St Leonards at Great Spittal may have been supported by a grange identifiable at neighbouring Tearnside.

---

<sup>689</sup> Farrer 1924, 202

<sup>690</sup> See above section on Shap Abbey

***The Grange of St Peter and St Hilda of Whitby in Crosby Ravensworth*** (Figure 5.18)

Sometime before 1153, a grant of two carucates of land (nominally 120 acres or 48.5ha)<sup>691</sup> and the church of Crosby Ravensworth was given to the church of St Peter and St Hilda in Whitby.<sup>692</sup> The site of the grange was Crosby Ravensworth Hall, a moated site now occupied by a mid-sixteenth century house. The hall is likely to be on the site of the grange farm as it lies immediately adjacent to the church which formed part of the grant. Although the bounds are not given, the 2 carucates of land can be defined as the land block bounded on the east by the road from the village to Maulds Meaburn, with the hall and the church next to the road, a continuous field boundary with Crake Trees to the north, Harberwain to the west, and the lane from Crosby Ravensworth to Haberwain to the south. This encloses an area of just over 140 acres, or 57 ha, but omitting a small block of enclosures which may have belonged to Harberwain, the area covers about 120 acres which would equate to the grant of two carucates of land. Within this area is a sub-circular enclosure of about 16 acres or 6.5ha, clearly marked on the Ordnance Survey first edition map and still discernible on modern maps despite some boundary loss. This was interpreted in 1936 by the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments, England, as a possible deer park, of medieval or later date.<sup>693</sup> The small size of the enclosure, however, would suggest that it was more likely a deer hay. Yet as the enclosure lies within an area of cultivatable land a better explanation is that it was a stock enclosure or large pinfold related to the workings of the grange. Where walls have been lost, they survive as earthworks marking the extent of this enclosure, within it there are indications of former boundaries, which may have formed subdivisions.

***The Granges of St Leonard's Hospital in York and of Byland Abbey*** (Figure 5.19)

The sub-circular enclosure at Crosby Ravensworth Hall Grange can be compared to the enclosures associated with the nearby grange of Gaythorn, in the parish of Asby. This was one of two granges in Cumbria granted to St Leonard's Hospital in York, the other being the small grange of Blasterfield in Crosby Ravensworth, sited on the margins of the cultivatable lands with the open limestone grasslands at the head of the River Lyvennet. Although this grange is much larger, it has a series of smaller enclosures next

---

<sup>691</sup> In practice the carucate could vary in size greatly, dependent on local custom and the quality of the soil. Crosby Ravensworth is within some of Cumbria's better agricultural land, and so a carucate here may have been close to 120 acres

<sup>692</sup> Curwen 1932, 312

<sup>693</sup> Pastscape 2007, list number 13397

to the hall of the grange which are similar to that seen at Crosby Ravensworth. On the Ordnance Survey 1<sup>st</sup> edition map, sheepfolds are marked within these enclosures and folds or stock enclosures would seem to be the likeliest interpretation, particularly as the grange was sited next to the unenclosed moors, known as Gaythorn Plain, which would have provided extensive summer grazing. The bounds for Gaythorn are given in a grant of 1239, from Ivo de Veteripont to the Hospital of St Leonard's in York, and clearly include an extensive area of unenclosed moorland:

*'from the older mill pond of Garethorn to the Ghil next the ploughland as far as the great dyke, and then across the way which comes from Kendal, up to the great stone, and then to the end of the four stones; thence descending to the lower head of Windcoteghil and thence to Rudekeldsike....'*<sup>694</sup>

The use of stone markers indicates that the bounds crossed unenclosed land, and the 'great stone' is almost certainly the Thunder Stone on Great Asby Scar, and the 'four stones' were still marked as stone piles on the Ordnance Survey 1<sup>st</sup> edition map. Although the grange in Crosby Ravensworth was sited in the heart of the village, next to the church, its enclosed lands ran up the hill to the west, alongside the road to Harberwain and would have provided access to the unenclosed moors.

Byland Abbey also held a grange in the parish of Asby (Figure 5.19). The history of the granges in this parish is complex, as there are a number of places which are associated with putative grange sites. In the village of Great Asby, Asby Hall has traditionally been considered to be a grange,<sup>695</sup> but there is no definite association with Byland Abbey, nor any evidence of a grant to any monastic foundation, and it may have been a seigniorial grange of the manorial lords, the Musgraves. Similarly, there is no evidence that Grange Hall had monastic associations.<sup>696</sup> Thus, it is most likely that the Byland Abbey grange was at Asby Grange, which sits under the fell known as Asby Scar. The bounds are given in the grant of 1160-70 but are difficult to follow as many of the landmarks were ephemeral features such as trees and small stone cairns. It clearly covered a large area of open fell, however, including the area now known as Grange Scar as far south as Sunbiggin Tarn.<sup>697</sup> The Byland Abbey grange at Bleatarn, in the neighbouring parish of Musgrave was also sited on the boundary between the fell and the cultivatable lands.

---

<sup>694</sup> Curwen 1932, 315

<sup>695</sup> Curwen 1926, 87

<sup>696</sup> Curwen 1926, 87

<sup>697</sup> Curwen 1926, 89



From the description given of a dispute over common of pasture between the Abbey and Peter Musgrave and his tenants in the thirteenth century,<sup>698</sup> it appears that the monks had the common pastures above their grange up to the parish boundary, from Hemmel Hill westwards. This included an area still called Abbey Park Hill on nineteenth century Ordnance Survey maps. This had an outgang next to the mill, providing access between the fell and the common arable fields of Bleatarn.

Byland Abbey's third grange was at Hardendale, in the modern civil parish of Shap Rural, and was first documented in 1235 (Figure 5.20).<sup>699</sup> Clearly assarted from the common waste, it lay in a gentle fold of the hills on the western side of the limestone escarpment above the settlement of Shap and the valley of the River Lowther. This was not a single farm with a discrete set of enclosures, however, as an analysis of its field systems and settlement pattern shows. Modern Hardendale is a hamlet with an apparently unplanned layout, with farms and cottages scattered around a central space, but this probably reflects some settlement shrinkage on the west side and the expansion of steadings to the east. The settlement does appear to have been planned within a rectangular compartment around a central lane.<sup>700</sup> Earthworks on the west side of the lane show that there were buildings on that side,<sup>701</sup> whilst the Hall, the likely main steading, lies to the east of the road. The regular nature of the main settlement block, along with some indications of back lanes, would indicate that Hardendale had been deliberately laid out as a small, but regular, settlement, with a main steading to the east and one or more steadings to the west. The fields on either side appear to have originated as closes for the individual steadings, while to the north there is evidence in later mapping of a common arable field. At the south end, there is a clear outgang leading onto the open limestone grasslands, known as Hardendale Nab. Animals would have been brought down off the fell, through the settlement to a small field at the north end of the settlement compartment, which was probably a green where animals were folded and managed before being let out onto the commonfield to graze after the harvest. A grange centre of this scale and plan, assarted from the common waste, showing clear organisation and planning, with elements of stock management and small-scale arable cultivation, suggests that it was run as either a vaccary or bercary

---

<sup>698</sup> Curwen 1932, 179

<sup>699</sup> Roberts 1993a, 139

<sup>700</sup> Roberts 1993a, 139

<sup>701</sup> National Heritage List n.d., scheduled monument 1016759

(sheep farm).<sup>702</sup> Given that the land was owned by Byland Abbey, which was known to have significant interests in sheep farming,<sup>703</sup> along with the location of the grange on limestone grasslands more suited to sheep, it is most likely that Hardendale was operated as a bercary. Its situation allowed it access to extensive grazing lands, but was close to the main route south through the Tebay Gorge to Kendal, Lancashire and the markets further south.

### ***The Granges of Shap Abbey***

The other granges in Westmorland were owned by Shap Abbey. There were only five of these, one being the original grant of land, at Preston Patrick, on which the first house was built in the 1190s.<sup>704</sup> This was a substantial block of land, stretching along the southern bank of the Peasey Beck, and included low-lying mosslands at Millness and Wath Sutton, between the Peasey Beck and the Farleton Beck in the south, to St Gregory's Hill in the north, which had been the site of the manor of Preston Patrick's deer park.<sup>705</sup> The site of the original monastery is lost, but presumably the succeeding grange would have occupied the same buildings. A sheltered location at the base of St Gregory's Hill, but above the mosslands around Millness would seem the most likely situation. This would put the site of the monastic buildings somewhere in the vicinity of the Lancaster Canal or the A65 road to Kendal. Shap Abbey also owned a grange on the edge of Milburn parish, which had its own small arable fields (Figure 5.21).

The other three granges were located within seven kilometres of the Abbey, at Reagill, Bampton and Sleddale (Figure 5.22). Sleddale Grange, in the Wetsleddale valley, probably represents the breaking-in of new ground in a side valley. It is first recorded in 1360,<sup>706</sup> but was clearly well-established at that time. Howe, a neighbouring farm, is recorded in 1235.<sup>707</sup> The granges at Bampton Grange and Reagill were much larger, indeed the Abbey owned the entire vill of both settlements,<sup>708</sup> within which their granges would have been run as demesne farms, in a similar way to any secular manorial demesne.

---

<sup>702</sup> Roberts 1993a

<sup>703</sup> Burton and Kerr 2011, 173,185

<sup>704</sup> Farrer 1924, 298

<sup>705</sup> See section on Preston Patrick Abbey, above

<sup>706</sup> Curwen 1932, 366

<sup>707</sup> Smith 1967b, 175

<sup>708</sup> Curwen 1932, 309

### ***The Granges of Carlisle Priory and Wetheral Priory***

Like some of the granges of Cockersands Abbey and Shap Abbey in Westmorland, so with the priories of Carlisle and Wetheral in Cumberland, there are indications that either monastic granges were being used to settle areas of waste, or newly enclosed and improved lands, already taken out of the waste, were being granted to the monasteries. One grange of Wetheral Priory lay within the township of Carleton, on the edge of the parish of St Cuthbert Without, and just outside to the western boundary of their core holdings in the valley of the River Eden. In 1292, this land was called Newlands.<sup>709</sup> The ‘new lands’ had clearly been assarted from a low ridge of unenclosed waste above the east bank of the River Petteril.

Much of Carlisle Priory’s land was held around the city itself and comprised entire villas.<sup>710</sup> Of these, the villas of Harraby, Linstock and Walby were all probably demesne farms and not tenanted estates and can be considered to have been granges. In the late eighteenth century, they were small settlements of one or two steadings,<sup>711</sup> though Harraby also had a corn mill.<sup>712</sup> One of Carlisle Priory’s furthest holdings was at Newbiggin, which was first documented in 1301.<sup>713</sup> This grange was in Ireby, in the low rolling hills to the north of the Lake District massif. Although it was in a well-settled and cultivated area generally, it was in one corner of the parish, and adjacent to Torpenhow Park in the next parish, suggesting that it had been assarted from more peripheral land on the edge of the settled and cultivated area. The name Newbiggin is interpreted as meaning ‘New Building’.<sup>714</sup>

### ***The Granges of Lanercost Priory***

The lands of Lanercost Priory were distinctive because they were generally concentrated in the Barony of Gilsland and along the Solway, as a result of endowments coming mostly from the de Vaux family and their vassals.<sup>715</sup> Amongst their holdings along the coast were salt pans and fishing rights, as well as land. It is quite likely that some of this coastal land was farmed as granges, but it could not be mapped

---

<sup>709</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 149

<sup>710</sup> Davey 1971, 284-6

<sup>711</sup> Donald 1774

<sup>712</sup> Summerson 1993, 694

<sup>713</sup> Wilson 1905

<sup>714</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 300

<sup>715</sup> Todd 1991, 61-2

definitively. The granges which could be mapped were all, apart from one, within Gilsland, and mostly close to the Priory's core holdings (Figure 5.23). All of these were on parish boundaries with direct or close access onto unenclosed grazing lands. This was true of most of the estates bestowed on the Priory, however, in general most of the land when granted was agriculturally marginal and uncultivated, apart from the vill of Walton to the north west of the Priory,<sup>716</sup> and Kirkhouse in Farlam which, as the name suggests, came to the Priory when the parish church was gifted to them.<sup>717</sup> The Priory had also been granted a large piece of waste in Midgeholme, between the Hartleyburn and Black Burn as well as pasture on Tindale side in order to establish a shieling.<sup>718</sup> This entire holding became a permanently occupied farm, and probably run as a grange. It was further from the Priory than the other Gilsland granges, situated in the valley of the Haining Burn against the county boundary with Northumberland. Although detached from the main core of land granted to the Priory, it was part of the initial land grant and was considered to be a principal estate, centred on a farm called 'Sumerslethes',<sup>719</sup> a name indicative of the holding's origins as summer grazing. This original name, also written as 'Sebineze', is documented up to 1823, but is now the farm known as Hill House.<sup>720</sup>

One of the few distant granges, beyond the Barony of Gilsland, was at Haresceugh, in Kirkoswald parish in the Eden Valley. This was a substantial grant of land high up the Raven Beck, immediately below the open fell of the Pennine edge. The land grant, which was made before 1183 and confirmed shortly thereafter, included all the common of pasture.<sup>721</sup> The modern settlement of Haresceugh is in a slightly different location to the grange, which was probably at the site known as Haresceugh Castle, which is said to have been demolished around 1830 (Figure 5.24).<sup>722</sup>

### ***The Granges of Calder Abbey***

The eight granges mapped for Calder Abbey are all within five kilometres of the abbey, with all but one being within the core land holding of the parish of St Bridget Beckermet (Figure 5.25). The only grange which lay outside this area was Brayshaw, in

---

<sup>716</sup> Todd 1991, 41

<sup>717</sup> Moorman 1948, 88

<sup>718</sup> Moorman 1948, 86

<sup>719</sup> Todd 1991, 34, 35

<sup>720</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 104

<sup>721</sup> Todd 1991, 2, 47-8

<sup>722</sup> Pastscape 2007, list number 13755

Haile parish, but bordering the Beckermeth parish boundary. It is difficult to determine a date for this grange, as it is not mentioned by name until 1535,<sup>723</sup> but it is probably the same as the land in Haile documented in 1392.<sup>724</sup> Two of the granges, Sella and Stephney,<sup>725</sup> were close to the Abbey precinct in the valley of the River Calder, and were in existence by the later thirteenth century.

The main concentration of granges was in a block of land along the east side of the River Calder, on the eastern edge of the abbey's original endowment land, on the parish boundary. This area was known as Hologate, though it is first documented as 'Flogate' in the earliest record of the possessions of Calder Abbey, in 1152-3. In 1243, the lord of Ponsonby confirmed the Abbot's right to pasture in Hologate within specified bounds which clearly referred to this part of the parish.<sup>726</sup> Although the area now comprises largely open fell, in 1246 it was said to lie in the Abbot of Calder's 'wood of Calderdale',<sup>727</sup> suggesting that the area was probably wood pasture. At this time, Conishead Priory also held land in Hologate, which they exchanged for other land in Ponsonby held by Calder Abbey, thus giving Calder Abbey the whole of the area known as Hologate. The extent of Hologate is not known definitively, but there are indications of its extent. The names Priorling, and High and Low Prior Scales<sup>728</sup> just to the north east of the Abbey precinct, suggest this was the area held by Conishead Priory, the 'scale' name indicating Conishead held it as a shieling. Calder Abbey presumably took over the existing shielings, merged the land with their Hologate holding and farmed this area directly as a series of granges, as all of Hologate was retained in demesne following consolidation.<sup>729</sup> Hologate appears to form a discrete block of land which has large ancient enclosures, though with indications that there was a later reorganisation and sub-division using a more planned layout.

Hologate was centred on a low fell now called Stords or Swainson's Knott, which rises to a height of 345m OD. Prior Scales lay to the south west of the fell, but to the north was a group of three granges called Thornholme, Moughton and Scalderskew (Figure 5.26). All three were recorded as holdings of Calder Abbey at the Dissolution, when

---

<sup>723</sup> Thorley 2004, 150

<sup>724</sup> Thorley 2004, 148

<sup>725</sup> Thorley 2004, 140, 144; Winchester 1987, 156-7

<sup>726</sup> Winchester 1987, 156

<sup>727</sup> Winchester 1987, 156

<sup>728</sup> First recorded in 1754, Armstrong *et al* 1950, 340

<sup>729</sup> Winchester 1987, 157

Moughton and Scalderskew were dairy farms.<sup>730</sup> Moughton no longer survives as a farm, but Winchester identified it as Mountain Pinfold on modern maps, as this was referred to as Moughton Pinfold in 1694.<sup>731</sup> All seem to have been single farms with a small enclosed steading and an attached larger enclosed pasture. There is no indication of arable fields, either shared or farmed in severalty, and the location of the granges at a relatively high altitude would have made cultivation very difficult. Although Winchester shows the whole of Stords as part of Thornholme Farm, the grouping of farms around it would suggest that this was a shared pasture. Given the 1246 reference to this area as being wooded, the ‘*skógr*’ element of Scalderskew derived from the Old Norse for ‘wood’,<sup>732</sup> and that Stords also derives from an Old Norse word, ‘*storð*’ meaning brushwood,<sup>733</sup> it seems likely that Swainson Knott was a common wood pasture. Prior Scales would also have accessed this pasture too, as there are indications of a small outgang leading from High Prior Scales along the road onto the lower slopes above the river. Adjacent to Thornholme, but on the west side of the River Calder, was another Calder grange, documented at the Dissolution as Symonkeld Grange, but now called Side.<sup>734</sup> This lay in a valley which ran up into the area of open fell, with Cold Fell to the west. It appears similar in form to the granges in Hologate, and is likely to also have operated as a cattle or dairy farm.

### ***The Granges of St Bees***

In contrast to Calder Abbey, St Bees had much wider holdings and 17 granges in their ownership were mapped (Figure 5.27). They all lay on the west coastal plain of Cumberland, the furthest being less than 30 kilometres from the Abbey. Like other monastic granges, many of those belonging to St Bees were located on the edge of the enclosed and cultivated areas suggesting that land grants were either of land which the monks could enclose and improve, or were on land which had been recently assarted from waste. Such grants also suggest that the land was of lesser value to the grantors. The grange in Tallentire was unusual, in that it appears to have been in the centre of the village. It was probably established with a bovate of land in the early thirteenth century. The bovate, here specified as being 14 acres and 10 perches, was spread around the

---

<sup>730</sup> Winchester 1987, 158

<sup>731</sup> Winchester 1987, 157

<sup>732</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 349

<sup>733</sup> Whaley 2006, 128

<sup>734</sup> Winchester 1987, 155

strips of the common arable field.<sup>735</sup> This was supplemented by other grants of individual tofts and crofts, as well as other acres of land in Tallentire.<sup>736</sup> Its location within the village, rather than being a discrete farm set apart within the township, is confirmed by one of the grants, which states that it was in the east of the vill, against the toft of the Prior of Gisbourne, Yorkshire.<sup>737</sup>

Most of the granges of St Bees were on the edge of the cultivated land and probably initially assarted from the common waste. Many of the grange names suggest recent enclosure and improvement. Some name elements reflect ground cover typical of uncultivated land, such as Ellerbeck (Alder Bank),<sup>738</sup> Low and High Lingbank (heather bank)<sup>739</sup> or Whins (gorse).<sup>740</sup> Others suggest marginal or new settlement, such as Stubsgill (originally Stubscals, this was the assart or stubbing with a shieling),<sup>741</sup> or Winder (the windy shieling).<sup>742</sup> Winder was on the parish boundary of Kelton and adjacent to unenclosed waste in Arlecdon parish. Adjacent to it was Salter, which at first glance appears to be in the midst of a well-settled and enclosed landscape. Most of the farms around it, however, are only documented from the early post medieval period. Thus Salter, which was granted to St Bees in the mid-twelfth century,<sup>743</sup> appears to have been a shieling (*ergh*) like Winder, with both later becoming permanent settlements. The process of conversion to permanent settlement seems to have been ongoing around the time of the grant, as another grant of the mid-twelfth century<sup>744</sup> gave the Abbey permission to enclose, dyke and farm the woods and pasture below the boundaries of Salter.

The Abbey's core holding was the parish of St Bees, which included Hensingham. The vill of Hensingham was granted to St Bees in the early thirteenth century, and later confirmed as two bovates of land.<sup>745</sup> It seems likely that this was a grange, as was

---

<sup>735</sup> Wilson 1915, 395-6

<sup>736</sup> Wilson 1915, 397-406

<sup>737</sup> Wilson 1915, 407

<sup>738</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 424

<sup>739</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 396

<sup>740</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 400

<sup>741</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 376

<sup>742</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 432

<sup>743</sup> Wilson 1915, 61

<sup>744</sup> Wilson 1915, 62

<sup>745</sup> Wilson 1915, 248-9, 534

Arrowthwaite to the west which, although not referred to explicitly as a grange, must have been run directly by the monks who were digging coal there to run salt pans.<sup>746</sup> The monks also had two bovates of land in Rottington, the neighbouring township on St Bees head.<sup>747</sup> The location of this land is not known, or given a name, but it may have been at Fleswick. This farm, which is marked on Donald's map of 1774, but which had gone by the nineteenth century, is in a typical location for a grange. It lay on the coast, at the base of St Bees Head, clearly assarted from a strip of unenclosed land, and may have had an ancillary role in providing the monastery with sea fish.

### *The Granges of Holm Cultram*

Like St Bees, Holm Cultram also had significantly more granges than the other Cumberland monastic houses. A total of 19 were mapped and, again like St Bees, these were concentrated along the coast of Cumberland (Figure 5.28).<sup>748</sup> Unlike most of the other monastic institutions in Cumbria, however, Holm Cultram's granges were more widely distributed. Just over half of the mapped granges were located around the core holding, on the 'island' of Holm Cultram, but others were scattered widely across the Barony of Copeland, in the Eden Valley, and in Inglewood, where the Abbey also had a vaccary.<sup>749</sup>

All the granges outside the core holding can be considered to have been established on marginal land, either on the edge of a parish, on unenclosed waste, or to have been assarted from waste. Two granges lay within the bounds of the Forest of Inglewood; land at Warnell, near Sebergham, was granted to the Abbey by the Rector of Caldbeck in 1232, and Bramery, on the county boundary between Cumberland and Westmorland, was granted to them around 1250.<sup>750</sup> Other granges, at Harras Park near Whitehaven, Hale near Kirkby Thore, Kelton in Lamplugh parish, and Grange Farm in Corney, were all situated on the edge of unenclosed waste and are likely to have originated as assarts. Bromfield, which lay just outside the Abbey's main holdings, was acquired around the end of the twelfth century.<sup>751</sup> The grange would have been taken in and improved from Bromfield Mire, to the north, as it lay on slightly higher ground, at a height of about

---

<sup>746</sup> Winchester 1987, 121

<sup>747</sup> Wilson 1915, 534

<sup>748</sup> Information on the granges of Holm Cultram has been taken from Grainger and Collingwood 1929, unless otherwise specified

<sup>749</sup> see Chapter 4

<sup>750</sup> Grainger and Collingwood 1929, 126

<sup>751</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 272



12m OD, within the moss. Holm Cultram also acquired a house and lands at Gilcruix, around 1240 from the rector of the parish, part of which was leased to Calder Abbey.<sup>752</sup> There is still a Grange Farm in Gilcruix, with a clearly definable set of fields on the eastern edge of the parish boundary next to an outgang leading onto the unenclosed moor (Figure 5.29).

Within the 'island' of Holm Cultram, the Abbey had seven granges by 1185. These were the Old Grange (Aldoth), de Ternis (Tarns), Mayburg (Mawbray), Skynburg (Skinburness), Raby, Sevehill and Arlosk (Newton Arlosh).<sup>753</sup> Wolsty was also probably the site of a grange. In 1348, it was described as a manor of Holm Cultram, when the Abbey was granted a licence to crenellate its house there.<sup>754</sup> The steading for Wolsty can also be mapped, the site of the original grange, known as Wolsty Castle, was later abandoned and survives only as an earthwork. It was surrounded by a wide, deep moat, with a curtain wall. It was ruinous by 1572 and demolished in the second half of the sixteenth century, but records show that with the curtain wall there was a tower, gatehouse, hall and courtyard ranges.<sup>755</sup> It has been described as a castle built to defend Holm Cultram,<sup>756</sup> but this seems most unlikely given its distance and the lack of any strategic relationship with the Abbey. As at many other similar farm and manor houses, defensive features such as stone towers and moats, were signs of status. Wolsty Castle was occupied by a family, the Chambers, one of whom was Abbot of Holm Cultram.<sup>757</sup> Defence of the Abbey's interests was always an important consideration, however, given Holm Cultram's position so close to the Scottish border. Increasing tensions from the thirteenth century led the Abbey to secure permission from Henry III to billet servants armed with bows on its granges,<sup>758</sup> and undoubtedly Wolsty Castle was a strong house for the Abbey. The extents of Calvo, Seville, Sandenhouse and Raby can still be discerned in the modern field patterns. It is more difficult to map the extent of the granges at Aldoth and Tarns, as there seems to have been considerable landscape

---

<sup>752</sup> Grainger and Collingwood 1929, 29-30

<sup>753</sup> Baxter 1914, 274-5

<sup>754</sup> Boynton 2003, 1345-1348, 194

<sup>755</sup> National Heritage List n.d., scheduled monument 1013508

<sup>756</sup> This was an antiquarian description put forward by Camden, but still regularly repeated in modern interpretations, including in the scheduling description

<sup>757</sup> The Chambers were tenants in the sixteenth century, and Robert Chambers was Abbot in the early part of that century; National Heritage List n.d., scheduled monument 1013508; Grainger and Collingwood 1929, 153

<sup>758</sup> Burton and Kerr 2011, 173

change, with land drainage and new farms in the late medieval and early post medieval period. The final two granges, Calvo and Sandenhouse, are known only from 1535.<sup>759</sup>

The site of the grange at Skinburness is not known. There is some evidence that the grange lay near the port of Skinburness, and this is supported by the licence which was granted for the establishment of a chapel here.<sup>760</sup> The grange itself was established by 1175,<sup>761</sup> and it may have been here that the Abbot intended to establish a port at the beginning of the fourteenth century. He was granted permission to establish a borough at Skinburness in 1301,<sup>762</sup> and the existing grange would have provided an existing settlement on which to base the new town. The town did not become established and it, along with the chapel, was abandoned in 1305 after a catastrophic episode of sea inundation. The chapel may have continued to be used at least for burials, however. Excavations in the nineteenth century uncovered a large number of burials, and the building must have still been standing in 1582, when it was leased with an acre of land.<sup>763</sup> On the south side of The Grune, the peninsula which runs eastward from Skinburness into Moricombe Bay, there are the partial remains of earthworks which suggest substantial wall foundations. These have been interpreted as the remains of the borough or the port,<sup>764</sup> but it is more likely that the earthworks are the remains of enclosures associated with the grange, as they bear no relation to burgage plots in form. The earthworks as they survive are more suggestive of rural settlement than of a planned borough, and they do not appear to bear any relation to port facilities. Perhaps the monks moved the grange to Silloth after land was lost to the sea. Skinburness is not documented as one of the granges in 1535, but there is one called ‘Selaythe’ or sea barn, which would later give its name to Silloth.<sup>765</sup> Clearly inundation continued to be a problem, as sea defences were built to protect low-lying agricultural land. Today, this survives as the Sea Dyke, a stone and earth bank which runs southward from Skinburness (Figure 5.30).<sup>766</sup>

---

<sup>759</sup> Baxter 1914, 275

<sup>760</sup> Pastscape 2007, list number 9623

<sup>761</sup> Baxter 1914, 274

<sup>762</sup> Pastscape 2007, list number 9637

<sup>763</sup> Grainger and Collingwood 1929, 163

<sup>764</sup> Pastscape 2007, list number 9637

<sup>765</sup> Grainger and Collingwood 1929, 162-72

<sup>766</sup> Pastscape 2007, list number 9624

Following the loss of the embryonic town at Skinburness, a charter was granted for the establishment of a borough at Newton Arlosh in 1305.<sup>767</sup> There was already a population living there in 1304, however, when the Abbey was granted permission to build a chapel there,<sup>768</sup> thus it can be considered that the grange, established by 1175, had been successful and had already provided the focus for a larger settlement.

Evidence from the modern plan form of Newton Arlosh suggests that it was fairly typical of a plan for a borough, with burgage plots laid out along the north side of the road and a back lane marking the end of the plots (Figure 5.31). Although there have been changes to the individual plots, each plot would probably have been around one rood, or quarter of an acre, a fairly standard measurement for a burgage plot.<sup>769</sup> The granting of borough status may have led to the founding of a wholly new settlement or less likely the replanning of an existing settlement based on the pre-existing grange.

A nucleated settlement also developed within the grange at Mawbray (Figure 5.32). Although the location of the grange farm is not known, it is likely that the village was laid out around it. It was clearly deliberately planned, elements of which can be seen in its layout. Both Mawbray and nearby Tarns seem to have ceased to be granges by the time of the Dissolution, which Baxter attributes to their distance from the Abbey and therefore their vulnerability to attack from the Scots.<sup>770</sup> This seems an unlikely explanation, however. Whilst Tarns clearly remained a single discrete farm, Mawbray was deliberately developed as a single row, nucleated settlement, laid out at right angles to the coast, with strip fields clearly planned behind the tofts at the same time. Consequently, it would appear the monastery moved away from direct demesne farming at Mawbray in favour of collecting the rents of tenants in a newly established vill.

### ***The Granges of Cartmel Priory and Conishead Priory***

Late medieval Lancashire-over-Sands was dominated by monastic land holdings. The two smaller institutions, Cartmel and Conishead priories, had only five granges between them in the district, though Conishead also had five granges in Cumberland and Westmorland (Figure 5.33). Given Conishead Priory's position on the Furness peninsula dominated by Furness Abbey, there was little room for it to develop granges close to its core holdings. The one grange within its core holding was a farm called

---

<sup>767</sup> Pastscape 2007, list number 9603

<sup>768</sup> Grainger and Collingwood 1929, 95

<sup>769</sup> White 2012, 127

<sup>770</sup> Baxter 1914, 277

Gascow granted to Conishead in 1275.<sup>771</sup> This farm lay on higher ground on the edge of the coastal marshes, but next to the commonfield of Ulverston. The Priory's only other grange in Lancashire-over-Sands was in High Furness, but outside their core holding, in Torver on the west side of Coniston Water. The lord of the manor granted the mill to the Priory, along with all of Hoathwaite, or Holthwaite.<sup>772</sup> This was an assart in a shallow valley on the edge of unenclosed waste next to Coniston Water. Three of the other granges in Cumberland and Westmorland; at Whitbeck north of Millom, at Baysbrown in the Langdale Valley, and Friar Biggins in Orton, Westmorland, were all on marginal land, taken in from the waste. Abbey Grange in the Lune Valley near Middleton, however, was a holding on more fertile agricultural valley-bottom land. The earliest dating evidence for surrounding farms in the valley bottom, however, is for the early post medieval period.<sup>773</sup> Abbey Grange, which dates from 1190,<sup>774</sup> thus may have been the first enclosure of meadow lands in the valley.

Cartmel genuinely seems to have had very few granges in Cumbria, and all lay within its core holdings (Figure 5.34). It did hold other land outside Cumbria, in modern Lancashire and Ireland, but most of its landed wealth came with the initial endowment from William Marshal.<sup>775</sup> The Priory seems to have farmed out most of its land, to customary tenants, at least by the beginning of the sixteenth century.<sup>776</sup> The directly farmed land appears to consist of three granges at Canon Winder, Frith Hall and Grange-over-Sands.

Canon Winder lies next to the coast. Its name distinguishes it from the neighbouring farm of Raven Winder, which was acquired by the Abbey before 1315.<sup>777</sup> The Winder element suggests that the original settlement was a shieling. The holding is not specified to be a grange, but its name may imply that it was retained as demesne by the Priory. Frith Hall, conversely, is recorded as a grange, although not until 1545-6 after the Dissolution, when it is referred to as such in a grant to Sir Thomas Holcroft.<sup>778</sup> Such a reference, made so soon after the Dissolution, indicates that it probably was a grange of

---

<sup>771</sup> Farrer and Brownbill 1914, 352

<sup>772</sup> Farrer and Brownbill 1914, 364

<sup>773</sup> Smith 1967a, 52-55

<sup>774</sup> Farrer 1924, 400

<sup>775</sup> Tait 1908, 143

<sup>776</sup> Farrer and Brownbill 1914, 268, 277-8

<sup>777</sup> Farrer and Brownbill 1914, 273

<sup>778</sup> Farrer and Brownbill 1914, 277

the Priory, though little else is known about it. It survives as a fragmentary ruin, the main upstanding feature being a gable end wall with a huge fireplace, indicating it was a building of some status (Figure 5.35).<sup>779</sup> It stood in a similar situation to Canon Winder on the coast, on slightly higher ground, surrounded by salt marsh. The lack of available land for cultivation, suggests that the Priory was running these granges as stock farms. The expanse of salt marsh around both farms would have provided good grazing for sheep, as they still do today.

The grange at Grange-over-Sands also stood on the coast of the Cartmel peninsula, below limestone fell. Its exact position cannot now be determined because of the subsequent growth of a late nineteenth century seaside resort.<sup>780</sup> This has probably removed any traces of earlier settlement, and makes it difficult to identify the morphology of the grange on nineteenth century Ordnance Survey maps. It was probably located on top of the small rise at the heart of the later town. This would have placed it at the north end of a relatively level area which could be brought into cultivation, and the nineteenth century Ordnance Survey maps show what appear to be an enclosed former common arable field nearby. This indicates that the grange may have developed as a small nucleated settlement. Stock rearing would probably have been an important function of this grange, as its coastal location would, have provided good grazing on the marshes, similar to the other putative granges. Indeed utilising the salt marshes seems to have been the *raison d'être* behind the development and location of Cartmel's granges, with the remainder of their fief being economically exploited by taking rents from customary tenants.

#### ***The Granges of Furness Abbey*** (Figure 5.36)

The house with by far the largest number of granges was Furness Abbey. Forty-five granges have been mapped for Furness, most of which were within its core holdings. Within that core, the granges were concentrated within High Furness, the area which they held as forest. All but two of the granges in High Furness can be considered to have been established on marginal agricultural land. Amongst their tenants' holdings in High Furness, the low fells and woods were used to graze the Abbey's cattle,<sup>781</sup> and the granges scattered throughout this area would almost certainly have been used as stock farms. The two granges which were on better agricultural land were Hawkshead Hall

---

<sup>779</sup> National Heritage List n.d., scheduled monument 1007098

<sup>780</sup> Farrer and Brownbill 1914, 254

<sup>781</sup> Powicke 1908, 121

and Waterside. Both were in the valley of the Black Beck, which feeds Esthwaite Water. Waterside was so-named because of its location at the top end of Esthwaite Water, and its land was probably mostly meadow, and like the granges which were more upland in character, it may have been part of a stock rearing economy being used to provide fodder in winter. Hawkshead Hall was not just a grange of the Abbey, it also acted as a manor house for the bailiwick of Hawkshead. Attached to the now demolished south wing of the hall is a gatehouse, the upper storey of which held the manor court.<sup>782</sup>

Outside of Furness, the Abbey held five granges: Abbot Hall in the Cartmel peninsula, Monk Foss and Ford House near Bootle in west Cumberland, Arnaby, near Millom in Cumberland, and Water Yeat south of Coniston Water, and adjacent to their holdings in Nibthwaite. All, apart from Ford House can be considered agriculturally marginal holdings.

In Low Furness, close to the Abbey, there were four granges which lay in the same valley as the Abbey itself, at Elliscales, Billingcote, New Park and Roose. Only New Park, which is first documented at the Dissolution,<sup>783</sup> appears to have been primarily for arable production, as the field pattern suggests enclosed strips. Roose, down at the southern tip of the Furness peninsula, is more likely to have been a sheep farm. It would have had good access to grazing not only on the salt marshes, but also on adjacent coastal moorland, and the meaning of the neighbouring settlement of Roosecote has been interpreted as the sheepcote belonging to Roose.<sup>784</sup> It may also have had some involvement with salt production as Salthouse, which was first recorded in 1247.<sup>785</sup>

Stock farming was predominant even in the monastic granges in Low Furness. North of the Abbey, was the grange of Elliscales, which seems to have been associated with a farm called Killerwick, a site now lost.<sup>786</sup> The '*scales*' element indicates the presence of a shieling here, and the '*wick*' of Killerwick is thought to derive from the Old English '*wic*' meaning dairy farm. The two granges on the west coast of the peninsula, Sandscale and Marsh Grange, would also have been stock farms, and place-name evidence suggests that Sandscale originated as summer grazing lands. There are

---

<sup>782</sup> Farrer and Brownbill 1914 378-9

<sup>783</sup> West 1805, 134-5

<sup>784</sup> Ekwall 1922, 202

<sup>785</sup> Ekwall 1922, 204

<sup>786</sup> Ekwall 1922, 205

extensive dunes at Sandscale, and sixteenth century surveys record it as a herdwick, or sheep farm.<sup>787</sup> Marsh Grange was well-named, and appears to have almost completely comprised salt marsh grazing. This had been granted to the Abbey in 1225 by Alexander de Kirkby Ireleth, and described as land near his grange of Dunnerholme called Steplangarthes.<sup>788</sup> Dunnerholme is a small rocky headland on the west coast of the peninsula, and the land for Marsh Grange appears to have comprised everything on the landward side of it (Figure 5.37).

The grange at Angerton, too, was operated as a stock farm by the Abbey. This had been granted to the monks by 1299.<sup>789</sup> It was almost certainly retained by the monks as demesne, and thus run as a grange, as it later became an extra parochial division of Kirkby Ireleth.<sup>790</sup> The Coucher Book of Furness Abbey records how the Moss was used to pasture the monks' cattle,<sup>791</sup> and this would have been run from the grange which was situated on a small rise between the moss and the estuary (Figure 5.38). It has been suggested that Angerton may have had earlier origins, from the derivation of its place-name.<sup>792</sup> The 'tūn' element may suggest a pre-Conquest settlement, but there are uncertainties as to the meaning of the first element 'anger', which could either derive from Old Norse, meaning a bay, or from the Old English word for pasture. Given the location of the farm on a rise of dry pasture land within the moss, the latter derivation and an early origin both seem likely. The core steading around the higher land covered about 14 ha. Although most of the moss remained unenclosed and unimproved, more land was taken in along the coast around the fringes of the moss, including an area named 'Moss Meadow' on nineteenth century Ordnance Survey maps. This land had been taken in by 1586. A 1649 a survey of the former property of Furness Abbey recorded the holding of pasture and turbary as 124 acres, or around 50 ha, with a cottage,<sup>793</sup> which is approximately the area covered by the original steading and the subsequent coastal enclosures.

---

<sup>787</sup> Farrer and Brownbill 1914, 308

<sup>788</sup> West 1805, 98; grange here is used as a term for a secular demesne farm not part of the core demesne holding

<sup>789</sup> Atkinson 1888, 329-32

<sup>790</sup> Farrer and Brownbill 1914, 409

<sup>791</sup> Powicke 1908, 121

<sup>792</sup> Ekwall 1922, 221-2

<sup>793</sup> LRO DDCa/10/98

### *Cumbria's Granges*

Granges represent only a small part of the land holdings of the medieval monastic institutions. They are, however, a recognisable and mappable feature. They are an expression of the significant influence that monasticism had on the landscape. Granges in Cumbria appear to have had a clear role in the colonisation of agriculturally marginal areas, both in mosslands and in uplands. They increased the productivity of these areas through specialist stock-rearing; they converted seasonal settlements into permanent farms and in some instances encouraged the development of nucleated settlements and even towns.

The granges tended to be distributed around edges of cultivated and improved land, and the many instances of place-names with elements such as 'thwaite' attest to the process of clearing and assarting. This was not a process peculiar to Cumbria, with its extensive uplands, but was common to the monastic orders throughout Britain. Marginal land allowed the monasteries an opportunity to acquire property unencumbered with existing tenants and rights.<sup>794</sup> In other areas of the north, Cistercians in particular are considered to have favoured areas of waste with a peasantry not already tied into an existing tenurial system.<sup>795</sup> Cartmel Priory appears to have made a deliberate choice to establish directly farmed granges only in places away from the core cultivatable zones in order to specialise in salt marsh sheep rearing. For the secular lords giving the land endowments, grants of more marginal land allowed the local economy to be stimulated, through land improvement and greater commercial activity, at no risk to the grantor. This improvement and intensification of land use was also part of a general pattern of colonisation in Cumbria in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, when charters record specific clauses allowing the grantees to assart and cultivate new land.<sup>796</sup> It is difficult to distinguish between those granges established on waste and those which were established on existing assarts, already cleared and cultivated. In some cases, there is evidence that the settlement was already established as, for example, Furness Abbey's grange at Angerton or Conishead Priory's grange of Gascow.<sup>797</sup> What cannot be determined is what happened to the original occupants of these farms. Although there are examples of the Cistercians, for example, forcibly expelling the local population,

---

<sup>794</sup> Aston 2000, 134

<sup>795</sup> Wilson 2013, 45

<sup>796</sup> Winchester 1987, 39, 56 (n7)

<sup>797</sup> Ekwall 1922, 221-2; Farrer and Brownbill 1914, 352



this does not appear to have been the normal course.<sup>798</sup> In many cases they would have been kept on and paid to work alongside the lay brothers.<sup>799</sup>

Most of the granges were worked as stock farms, for either sheep or cattle. Large-scale sheep farming is usually associated with the Cistercians, but it was a widespread form of commercial farming, undertaken by other monastic orders as secular estates.<sup>800</sup> Certainly some of the granges in Cumbria can be specifically associated with sheep farms, in particular the grange at Hardendale, owned by Byland Abbey, which seems to have been established as a bercary. Both Holm Cultram and Furness Abbey were also granted land which allowed them to establish vaccaries within the forests.<sup>801</sup>

The advantage of having granges in peripheral locations was that it allowed easy access onto the unenclosed summer grazing lands. In the case of the grange of Grassoms, which belonged to St Bees, this was an enclosed upland farm established in the middle of Bootle Fell, remote from any lowland settlement and at some distance from the Priory.<sup>802</sup> The remoteness of its location almost certainly accounts for its later abandonment, but there are the remains of two steadings, one perhaps with indications of cultivation.<sup>803</sup>

Granges at great distance from the abbey or priory were unusual for the Cumbrian-based institutions. Most were within, or close to the core holdings. The dairy and cattle farms of Calder Abbey, for example, were concentrated in nearby Hologate, which formed a significant upland portion of their land. The restriction in the number and range of their holdings, however, had an impact on their wealth, and at the Dissolution the poverty of the monastery was evident.<sup>804</sup> Lanercost, too, was a poor institution, with most of its lands confined to the Barony of Gilsland, where the soils were generally poor, and the Priory suffered at the hands of the Scots.<sup>805</sup>

The granges of Cistercians monasteries were meant to be within a day's journey of the Abbey, so that lay brothers could return to celebrate liturgical offices on Sundays and

---

<sup>798</sup> Burton and Kerr 2011, 170

<sup>799</sup> Aston 2000, 134

<sup>800</sup> Aston 2000, 141

<sup>801</sup> See Chapter 5

<sup>802</sup> Wilson 1915, 365

<sup>803</sup> National Heritage List n.d. scheduled monument 1017065

<sup>804</sup> Thorley 2004, 149

<sup>805</sup> Todd 1991, 62, 172

feast days.<sup>806</sup> This is apparent even with the great Furness Abbey, which held most of its granges within its own lands, though its holdings were so extensive this amounted to a fief covering a large part of Lancashire-over-Sands. The Abbey of Holm Cultram had the most widespread granges, including properties in Westmorland and down the west coast of Cumberland, which were well beyond a day's travel. Even so, it still had a concentration of farms within its own core lands, within the 'island' of Holm Cultram. This could be seen to be typical of a Cistercian house, with the Abbey founded in a remote and peripheral location, in this case in the midst of expansive mosslands. Around the Abbey, on small islands of slightly higher ground, they established sheep farms in granges. There, they improved and drained enough land to support the farms with their own arable fields, and exploited the resources of the mosses, such as peat, as well as using them for grazing.

Monastic granges could take many forms, including specialist settlements; sea granges exploiting marine and salt marsh resources, bercaries and vaccaries. Often they formed definable, discrete estate blocks that can be identified on later maps. Their recognisable form in the landscape, and the sometimes excellent documentation relating to their origins and boundaries, allowed them to be a mappable enhancement of the baseline map data.. In general the monastic granges were an engine for land-use intensification, land improvement, settlement and economic growth. They seeded dispersed, discrete settlements across the landscape and in some instances led to the development of nucleated settlements as at Mawbray and Nunclose. Occasionally as at Skinburness, Newton Arlosh and Hawkshead they were instrumental in the development of markets and towns. They helped to colonise marginal lands, extending cultivation and enclosure whilst driving the edge of the open waste further away from the settlement cores. This process has been noted elsewhere, in other marginal, upland areas, as in the development of Staintondale and Westerdale, in the North Yorkshire Moors.<sup>807</sup> Monastic granges undoubtedly influenced the landscape character of Cumbria, especially so in some areas as around Hawkshead, Silloth and Kirkby Lonsdale, where they promoted the enclosure and improvement of new land.

It is possible that the level of documentary evidence for monastic settlement over-emphasises its relative importance in relation to secular granges and assarts as mechanisms for extending settlement. Unfortunately, the documentary support for

---

<sup>806</sup> Burton and Kerr 2011, 168

<sup>807</sup> Both granges of military orders; Harrison 2000, 312-313; Wilson 2013, 56

secular 'colonisation' is less readily accessible than that for monasteries. The next chapter, however, attempts to redress the balance by examining the overall pattern of settlement and fields which were mapped for the late medieval period. It puts the evidence from all relevant sources together and produces character areas which allow patterns to be compared and contrasted. The character areas also provide a framework in which the relative influence of secular and religious lordship on the landscape can be assessed.

## Chapter 6. Settlement and field pattern in late medieval Cumbria

*‘Albeyt the countrey most in wast grounds and ys very cold hard and barren for the winter, yet ys very populous and bredyth tall men and hard of nature, whose habitaciouns are most in the valleys and dales where evry man hath a small porcion of ground; which, albeit the soyle be hard of nature, yet by continuall travel ys made fertile to there great relief and comfort. ... They have but little tillage, by reason whereof they lyve hardly and at ease, which makyth them tall of personage and hable to endure hardness when necessaryte requyryth’.*<sup>808</sup>

### Introduction

This view from a survey of 1570 of the Earl of Northumberland’s Cumberland estates gives an impression of a tough landscape in which it was difficult to make a comfortable living. It suggests scattered dwellings in the valleys, surrounded by small parcels of severalty ground. The description is not reflective of the whole of the old county, as the surveyors were writing about the former Forests of Copeland and Allerdale, which predominantly comprised the uplands of the western Lake District fells.<sup>809</sup> To what extent agriculture was so challenging in the rest of Cumberland cannot be gauged from this statement. Equally, the emphasis on the stature and hardness of the inhabitants suggests the description, even of its specific area, is not a highly rigorous analysis. Writing over 150 years later, however, Daniel Defoe provided a similar view of Westmorland’s landscape when he wrote,

*‘A country eminent only for being the wildest, most barren and frightful of any that I have passed over in England, or even in Wales it self; the west side, which borders on Cumberland, is indeed bounded by a chain of almost unpassable mountains, which, in the language of the country, are called Fells’.*<sup>810</sup>

Yet Defoe also wrote about the prosperous market towns, and the *‘pleasant, rich and fruitful’* north of Westmorland. In both Westmorland and Cumberland, he noted that there were many marks of antiquity surviving, as, *‘there are not so many people, or so many buildings, or alterations or enclosing and plantings, as in other places’*. He had little to say about rural Cumberland, other than to comment on the copper and black lead mines and to remark on it being *‘a country full of castles’*. In comparison to much

---

<sup>808</sup> Crown Survey of the Earl of Northumberland’s Estates in Cumberland, 1570, reprinted in Winchester 1987, 1

<sup>809</sup> Winchester 1978, 121

<sup>810</sup> Daniel Defoe 1724-6,

of England, Cumbria is generally considered to have been an under-populated and economically less developed area in the early post-medieval period, a situation that is considered reflective of its later medieval circumstances.<sup>811</sup>

The extensive areas of unenclosed fell and moorland were the overwhelming feature of Cumbria's landscape until the large-scale, systematic enclosures of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The open Lake District fells and the Pennine hills still strongly characterise the region, and in the medieval period they would have formed a formidable obstacle to travellers through Cumbria. The fells, moors and mossland expanses of Westmorland made the journey north from Lancashire a dangerous one, and from the medieval period up to the advent of turnpike roads in the eighteenth century, it was deemed safer and more direct to access the Furness and Cartmel peninsulas via the low-tide routes across Morecambe Bay. These were risky because of quick sands and the rapid ingress of the sea once the tide had turned.

Parts of Cumbria, clearly, were viewed as wild and challenging by eighteenth-century contemporaries, a view supported by the extent of unenclosed waste which was mapped in this study for the late eighteenth century. Yet these observers recognised the diversity of the landscape and that some areas were agriculturally productive. In 1764, the northern part of Westmorland was described as, '*an open champaign country, twenty miles long and fourteen broad, consisting of arable land, and producing great plenty of corn and grass*'.<sup>812</sup> The term '*champaigne*' or champion was widely used by early topographers.<sup>813</sup> It was particularly applied to England's Midland counties to describe areas dominated by nucleated settlement and strip farming in common open fields.<sup>814</sup> It is an area which corresponds very closely with Rackham's 'planned' as opposed to 'ancient' countryside.<sup>815</sup> Many nucleated settlements appear to be highly planned, and nowhere is this more true than in parts of the north of England, including Northumberland, Durham, North Yorkshire,<sup>816</sup> the Eden Valley and to a lesser extent the Solway Plain.<sup>817</sup> This view, of the Westmorland part of the upper Eden Valley as champion countryside, is reflected in the mapped evidence for this study which

---

<sup>811</sup> Winchester 2000

<sup>812</sup> Dodsley and Dodsley 1764, 318

<sup>813</sup> Williamson *et al* 2013, 3

<sup>814</sup> Williamson 2004, 89

<sup>815</sup> Rackham 1976, 17

<sup>816</sup> Taylor 1983, 133-4

<sup>817</sup> Roberts 2008, 91-99

indicates nucleated settlements with extensive common arable fields present in the late medieval period. This pattern was also picked up by Roberts and Wrathmell in their atlas of rural settlement, where the Eden Valley was identified as part of an outlier of their Central Province.<sup>818</sup> This chapter will analyse to what extent these views of the study area are reflected in the mapped evidence. In particular, it will examine the mappable evidence for late medieval settlement pattern and field systems.

The correlation of settlement types with types of field pattern has long been recognised, with the coincidence of planned nucleated settlements and regularly laid-out strip fields being well known.<sup>819</sup> Small irregular enclosures clustered within a definable area around a discrete farm, are also a noticeable feature of the eighteenth century landscape which appear to have origins in the medieval period. The recognition of these pattern correlations lies at the heart of the historic characterisation process. Landscape difference and diversity across Cumbria is clearly recognisable on this basis in both the eighteenth century and medieval landscape.

The medieval settlement pattern, and its associated field systems, was mapped using data taken from published secondary sources, sixteenth and seventeenth century manuscript maps, place-name evidence and information on common arable fields taken from interpreted layers of the HLC project for Cumbria.<sup>820</sup> By the nature of the sources used to gather data on the medieval landscape, this is inevitably incomplete and partial. Some areas, such as Gilsland, have more accurate coverage than others.<sup>821</sup> The mapping of the medieval landscape is not intended to provide a definitive view of Cumbria in this period, but to record a view of landscape character. Nor does it show the medieval landscape at any precise moment. It is a composite of later medieval features and attributes and cannot be used as a point in time description of the medieval landscape. Rather, it is a view of the late medieval landscape over a period of around 300 years.

Within this period, some settlements were founded, grew, shrank or even disappeared ([Figures 6.1 and 6.2](#)). Land was taken in and enclosed on a piecemeal basis, but there were also examples of settlements disappearing and their land being distributed amongst other tenements, or even being abandoned.<sup>822</sup> There are a number of archaeological sites within Cumbria which are interpreted as the earthworks of abandoned medieval crofts

---

<sup>818</sup> Roberts and Wrathmell 2002, 128-9

<sup>819</sup> Taylor 1975, 109,123

<sup>820</sup> Newman and Hardie 2007; Cumbria County Council 2009

<sup>821</sup> CCA DHN/C713-001 to DHN/C713-013

<sup>822</sup> Winchester 1978, 215-7

and farmsteads, as at Wardhall and Ellergill.<sup>823</sup> Few of these have been excavated, however. Where there have been archaeological investigations, as at Newby in the Eden Valley, settlement has been shown to date to between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries before desertion.<sup>824</sup>

The mapping of the later medieval landscape provides a base on which further, more detailed work can be undertaken on individual settlement, townships or parishes. The late medieval landscape portrayed on this map shows only selected elements based on the limitations of the evidence available, consequently it is a map primarily depicting settlement pattern and its characteristics. Where possible, the holdings associated with individual farms and dwellings have been mapped, but this is based largely on an interpretation of modern and historic Ordnance Survey maps. Interpretive reliability is dependent on the legibility of landscape features of likely medieval origins, such as field patterns and boundary shapes on these later maps. Even where field patterns appear to preserve medieval holdings, these should be treated with caution as boundaries changed, and enclosures were added or removed within holdings.

The settlements were linked by a network of routes which also helped to define areas of enclosures. The fourteenth-century Gough Map shows only one north-south route through the region, linking Lancaster to Carlisle,<sup>825</sup> with two east-west roads running from Penrith and Kendal into Yorkshire.<sup>826</sup> Although not depicted on early county-scale maps, the towns of the region were linked by the King's highways. Because of the difficulties of travelling through an area with so many physical obstacles, they represented the concept of a right of way in the form of an easement, rather than being constrained by boundaries in the same way as a modern road, and many may have had established alternative routes where required.<sup>827</sup> Each settlement would also have been connected by local roads and tracks and, in the more sparsely populated areas, tracks linked communities to their manorial centres and parish churches or chapels of ease. The roads mapped for the eighteenth century landscape probably represent the main road network of the medieval period. Some alterations would have occurred where turnpike roads were established on new routes, and a few minor re-routes resulted from road deviations around landscape parks. The major road network however, as with the

---

<sup>823</sup> Webster and Newman 2007, 3-5

<sup>824</sup> Pers. comm. R. Newman

<sup>825</sup> Higham 1993, 28-32

<sup>826</sup> Newman and Hardie 2007, 140

<sup>827</sup> Hindle 1998, 51

settlement pattern they served, broadly reflected the situation established by the late medieval period. Where roads are shown on early maps, such as that of Bolton Wood<sup>828</sup> and a number of the Gilsland Survey maps,<sup>829</sup> they appear to vary little from the modern routes where they run through enclosed lands.

There has been no attempt to map the areas of unenclosed land for the medieval period, and the base data for the mapped medieval landscape remains the same as that for the eighteenth century. The process of taking in new land from the fell edge, the edge of moorland and mossland, or from woodland was piecemeal and continuous. That said, the decline in population, or at least a lack of growth, from the fourteenth to the mid-sixteenth centuries,<sup>830</sup> and a consequent diminishing of the pressures for settlement and enclosure expansion, must have slowed change at this time. In Cumbria, as nationally, it would appear that the medieval population reached its height in the mid-fourteenth century, and it is likely that this equates with the greatest extent of settlement in the medieval period.<sup>831</sup> Consequently, the extent of the unenclosed land in the late eighteenth century provides a baseline against which the mapping of the extent of medieval enclosed land can be compared. Even so, within specific localities, settlement would have ebbed and flowed for the next 300 years between the zenith of medieval population expansion and the general sustained population rise which began in the later seventeenth century.<sup>832</sup> The progress of the processes of settlement abandonment on the one hand and, on the other, fell-edge enclosure, intaking and colonisation, cannot be accurately defined across Cumbria. Within this chapter, illustrative vignettes mostly provide limited localised illumination of these processes, though an element of interpretative overview has been possible.

An illustration of the general processes of enclosure can be seen in Westmorland, which seems to have been a county dominated by unenclosed moorland and fell up to the end of the medieval period. Even taking into account an underestimate of the level of medieval settlement because of lack of definitive evidence, there was in Westmorland a larger increase in the number of settlements and the areas of new enclosure by the late eighteenth century, than was seen in the historic county of Cumberland and in Lancashire-over-Sands. In those two areas, the number of individual settlements

---

<sup>828</sup> TNA Ward/2/61/241/14

<sup>829</sup> CCA DHN/C713-008 and DHN/C713-008 for example

<sup>830</sup> Winchester 2006,40; Bouch and Jones 1961, 79-81

<sup>831</sup> Winchester 2006, 40

<sup>832</sup> Wrigley and Schofield 1981, appendix 3; Butlin 1982, 24



increased by just over 50% between 1600 and the late eighteenth century, in Westmorland, that figure was 59%. The extent of unenclosed land at the end of the medieval period in Westmorland covered somewhere between 55% and 77%.<sup>833</sup> The latter figure is the area of known unenclosed land plus the areas where no evidence for medieval settlement and enclosure has been identified and which are mapped as white space.

### **Settlement**

The data set for medieval settlement was refined from the data mapped for the late eighteenth century landscape. Using evidence derived from place-names, manuscript maps and secondary sources, a subset of the eighteenth century settlement data was selected, which were known to have been extant in 1600 or earlier, including settlements known to have been deserted by the late eighteenth century. This provided a total data set of 2,545 settlements of all kinds, including individual farms and cottages, small settlement clusters of between two and five dwellings, and larger nucleations of hamlets, villages or towns ([Figure 6.3](#)). As with the late eighteenth century settlement data, these were grouped into three categories: discrete settlements, small nucleations and nucleations.

An analysis of overall settlement density across Cumbria ([Figure 6.4](#)) does not show the densest numbers of settlement in the most productive agricultural areas, such as the Eden Valley and the Solway Plain. The areas with the greatest numbers of settlements were around the fringes of the Lake District fells particularly along the west coast, around Keswick and St Johns in the Vale to the north, and between Windermere and Kendal in the south. There were also concentrations of settlement in the Westward part of the Forest of Inglewood, in the valley of the River Irthing in the north, around Alston and in Stainmore. This does not take settlement size into account, however, so an analysis of settlement density was also run with weighted values according to type ([Figure 6.5](#)):

- Individual settlements were given a value of one, to represent single dwellings or holdings,
- Small nucleation were weighted at three, as these represent settlement of between two and five dwellings,
- Nucleations were weighted at 10, to represent larger hamlets and villages,

---

<sup>833</sup> See Chapter 3 for the calculated extent of the waste in the late eighteenth century

- Large nucleations were given a value of 20, to represent towns and significant population centres.

The weightings were in accordance with the attributes given to settlement of all periods, for consistency, apart from the value given to large nucleations. A weighting of 20 was given to 16 larger nucleations deemed to be important central places. All these places were defined as towns within the Cumbria Extensive Urban Survey.<sup>834</sup> The 16 places are:

Appleby  
 Brampton  
 Broughton-in-Furness  
 Carlisle  
 Cockermouth  
 Egremont  
 Kendal  
 Keswick  
 Kirkby Lonsdale  
 Kirkby Stephen  
 Kirkoswald  
 Market Brough  
 St Bees  
 Ulverston  
 Wigton  
 Workington

Formatted: Line spacing: single

Although this is a coarse tool, as it does not distinguish between the varying settlement size of towns, either in physical form or in population, it does provide some indication of the greater population density in these settlements, and of their effect on the surrounding landscape. In general, the resulting distribution shows similar densities of settlement, but it is far less pronounced than the unweighted distribution, and there is a more even spread of settlements over the whole of the region. There are some significant differences, however. As a result of weighting nucleated settlement, the general sparsity of settlement is more pronounced in Bewcastle and Nichol Forest, and the effect of discrete settlement in the Irthing Valley is lessened. The bias towards Stainmore as a centre of settlement density is also lessened, as it had an entirely dispersed settlement pattern. The distribution of nucleated settlements in the Lower Eden Valley, to Carlisle and west across the Solway Plain is more apparent, however. Westward remains a significant area of settlement. Other areas of greater settlement density remain, particularly around the Lake District fells and between Kendal and Crosthwaite. The effect on the settlement density patterns on the Eden Valley is more

<sup>834</sup> Information supplied by Cumbria County Council

subtle, with a more even pattern of settlement distribution, though with a slightly higher density in the Upper Eden Valley below Stainmore, where the polyfocal town of Church and Market Brough is given more significance. The baronial centre of Appleby-in-Westmorland, too, helps to shift the distribution density.

Looking at the distribution densities of each settlement type, it is clear that the unweighted settlement distribution is skewed by the pattern of dispersion, with high densities of individual dwellings on the west coast of Cumbria, in Westward, in St John in the Vale, to the east of Windermere, in Stainmore and, to a lesser extent, in the Irthing Valley. The intensity of the dispersed settlement pattern of Westward is a result of the piecemeal assarting on a scale which suggests that new settlement was actively encouraged by the manorial lords, probably to improve incomes. The main concentration of discrete farms and cottages was in the north-east corner of Westward, where place names also suggest that assarts were used as the main form of colonisation. Specific names such as Woodside are indicative of this form of settlement creation, as is the suffix 'thwaite' meaning clearing. 'Thwaite' names are especially prevalent in Inglewood for discrete farms and small hamlets. In Westward, Curthwaite and Woodside are first recorded in 1292,<sup>835</sup> while Moorthwaite is documented in 1332.<sup>836</sup> The expansion of medieval settlement is evidenced by the sub-division of both Curthwaite and Woodside into East and West, but it is not possible from the available map evidence to discern which the original assarts were. Apart from Greenrigg, which was established by the late thirteenth century, it is notable that all settlements with known pre-sixteenth century origins were located on the northern boundary of Westward. This suggests that the assarts were made by enclosing land from woodland on the edge of the Forest from the already settled lands to the north.

Given the likely decline in the local population and the consequent reduction in settlement pressure between the mid-fourteenth century and mid- sixteenth century,<sup>837</sup> it is highly likely that the growth in dispersed settlements had taken place by 1350. Elsewhere in England, medieval population pressure and settlement growth appear to be at their greatest during the thirteenth century, when many assarts are considered to have originated.<sup>838</sup> This may also be true in parts of Cumbria such as Inglewood Forest. Even

---

<sup>835</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 329, 331

<sup>836</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 335

<sup>837</sup> Dyer 1989, 46

<sup>838</sup> Dyer 1989, 54; White 2012, 40

so, many place-names in Inglewood, including those with ‘thwaite’ elements, are not recorded until the later part of the sixteenth century, though this may be an accident of documentary survival rather than of late colonisation. Brackenthwaite within the heart of Westward, for example, is not documented until 1578,<sup>839</sup> even though its name would indicate pre-sixteenth century origins.

### **Landscapes of Dispersion**

An examination of the pattern of dispersed settlement alone shows several areas with higher densities of scattered farms and small hamlets (Figure 6.6). The explanation for some of these densities can be explained in their tenurial histories. For example, the concentration of individual settlements in Stainmore reflects its status as a baronial forest which was exploited for cattle farming. The eleven vaccaries which are recorded in Stainmore left a legacy of scattered farmsteads in the valleys of the becks which flow into the upper reaches of the River Eden (Figure 6.7).<sup>840</sup> Although the available evidence for these settlements meant that they were mapped as individual farmsteads, they probably operated as small hamlets. Thus, this would still have been a landscape with a dispersed settlement pattern, but the mapping probably under-represents the density of population.

The Nent and South Tyne Valleys, too, were areas with a largely dispersed settlement pattern, though centred on the town of Alston (Figure 6.8). This was a result of the exploitation of the area for silver mining from the medieval period, where the tenants had protected rights to mine by the thirteenth century.<sup>841</sup> This encouraged the establishment of steadings along the valleys where the tenants could explore for silver. The environmentally challenging nature of the landscape of Alston Moor would also have encouraged a scattered settlement pattern, based largely on pastoralism. This is indicated strongly by the description of the manor of Alston at the death of its lord, Nicholas de Veteriponte in 1315 when it is described as consisting of,

*‘14 acres of arable and 100 acres of meadow ground; had 33 tenants at Garrigil, who held 33 shieldings and paid £5 18s yearly rent; 13 tenants at Ameshagh, who paid £3 8s 4d; 22 tenants at Nent and Corbygates, who had 22 shieldings, and paid £5 2s rent,*

---

<sup>839</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 331

<sup>840</sup> See Chapter 6

<sup>841</sup> Sopwith 1833, 19-20

*also one water corn mill, one fulling mill, and 3,000 acres of pasture on Alston Moor*.<sup>842</sup>

The extraordinarily small proportion of arable land held in demesne, the vast acreage of common pasture and the numerous shielings reveal a series of communities that operated agriculturally and economically in a very different way to neighbouring communities in the Eden valley just a few miles distant.

The landscape of north Cumbria, between Hadrian's Wall to the Scottish border, was dominated almost wholly by dispersed settlement, though the densest area was around the valley of the River Irthing between Brampton and the boundary with

Northumberland ([Figure 6.9](#)). The dispersed nature of settlement was at least in part caused by the district's limited agricultural productivity, with extensive unenclosed moorland. The uncertainty presented by the constant threat of border warfare would have been the greatest barrier to settlement development, however, particularly in the more remote parts of Bewcastle and Nichol Forest. The River Irthing would have provided more sheltered conditions which allowed the growth of a greater density of farmsteads and small hamlets, perhaps encouraged to by the land ownership of Lanercost Priory.<sup>843</sup>

Elsewhere, the Abbey at Holm Cultram, created a landscape with a densely dispersed settlement pattern though with some nucleated settlement ([Figure 6.10](#)). This was the result of the Abbey's policy of exploiting their core land holdings through a series of granges based on pastoral farming, though they also promoted the establishment of villages and even a town at Newton Arlosh. The influence of Furness Abbey can also be seen in the relatively dense dispersed pattern of settlement in both Low and High Furness ([Figure 6.11](#)), reflecting their extensive use of a system of granges to manage their pastoral farming system. This dispersed settlement pattern is not as clear cut as that for Lanercost, however, and probably reflects the better quality agricultural land available to Furness Abbey which led to a greater degree of nucleation.

The influence of the granges of the monastic houses of Calder and St Bees may be partly responsible for the high density of dispersed settlement on the west Cumbrian coastal plain ([Figure 6.12](#)) but other factors were probably of greater significance.

Winchester discusses settlement expansion in the thirteenth century in Copeland, and shows that there was an ongoing process of assarting, though this was not always

---

<sup>842</sup> Jessop and Whitfield 2010, 9

<sup>843</sup> Todd 1991, 34

manifested in new settlement but often in the expansion in the holdings of already existing settlement.<sup>844</sup> Nearly half of the dispersed farmsteads and small hamlets were also documented for the first time in the sixteenth century, mostly from the Percy Survey of 1578<sup>845</sup> and so may be late foundations. In many cases it is more likely that the first record is much later than the settlement's origins.

The late medieval dispersed settlement pattern can be mapped in some detail for the area between the villages of Gosforth and Nether Wasdale ([Figure 6.13](#)) as this area known as Bolton Wood, appears on a map of 1567 as part of the settlement of a boundary dispute ([Figure 6.14](#)).<sup>846</sup> The map itself may be older, as text on the reverse states that it had been '*Correctyd and maide perfytt*'. Indeed, there are clear annotations and additions to the map such as the holding called Dirt Hole (now known as Julian Holme). Many of the tenements have also been annotated with the names of the tenants and the manor to which they belonged. Even so, stylistically the map is unlikely to predate 1567 by many years. Some parts of the map are clearly schematic. An area to the south of the River Bleng is labelled '*The Rest of Santon Lordshyppe*', and shows what appears to be two rows of closely built houses. There is no map evidence to support the idea that there might have been any kind of nucleated village settlement here, however, and this may just be a map maker's convention to indicate the well settled area of Santon which lay outside the disputed area. The areas pertinent to the dispute are shown in more detail, with the names of individual tenants appended and seem reliably accurate. Many of the properties are identifiable with holdings still occupied today. The map is centred on an area known as Bolton Wood, even though there seems to be no surviving woodland in the mid-sixteenth century. Steadings are shown in a dispersed pattern around the edge of Bolton Wood, suggesting they originated as assarts. On the north side of Bolton Wood, a large area known as Thistleton had been cleared and enclosed, and was settled with a series of farms around its edge. The addition of Dirt Hole to this map, suggests that settlement expansion was still ongoing in the mid-sixteenth century.

A pattern of dispersed settlement can be observed elsewhere around the fringes of the Lake District fells. The densest pattern of dispersed settlement dispersion was in the lower parts of Lorton Vale, for example, around Derwent Water and St Johns in the

---

<sup>844</sup> Winchester 1978, 202-7

<sup>845</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950

<sup>846</sup> TNA Ward/2/61/241/14; Winchester 2003b, 84-5

Vale, around Ullswater, and in the area between Kendal and the Lake District fells. These areas were at the mouths of valleys leading in to the heart of the fells, generally in gently rolling landscapes lying between 100 and 200m OD. Settlement density may be related to ease of access to grazing rather than to agricultural land quality. Assessing the distribution of settlement against the modern agricultural land classification<sup>847</sup> reveals that most settlements were located on grade 4 agricultural land, which would have had very limited potential for cultivation but was suitable for pasture, and some were sited on very poor quality grade 5 land, suitable only for permanent pasture. The predominance of grade 4 and 5 agricultural land in these areas of dense dispersion suggests a mainly pastoral economy. Settlements on the edge of the Lake District fells had access to the extensive grazing of the unenclosed uplands. In the area of densely dispersed settlement north and west of Kendal locally accessible common grazing was provided by the unenclosed low fells.

### ***Stock Farming***

The patterns of grazing on the unenclosed commons were regulated through common rights managed through the manorial courts, or through agistment, which was a form of rental agreement between the manorial lords and their tenants.<sup>848</sup> Mapping such uses lies beyond the scope of this work, as they did not necessarily leave any physical expression in the landscape mappable at a county scale. Mappable archaeological evidence for exploitation of grazing in the uplands occurs as shielings. There is no reliable body of evidence for shielings, however, though some are recorded within the historic environment records and in the English Heritage Archive. Many of these are considered to be of national importance and have been designated as scheduled monuments.<sup>849</sup> In Cumbria, over 100 such sites have been recorded but this is a sizeable underestimate of surviving archaeological remains, and more possible shielings are being revealed through fieldwork.<sup>850</sup> There are issues, however, in assuming that all upland 'hut' sites were shielings, as they have been interpreted only from earthwork remains and few have been excavated. Where there are clusters of single-celled structures without any relationship to any surrounding enclosures, and lacking boundary

---

<sup>847</sup> MAGIC 3013

<sup>848</sup> Winchester 1987, 165

<sup>849</sup> Pastscape 2007

<sup>850</sup> Leech and Quartermaine 2012; Oxford Archaeology North 2003, 28, Oxford Archaeology North 2009, figures 8 and 9

garths, an interpretation as a shieling site seems most plausible.<sup>851</sup> The distribution of *shieling* and *scale* place names indicates they were found in both lowland and upland landscapes, but detailed examination of these sites suggests that the names indicative of shielings could be used in a variety of contexts not all related to seasonal settlement for upland pasture exploitation.<sup>852</sup>

### **Enclosures** ([Figure 6.15](#))

As might be expected, the distribution of enclosures of probable medieval origin coincides closely with areas of dense dispersed settlement. To an extent this is a reflection of the mapping methodology, as identifiable enclosed holdings were mapped for discrete farmsteads. In most cases, these were most easily identified where farmsteads were isolated and not part of a larger settlement nucleation. The establishment of new farms could often be identified by a continuous boundary surrounding the farm buildings and the associated enclosures. In some cases, however, the extent of the holdings was not always so clear, particularly where a process of accretion had taken place, with new enclosures added over time. Where this had occurred along the fell edge beyond the ring garth, enclosure additions were easier to identify. Where new enclosures were made from unenclosed land within the ring garth, however, this was much more difficult to recognise.

In areas where landscapes had undergone significant change at a later period, it was more difficult to map the land holdings of individual farms. This was the case, in particular, around Nichol Forest, where farms had been rationalised and, to some extent, reorganised in the post medieval period.<sup>853</sup> Where field boundaries, roads or streams hinted at the preservation of possible early blocks of land, an attempt was made to map the likely landholding areas for farms. This was not always possible however, particularly around the Solway Moss, where the bog burst of 1771 led to the loss of a number of farms and farm land.<sup>854</sup> Post medieval industrial activity, too, caused major landscape change in Low Furness and around Egremont, with significant boundary change and loss.

It was in the areas of more densely dispersed settlement where the enclosed medieval landscape appears to have remained most legible. In Westward, for example, in

---

<sup>851</sup> Ramm *et al* 1970, 2; Wrathmell and Young 2012, 263-4

<sup>852</sup> Winchester 2012

<sup>853</sup> Spence 1977

<sup>854</sup> Gilpin 1786, 135-7



Ennerdale, Matterdale, Nether Wasdale, around Millom and on the west Cumbria coastal plain, in High Furness and in the low fells between Kendal and Windermere. These areas have remained predominantly rural, with the spread of farms and enclosed land continuing in a piecemeal fashion in the post medieval period.

### **Landscapes of Nucleated Settlement**

The analysis of the map evidence indicates that in the medieval period nucleated settlement predominated along the north-west coast of Cumbria, along the Solway Plain and in the Eden Valley ([Figure 6.16](#)), a pattern also identified for the nineteenth century by Roberts and Wrathmell.<sup>855</sup> Furthermore, a concentration of nucleation was noted in the south of Low Furness and in the area of the lower Kent and Lune valleys. Finally, the Eamont and River Lowther Valleys were also significant areas of nucleations. Nucleated settlements were rare in the valleys of the Lake District, though there was less settlement in general. Some areas were notable for their complete absence of nucleated settlement: Nichol Forest and Bewcastle being the largest, but also to the north of Kendal, most of Westward, and most of the land between Ennerdale Water and the coast north of Egremont.

The most significant area for nucleated settlement was not the Eden Valley, even though it is often seen as the core area of planned, nucleated medieval villages in Cumbria.<sup>856</sup> Some of its settlements have been the subject of morphological study, and in the case of Melkinthorpe<sup>857</sup> and Maulds Meaburn,<sup>858</sup> some of the surviving earthworks surrounding the modern villages, have been scheduled as being of national importance. There is probably a greater density of nucleated settlement, mostly in the form of regular, one or two row villages and hamlets, along the Solway Plain, extending eastwards beyond Carlisle to the lower reaches of the Eden Valley, including within the Forest of Inglewood. These settlements, however, tend to be smaller than those of the Eden Valley and, for the most part, lack the extensive village greens.

On the coast of the Solway Firth a string of settlements follows the line of Hadrian's Wall, from Drumbrugh in the west to Kirkandrews in the east ([Figure 6.17](#)). The 'burgh' element, meaning fortified place, is seen also at Longburgh and, the largest village, Burgh by Sands, and indicates knowledge of the Roman forts at the time the

---

<sup>855</sup> Roberts and Wrathmell 2002, 5, fig.1.1

<sup>856</sup> Roberts 2008, chapter 3

<sup>857</sup> National Heritage List n.d., scheduled monument 32844

<sup>858</sup> National Heritage List n.d., scheduled monument 32822

settlements were established. The settlements take advantage of slight rises in the coastal lowlands, and most are on land over the 10m OD contour, apart from Easton, which lies at 7m OD. Drumburgh and Boustead Hill were sited on small islands of slightly higher land, whilst Longburgh lies at the north end of a low ridge. There is a second line of settlements on slightly higher land inland, with Fingland to the west and Little Orton to the east, whilst other villages lay along the river valleys of the Waver, the Wampool and the Caldew, creating a wide band of settlement dominated by nucleated settlements and common arable fields. Further south, the coastal plain around the Rivers Ellen and Derwent was also mainly nucleated settlements with sizeable arable fields. This entire swathe along the Solway Plain includes some of the better agricultural land, designated as grade 3.

#### *Common Arable Fields* (Figure 6.18)

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Where settlements had common arable fields, these were of varying size. The extent of the fields was initially taken from the HLC mapping, based on modern and nineteenth century Ordnance Survey maps. The HLC project tended to over-estimate the individual extent of common arable fields in many areas, and so the mapping was adjusted to take into account the information from earlier historic maps on enclosures and common waste. In addition, small scattered common fields, many of which had ceased to function before the eighteenth century, were usually unrecognised within the HLC process, as they did not leave a distinctive imprint on the later landscape. It is clear from historical research on the common land in Cumberland, that most settlements of more than a few houses would have operated some common arable.<sup>859</sup> From the mapped evidence, common arable fields in areas of dispersed settlement do seem to be associated with a least small hamlets rather than just associations of discrete farms. On the Solway Plain, the land available for cultivation was limited by the extensive mosslands, which provided the settlements with areas of common waste. Large areas remained open and unenclosed until the late eighteenth or early nineteenth centuries, though it is clear from a lack of evidence for planned systematic enclosure, that areas of former mossland were enclosed piecemeal from the medieval period onwards. The predominance of nucleated settlements with common arable fields extends in a band along the west coast to south of Workington. Within the Eden Valley, nucleated settlements and common arable fields are found throughout, but with a particularly high

---

<sup>859</sup> Dilley 1972, 21

density within the former county of Westmorland, and to the west of Penrith and the Lazonby Ridge.

One of the most extensive areas of common arable fields was to the west of Penrith, in the gentle, rolling countryside formed where the valleys of the rivers Petteril and Eamont run close to each other. This created a swathe of permanently cultivated land running from the foothills of the Lake District fells in the south to the southern parts of the Forest of Inglewood in the north. A similarly extensive area of common arable cultivation can be recognised in north Westmorland, below the foothills of the Pennines, where a number of small rivers fed the River Eden. Here the open, rolling countryside was dotted with nucleated settlements amongst open arable land farmed in common, which differed from the more mixed pattern of nucleations with discrete steadings scattered between which featured to the west of Penrith.

Outside of these areas, arable land was much more limited. Common arable fields of any size were found only in Kendale, on the southern boundary of Westmorland, and in the Cartmel and Low Furness peninsulas. In Kendale, nucleated settlement with associated common arable fields developed in the valley of the River Lune and on the gentle, open rolling landscape around the River Bela, inland from the mosses fringing Morecambe Bay. This area was characterised by small nucleations of a few farmsteads arranged in a single row as at Hale and Ackenthwaite. Both Cartmel Priory and Furness Abbey ensured the cultivation of all available land to support themselves and their tenants. On the Cartmel peninsula, the better quality agricultural land between the low fells and the coastal mosses was cultivated, and in Low Furness, a large swathe of higher grade farm land along the centre of the peninsula was suitable for permanent cultivation, both by the Abbey and its tenants, and by the tenants of the Manor of Aldingham. In conclusion, it is clear that areas where nucleated settlements and larger regular common arable fields predominated were, to an extent, determined by geomorphology, especially favouring gently rolling countryside in river valleys and at an altitude well below 200m OD.

Elsewhere in Cumbria, common arable fields were small, required to provide a subsistence level of cereal production only, within an economy dedicated to pastoralism and generally having a dispersed pattern of settlement. This was particularly true of the vaccary system of farming, for example at Wasdale Head and Gatesgarth, where the arable fields lay in the valley bottom, supplying the vaccary farms with cereal but also

providing somewhere to fold overwintering stock.<sup>860</sup> Some common fields, as at Matterdale, were known to have been held as meadow,<sup>861</sup> and it is likely that other valley bottom fields, particularly in the Lake District valleys, such as in Kentmere and Langdale, would also have been meadow when not cultivated. Other small common arable fields seem to have been interspersed amongst severalty enclosures, particularly where the settlement pattern was more dispersed. Many of these small areas of arable could not be recognised and mapped. They would have been enclosed piecemeal at an early date, and are indistinguishable on later mapping from the enclosures of individual farms. This can be seen at Westward, for example, where a sixteenth century survey lists common arable land belonging to separate hamlets,<sup>862</sup> but none of which retained sufficient character to be identified as former common arable within this study.

Even where common arable fields were more extensive, the process of enclosure appears to have been ongoing from the end of the medieval period. The few surviving common arable fields which were still operating in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries illustrate that the process of enclosure was long standing, but seems to have been particularly active in the earlier post medieval period.<sup>863</sup> The fragmentary late survival of remnant common arable strips in otherwise enclosed fields, was documented by the Rev. Graham<sup>864</sup> in the early twentieth century.

Former arable strips have been fossilised in the enclosure patterns of many former common fields. Their distinctive landscape character is still legible in the modern landscape, even after years of gradual consolidation and rationalisation. This holds true even in areas of considerable post medieval and modern landscape changes like Low Furness (Figure 6.19). In areas where the perception is of a more stable, less altered landscape, the process of enclosure of the common arable fields can be understood in some detail. At Newbiggin, Westmorland, close to the old county boundary with Cumberland, the former common arable fields are still clearly legible in the form of fossilised strip fields, although there has considerable boundary loss since the mapping of the Ordnance Survey 1<sup>st</sup> edition map of 1863 (Figure 6.20). The common arable field was probably enclosed by the end of the medieval period, as there is evidence of consolidation of holdings from the fifteenth century. In particular, a farm called

---

<sup>860</sup> See Chapter 4

<sup>861</sup> Gray 1915, 229

<sup>862</sup> Elliott 1959, 95-6

<sup>863</sup> See Chapter 3

<sup>864</sup> Graham 1908c; Graham 1910; Graham 1913

Moorland Head was established on the eastern edge of the commonfield, next to the boundary with the unenclosed common by 1548.<sup>865</sup> The enclosure map of 1850<sup>866</sup> shows that Moorland Head occupied a small consolidated block of land which was once clearly part of the former common arable field, as well as holding a number of enclosed strips scattered through the old common arable field.

Gradual enclosure, particularly in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, seems to have been usual in the common arable fields of Cumberland.<sup>867</sup> There is some evidence, however, that taking-in from the waste led to the expansion of at least temporary arable land in some areas.<sup>868</sup> In the estates of Holm Cultram, for example, the tenants took the Abbey's horse pasture, known as Colt Park, and divided it into strips, which were then managed as an outfield, being cultivated for three years and laid fallow in stinted pasture for six years.<sup>869</sup> An area of Colt Park was enclosed in 1814, as part of the parliamentary enclosure of the commons. It has been argued that arable land expanded by at least 1,700 acres in Cumberland in the sixteenth century, with the assumption that it was held in open fields,<sup>870</sup> but the late creation of new fields has been dismissed as unconvincing by others.<sup>871</sup> The process of piecemeal enclosure was clearly happening at a faster rate than any creation of new common field, so that by the time of the large-scale enclosures in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, little common arable survived.

### ***Infield Outfield System*** (Figure 6.21)

The infield-outfield system is an aspect of arable farming in Cumberland which has attracted some previous attention.<sup>872</sup> It is a variant of common arable farming. The system involved the arable land being divided into two divisions, both of which were farmed in common. The infield was usually cultivated each year, and was heavily manured by grazing animals after cropping. Thus, it is physically indistinguishable from any other form of permanent common arable field, and so has not been mapped separately from other types of common arable field. The outfields, however, were only

---

<sup>865</sup> Smith 1967b, 126

<sup>866</sup> TNA MAF 1/390

<sup>867</sup> Graham 1910; Graham 1913a; Dilley 1972, 23

<sup>868</sup> See below, section on infield-outfield

<sup>869</sup> Elliott 1959, 98-9

<sup>870</sup> Elliott 1959, 100-101

<sup>871</sup> Dilley 1972, 23

<sup>872</sup> Elliott 1959; Elliott 1960; Gray 1915, 232

cultivated for short periods of perhaps three or five years, and then left fallow for longer periods in between, as they tended to be situated on poorer soils.<sup>873</sup> These have been mapped separately, as they can often be distinguished, both by their location within the township and their physical attributes. As a result of the long periods of fallow, they do not always exhibit evidence for ridge and furrow, and were sometimes enclosed in long straight strips, particularly in areas below 10m OD, as along the Solway Coast. They are not always physically distinct from common arable fields, however, and most evidence for their existence was derived from documentary sources.

The infield-outfield system was a practice common in Scotland but was also found across northern England, including in Cumberland.<sup>874</sup> It has been assumed that the practice was widespread in Cumberland but, apart from a few examples, such as Aspatria where the outfield is described in eighteenth century documents,<sup>875</sup> the identification of outfields lacks certainty. Outfields are mentioned by name for some townships, and elsewhere their presence can be identified from more oblique references in documents, such as at Soulby where some land holdings were described sometimes as arable and sometimes as pasture, including Sourelands, a name suggesting less favourable soil.<sup>876</sup> In both Hayton and Ainstable in the Eden Valley, the name Faugh occurs as a settlement name. 'Faugh', meaning fallow,<sup>877</sup> is also used in Scotland for outfield land brought under occasional cultivation.

Outfields seem to have been a feature of some of the common arable land on the Solway Plain and along the west coast. Outfields were recorded at Mockerkin and Lowside Quarter<sup>878</sup> in the sixteenth century for example, and are still identifiable on modern maps, and at Dean, a set of enclosures are still labelled as 'outfield' on the nineteenth century Ordnance Survey maps. Greysouthen, near Dean, is referred to as having infields in 1578.<sup>879</sup> It is possible that the term 'infield' was applied to cultivatable land in contrast to waste, but in the south of the township there is an individual dwelling and mill called Oldfield in the post medieval period,<sup>880</sup> which may indicate the presence of a

---

<sup>873</sup> Elliott 1959, 92-3

<sup>874</sup> Gray 1915, 158-9

<sup>875</sup> Elliott 1960

<sup>876</sup> Gray 1915, 232

<sup>877</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 89

<sup>878</sup> Elliott 1959, 94; Winchester 1978, appendix B, map 8

<sup>879</sup> Winchester 1978, 182

<sup>880</sup> Donald 1774

former outfield. The enclosures in this part of the township are irregular, but they do not suggest the enclosed strip fields of regularly ploughed common arable fields.

It has been suggested by Winchester that the terms ‘infield’ and ‘outfield’ may have been used to distinguish physically between a tenement’s better and poorer holdings on the ground, rather than representing separate types of common field within a township as, for example, at Nethertown in Copeland.<sup>881</sup> This would explain the difficulty in identifying some areas of outfield, but whilst Winchester may be correct in some specific cases, there are indications from map-based landscape characterisation for the former existence of common fields as discrete outfields elsewhere, such as at Faugh near Hayton. The challenge in identifying their physical characteristics on maps is that in some cases changes in agricultural management, perhaps through a local need for intensification, may have resulted in their absorption into permanent common arable fields. The outfield at Fingland on the Solway Plain, for example, appears to have been roughly two-thirds of the size of the infield (Figure 6.22). There is no one obvious area which may have been the outfield for Fingland, but the eastern end of the area mapped as former common arable field in the HLC fits the description given in a sixteenth century survey.<sup>882</sup> The survey of 1593-4 can be interpreted as indicating that this outfield had been recently enclosed from the waste,<sup>883</sup> and this may be a process which was ongoing throughout parts of Cumberland in the sixteenth century.

Elsewhere the presence of outfields may be inferred from the gaps in evidence for land use between the mapped waste and the mapped common arable fields, particularly in an area such as the Solway Plain. In this area are fields which appear to have been enclosed by agreement, in the post medieval period, resulting in straight-sided strip-like enclosures. In some instances the land lies below 10m OD, and almost certainly represents the enclosure of areas of moss. There are also areas on slightly higher land, however, which may have been used as outfields, having been taken in from the waste before 1700 and then enclosed later in the post medieval period. The straight-sided field boundaries represent notional strip divisions between tenants, rather than divisions made physical by ploughing. An example of these straight-sided field divisions occur at the south end of the monastic lands of Holm Cultram on a low ridge on the north side of the Black Dub stream (Figure 6.23). The settlement of Edderside lies at the centre of a

---

<sup>881</sup> Winchester 1978, 182

<sup>882</sup> Gray 1915, 232

<sup>883</sup> Gray 1915, 232

regular field pattern of long narrow, straight-sided strips. The earliest document reference to Edderside dates to 1538.<sup>884</sup> It is, therefore, of late medieval date at least in origin, but its location may suggest that it was founded within a pre-existing outfield. It is on the edge of Holm Cultram's core estates and it may have been an outfield for the surrounding individual granges. New settlements were fostered by the abbey as at Old Mawbray.<sup>885</sup> Further north, in the parish of Kirkbampton, two low ridges on either side of a stream were known as Studholme and Little Bampton Pastures on nineteenth century Ordnance Survey maps. Situated on the edge of permanent common arable fields, and sub-divided into straight, strip-like enclosures, it is possible that these, too, may have been outfields which were converted into permanent pasture sometime in the later medieval period, perhaps at a time of local population decline.

## **Settlement Formation and Expansion**

### ***Nucleated Settlement***

One of the archaeological purposes of HLC is to provide a landscape-scale context for archaeological remains. Without this a map of archaeological evidence consists of apparently random dispersed points against a background of white space or data of dubious chronological relevance. This is because archaeological remains by definition relate to features whose past function has ceased. Hence, medieval settlement studies have until recently been dominated by the investigation of failures, those settlements that shrank or were abandoned. These places are archaeologically visible as earthworks, cropmarks and artefact scatters, but no longer form part of an inherited, functioning settlement pattern. HLC restores the relationship of such places with the far more frequent successful places whose medieval legacy is with us today as surviving, functioning settlements. Whilst HLC redresses the balance by focusing attention on success and survival rather than failure and desertion, it inevitably has a tendency to reflect settlement expansion rather than shrinkage. The approach used in this study, clearly reveals the growth of settlement over time but it is inherently less able, except in a few specific cases as at Brougham<sup>886</sup> to reveal its shrinkage. It is necessary, therefore to caveat the story of general settlement growth revealed in this HLC-based study, by acknowledging that within the same timespan there were settlement failures, shrinkage and migrations. Nevertheless, it is important to highlight the benefits of this type of

---

<sup>884</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 296

<sup>885</sup> See Chapter 5

<sup>886</sup> CCA D/CHA/Machell/MSS1



study on focusing archaeological attention on the far more commonplace successful medieval settlements rather than the rare failures.

Brian Roberts has written in some detail about the settlement morphology of nucleated villages in Cumbria, particularly in the Eden Valley.<sup>887</sup> These settlements attract attention through both their surviving distinctive plan forms and the presence within many of them of visible earthworks related to past shrinkage as for example at Maulds Meaburn in Westmorland.<sup>888</sup> Most of the nucleated settlements and small towns exhibit some regularity in their plan forms. Many are laid out as one- or two-row settlements on either side of a street, such as the villages along the Solway Plain, for example at Bowness, Easton and Boustead Hill, with short crofts to the rear. Similar villages are found along the length of the Eden Valley, for example at Winton at the upper end of the valley, Long Marton in the centre of the valley and Croglin to the north. Variations on this regular pattern are also found, sometimes with village greens incorporated, as at Dufton and Milburn. The same elements of deliberate organisation are found in many of the villages on the west coastal plan, for example at Dean, Rottington and Drigg, as well as in some of the villages of south Westmorland and Low Furness, such as Barbon and Little Urswick. The continuation of this medieval morphological character within these settlements was still legible on the Ordnance Survey maps of the nineteenth century, and in most cases on modern maps, too, even where settlements have experienced recent expansion as at Gilcrux in west Cumberland (Figure 6.24).

In Low Furness and in south Westmorland, however, there are a number of villages which had less regular plans on nineteenth century Ordnance Survey maps. In the case of Great Urswick, this is probably the result of its location next to Urswick Tarn and the village developed around its fringes. Elsewhere in Low Furness, the development of the iron industry influenced the evolution of settlements such as Stainton, resulting in a much less regular plan form.<sup>889</sup> In these cases, it is much more difficult to know the extent and layout of the medieval settlement. In south Westmorland, small towns such as Burton in Kendal had regular plan forms, which they retain, with a legible field system of former common arable, fossilised as enclosed strips. Other nucleated settlements, such as Hale, have been much altered by post medieval and modern changes to the road system, divorcing the settlement from its medieval field system and

---

<sup>887</sup> Roberts 2008, Chapters 3 and 4

<sup>888</sup> Roberts 2008, 77

<sup>889</sup> Bowden 2000, 19

isolating and stranding it from its landscape context. Nearby in the township of Milnthorpe, which originated as a market and mill hamlet for the church and manorial centre at Heversham and port for Westmorland, changes to road layout and settlement growth in the nineteenth and earlier twentieth centuries altered settlement orientation and the nature of the settlement pattern. Milnthorpe is now focused along the north-south A6 highway, rather than along the roads which run at right angles to it and gave it access to the sea. The settlement pattern of the township, which in the medieval and early modern periods was dominated by equally sized one- and two-row small hamlets at Milnthorpe, Leasgill, Whasset and Ackenthwaite with even smaller nucleations such as Heversham, Rowell and Deepthwaite, now consists of a hierarchy of nucleations. These range from large villages such as Heversham and Milnthorpe to small nucleations like Whasset. Consequently, the legibility of the medieval landscape within the modern landscape or even on nineteenth century Ordnance Survey maps is blurred and difficult to perceive.

Even with modern development and the ongoing, piecemeal rationalisation of field systems, the crofts and strip fields behind the houses in many nucleated settlements are mostly still recognisable and mappable from modern and nineteenth century Ordnance Survey maps. Roberts's defines three kinds of crofts, all of which can be found in the nucleated settlements of Cumbria. Short crofts, such as those in Crosby Garrett in the Eden Valley, were less than 150m long, long crofts were between 150m and 250m, and strip crofts were over 250m long, and sometimes as long as 1,200m.<sup>890</sup> Even where boundaries have been altered and crofts amalgamated or split, the general pattern of long, narrow compartments to the rear of village building plots is well preserved in many of the nucleated villages of Cumbria (Figure 6.25). All three of the types defined by Roberts can still be found in the Eden Valley. Within a distance of 10km, there are short crofts at Crosby Garrett, long crofts at Winton, and strip crofts in Great Asby. Other strip crofts, 400m in length, are still fossilised in modern field patterns in a number of villages in the Eden Valley, can be seen at villages further north in the Eden Valley at Knipe and Northsceugh. The length of some of these strips, in conjunction with their aratral curves, has led Roberts to suggest that the building plots and crofts were laid out as one by the plough with the arable fields.<sup>891</sup> One of the most striking examples, however, can be seen in the well-preserved strip fields of Old Mawbray, on

---

<sup>890</sup> Roberts 2008, 58

<sup>891</sup> Roberts 2008, 91

the Solway Plain. Here the crofts are around 400m long, laid out behind a small, single row settlement, at right angles to the adjacent coastline. It originated as a grange of Holm Cultram, and had been founded by 1185.<sup>892</sup> There is no surviving evidence for a single farm which may have been the grange, but it is likely that the Abbey deliberately planned and laid out the settlement on the site of the original grange.<sup>893</sup> Instead of farming the land in severalty through a grange, it was more worthwhile farming rents by fostering the development of a village with its own common arable fields, which is suggested by the regular layout of the row of dwellings and the strip crofts behind.

#### ***Newbiggin, Hutton Roof, Westmorland: Evidence for New Settlement Formation***

From evidence derived from historical maps and the documentary sources used in this study, it is rarely possible to recognise the processes of settlement formation. At Newbiggin in Hutton Roof, on the Westmorland border with Lancashire, however, the process of settlement formation does appear to be captured in records relating to late twelfth to early thirteenth century documents, recording land grants to the Abbey of St Mary's in York. The records contain enough detailed information that an attempt can be made to reconstruct the individual house plots and land grants from modern and historical Ordnance Survey maps (Figure 6.26).

Newbiggin, a name which means 'new building',<sup>894</sup> was probably established following the granting of the vill of Hutton Roof to the Abbey of St Mary's in York in 1090-7.<sup>895</sup> The most likely period is between 1161 and 1184, when St Mary's Abbey regranted the vill back to the family of the original holders.<sup>896</sup> A series of grants from the early thirteenth century suggests that this had been the impetus for the founding of Newbiggin.<sup>897</sup> The grants reference the message that '*Thorald*' founded and a '*ridding with the house which Robert the Skinner founded*'. These formed part of a series of grants made to Cockersands Abbey, in Lancashire, which included 20 acres of land at Kelker Well between 1184 and 1200, five acres of land and a '*ridding which Gilbert tilled*'. The implication from the way these grants used personal names which must still have been remembered, is that these had been established relatively recently, certainly

---

<sup>892</sup> Baxter 1914, 274-5

<sup>893</sup> See Chapter 5

<sup>894</sup> Smith 1967a, 37

<sup>895</sup> Farrer 1923, 377

<sup>896</sup> Farrer 1924, 342

<sup>897</sup> Farrer 1924, 342-3

within a couple of generations. Reference is made in several of the grants to riddings, and a document of 1220-30 refers to the house which Thorold founded, all of which suggests that this was a new settlement carved from the edge of the unenclosed waste. Its location, on the side of the hill below the unenclosed limestone crags of Farleton Knot also supports this. The names of some of the tenants, which include Robert the Skinner, Thomas the Singer and Richard the Clerk, suggests that this recent hamlet was rented out to those who were farming as a supplement and had either moved into the area to settle, or were perhaps younger sons who needed land.

Despite the tantalising detail provided in some of the documents, it is not possible to identify individual building plots from the grants, though the post medieval houses and farms are likely to lie within the messuages of the medieval settlement. Newbiggin Farm, Town End Farm and Newbiggin Old Hall may all be on the site of medieval antecedents. One of the more detailed descriptions is of a ridding tilled by Gilbert (the lord of the manor, known as Gilbert the Noble),<sup>898</sup> which ran, '*from the head of Thorold's croft on the south side descending by the path to the high street and ascending the high street to the ridding of William*'. The high street was probably the lane from Farleton to Newbiggin, which crosses the unenclosed common to the north, and a small path which runs behind the farms of Newbiggin may be the one mentioned in the document. It is difficult to be certain, however, and the identification of the site of Thorold's croft may be one of two existing properties, or it may be a site which has since been deserted. One of the last grants of land was for one and a half acres of land in Newbiggin under Farleton Knott, along with a house and toft and a further 16 acres of land.<sup>899</sup> This may be the farm known as Wind Yeats, which is first referenced by name in 1451.<sup>900</sup> This farm, which is still extant, is located directly under the fell on the edge of the unenclosed common, would suggest that it also originated as an assart.

#### ***New Settlement: Assarts***

From evidence given in charters from the twelfth and thirteenth century, there appears to have been significant colonisation through a process of assarting new land.<sup>901</sup> A subset of the settlements known to have medieval origins shows that 6.5% have place names which indicate that they originated as assarts (Figure 6.27). This figure includes

---

<sup>898</sup> Farrer 1924, 342

<sup>899</sup> Farrer 1924, 343

<sup>900</sup> Farrer 1924, 349

<sup>901</sup> Winchester 1987, 39

only those places with names directly associated with assarting: ‘thwaite’, ‘ridding’ or ‘stubbing’ and their variations. It does not include other names which might be associated with assarting, for example woodland names such as ‘sceugh’, ‘hirst’ and so on. The total proportion of actual settlements established through assarting, therefore, would have been greater than those mapped. Even so, the distribution of place names relating to assarts indicates that most were on less agriculturally favourable land, for example on the edge of unenclosed waste, particularly along the upland margins, in the valleys of the Lake District and in the forests and chases. There are none in the lowlands of the Solway Plain, apart from a single small steading called Stubsgill to the east of the village of Westnewton. This was carved out of land between the common arable field and the common waste,<sup>902</sup> but is not recorded until 1595.<sup>903</sup> A few new farms appear to have been established on the west coastal plain, commonly on the edge of parishes or from the edge of the common waste, as at Godderthwaite in Beckermeth and Stubsgill in Distington. In the low fells of Lancashire-over-Sands, there was a particular concentration of new settlement on the valley sides around Angerton Moss and in the Crake Valley, as well as in High Furness. Much of this land was owned and run directly by Furness Abbey,<sup>904</sup> and they clearly fostered settlement here, either to be run directly as granges or as tenements. The influence of the monasteries can also be seen in Borrowdale, in the Lake District, where land was divided between Furness Abbey and Fountains Abbey.<sup>905</sup> Each had a grange: Grange in Borrowdale belonged to Furness and Watendlath in the adjacent valley was owned by Fountains. Higher up the valley, there is clear evidence of enclosure and improvement, with a number of ‘thwaite’ names, such as Seathwaite, Thorneythwaite, Rosthwaite, and Stonethwaite, which operated as a vaccary.<sup>906</sup> This process of settlement expansion, and enclosing areas of waste, took place beyond monastic lands and areas under forest law. There was also a cluster of new settlement on the low fells between Kendal and Windermere, an area which retained large amounts of common waste until enclosure in the nineteenth century. Most of these assarts were single farms, and they have left a clear legacy in the landscape, with mappable definable holdings.

---

<sup>902</sup> Dyer 1989, 54; Heaward *et al* 2004

<sup>903</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 328

<sup>904</sup> See Chapter 5

<sup>905</sup> Oxford Archaeology North 2007

<sup>906</sup> Winchester 2010, 121

Evidence for the date at which place names are first recorded suggests there may have been an increase in the number of dispersed settlements in the early post medieval period. Many settlement names first appear in the middle of the sixteenth century, but this seems mainly to be a facet of the sudden increase in surviving documentation from this period, because of the surveys of former monastic lands undertaken following the Dissolution. There was also a general growth of surviving documentation from this period, with the greater estates keen to document their holdings as with the Percy Survey of 1578 and the Gilsland Survey of the early seventeenth century. It seems likely, however, that many of the settlements first documented at this time were already in existence and are likely to have had origins earlier than the sixteenth century. Some were former monastic granges, and others were discrete, secular farmsteads. Given that the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were a time of settlement decline nationally,<sup>907</sup> it is likely that those settlements first named in the sixteenth century originated before the mid-fourteenth century. Indeed, it is most likely that they were created during the time of greatest settlement expansion in the thirteenth century.<sup>908</sup> It may be considered that the active land market created by break-up of the monastic holdings and the redistribution of land to secular owners and tenants<sup>909</sup> might have encouraged the expansion of new settlement. There is no evidence for this locally. Nationally, however, what evidence does exist suggests that secular estates which developed from monastic lands encouraged agricultural practices which led to the abandonment of settlement.<sup>910</sup> In conclusion it seems sensible, therefore, to assume that most farmsteads which are first recorded in the later sixteenth century have much earlier origins.

Where the first recorded date is in the seventeenth century, however, it is more difficult to justify an assumption of medieval origins, because population expansion and new settlement creation was more likely from the late sixteenth century. The HLC shows areas of probable former commonfield within the bounds of Inglewood Forest. These are clearly associated with small settlements, such as Sewell Houses and Mellguards but, there is no earlier documented date than the seventeenth century for either. Sewell Houses is recorded in 1631 and Mellguards in 1697.<sup>911</sup> This may indicate that small settlements such as these had earlier, medieval origins but lack documentation, or that

---

<sup>907</sup> Taylor 1983, 169-70

<sup>908</sup> Winchester 2006, 40

<sup>909</sup> Williamson and Bellamy 1987, 119

<sup>910</sup> Aston and Bettey 1998, 124-5

<sup>911</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 206

they are the result of sixteenth or early seventeenth century settlement expansion within the forest.

***Sadgill, Longsleddale, Westmorland: Sixteenth Century Expansion*** (Figure 6.28)

In the valley of Longsleddale to the north of Kendal, there is clear evidence for this process taking place in the late sixteenth century. Settlement appears to have developed originally in the medieval period along the valley sides, in the form of individual holdings. Both the farmsteads and their associated fields can still be identified in many cases, including Beech Hill, Docker Nook, Kilnstones, Murthwaite, Stockdale, Swinklebank, Till's Hole, Tom's Howe, Underhill, Wad's Howe and Yewbarrow Hall. A series of three maps from 1578,<sup>912</sup> however, shows that the modern settlement at the head of the valley, now known as the hamlet of Sadgill, was the result of early post medieval expansion. The maps were made to accompany an Exchequer inquiry into rights of pasture on the moor and waste of Longsleddale, which was carried out in 1580.<sup>913</sup> The three maps all depict the same area centred on the head of the valley, showing the fell gate and wall between the enclosed lands and the open moor and waste beyond. There are difficulties in relating these maps to modern Ordnance Survey maps, particularly with regard to issues of scale, even though features are generally depicted correctly in relation to each other. Even so, it is possible to pick out key features which are still identifiable on modern maps and, from this, to ascertain the extent of the enclosed lands in the second half of the sixteenth century, before the intaking of new lands.

The most dominant feature, common to all three maps, is the Sadgill Beck, flowing north to south, with two of its key tributaries. Two of the maps also show a third tributary on the east side, known as Galeforth Gill, which issued from a tarn high up on the valley sides. This tarn, called Greycrag Tarn, and now survives only as an area of moss but in the sixteenth century it is shown as water-filled. It was then known as Know, or Knoute, Tarn. The confluence of Galeforth Gill with Sadgill Beck was shown some way north of the limit of enclosed land. The other key feature, shown on two of the maps, is an area of woodland on the moor outside the fell wall. This has to be Sadgill Wood, a remnant of which survives today, designated as an area of Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland.<sup>914</sup> In the sixteenth century, it extended up the valley sides and

---

<sup>912</sup> TNA MPB/1/61

<sup>913</sup> TNA E/134/22and23Eliz/Mich9

<sup>914</sup> MAGIC 2013

appears to have been wood pasture. The fell wall lay to the south of this woodland, and south of the present settlement of Sadgill, which is absent from the map. There is sufficient locational information on this map to demonstrate that the hamlet of Sadgill, and its surrounding fields as far as the modern-day fell wall, post-date the creation of these maps in the late sixteenth century. The exact line of the fell wall is difficult to determine, as all the maps depict it in a schematic way; it was the moor and waste to the north of the wall which was of prime interest, along with the key features of woodland and water. The feature markers as '*Gape in the Wood*' is a beck called Reade Gill on one map. There are indications that this is one of the small tributaries of the Sadgill Beck on the west side. It may even be the beck which runs down to Till's Hole Farm, as there are suggestions that the track (now a byway) from Longsleddale to Kentmere, the next valley to the west, lies alongside it. Clearly, this track once ran from Stockdale, right across the valley, now preserved as a footpath in the valley bottom whilst the byway now turns north to the hamlet of Sadgill. This old track probably marks the line of the old fell wall.

#### **Character Areas** (Figure 6.30)

The mapping of medieval landscape features, although not comprehensive across the whole of Cumbria, has created identifiable patterns of landscape types. From this, it is possible to attempt a map of the character of Cumbria's landscape in the late medieval period. Such a map is highly selective of the features that contribute to character for the most part focusing on settlement density and type and the nature of field systems. Additionally it cannot be considered in anyway to be definitive as the contribution of data from further research would, in all probability, alter the boundaries of some of the character areas, even perhaps dividing or amalgamating some of the areas proposed here. Being based on the relationships between settlement pattern, enclosed land, common arable fields, unenclosed land and woodland, the character areas reflect the attributes which can be evidenced most easily from cartographic and documentary sources. As with the character areas for the late eighteenth century map, to an extent these reflect underlying geomorphological and ecological conditions as well as local societal and cultural factors. Changes in character from one area to another were often gradual and not sharp or clear, consequently, the character area polygons should be considered as having 'fuzzy' edges. The definition of character areas is a subjective process, and in areas such as Nichol Forest subsequent landscape change means that much data is missing. Even so, the creation of character areas helps define some of the



principal aspects that may have given a particular area its local distinctiveness in the late medieval period. A total of 18 character areas were defined, ranging in size from Cartmel, the smallest at 74km<sup>2</sup> to the Fells at 1,978km<sup>2</sup>. Despite the range in size of the areas, each one can be defined as being locally distinctive, as described below.

### ***1. Bewcastle and Nichol Forest*** (Figure 6.31)

Covering an area of 439 km<sup>2</sup>, this character area was generally sparsely settled with an overwhelmingly dispersed settlement pattern. Even so, the lowland parts of this character area appear to have been relatively well settled from the medieval period. One of the dominant features, however, was the large area of unenclosed waste in the more upland parts towards the border with Scotland and Northumberland. There were also areas of upland moss on Bolton Fell, and extensive areas of lowland moss, including Solway Moss, in the area west of the River Esk. The character area came under three separate administrative influences: in the south west was the debateable land, on the west side was the Barony of Liddel and in the east was Bewcastle. An Inquisition Post Mortem of 1276 for Nichol Forest provides evidence for the nature of the landscape in the medieval period, with a detailed description of the settlements throughout the barony, including within the Forest of Liddel.<sup>915</sup> This demonstrates that the farmland and settlement were concentrated on the lower lying lands, particularly to the south along the valleys of the River Lyne, the White Lyne and the Black Lyne, as well as along the Rivers Esk and Liddel. The baronial centre was at the motte and bailey castle known as Liddel Strength, where the lord also had a deer park.<sup>916</sup> The Inquisition shows that the lord had demesne land in the divisions of the barony, at Liddel, Arthuret, Stubhill, Randolph Levington and Brackenhill, and that within the forest of Liddel there had been a number of assarts.<sup>917</sup> The document also lists bovates of land in each division, 31 bovates in Arthuret, 24 bovates in Stubhill, 33½ bovates in Randal Levington and 10½ bovates in Brackenhill, which suggests significant areas of cultivatable land.

The physical evidence for much of this information, on modern and historic maps, does not survive. For example, there is no evidence for former common arable fields, or for infield-outfield systems, as the field pattern appears to have been comprehensively reorganised in the post- medieval period. This means for mapping purposes the

---

<sup>915</sup> Graham 1913b, 39

<sup>916</sup> Information supplied by Harry Hawkins

<sup>917</sup> Graham 1913b, 45-6

medieval legacy of the area is not very legible resulting in large areas of white space on the map within this character area. An attempt has been made to plot the land managed in severalty, known as forland,<sup>918</sup> and which went with individual farms. The boundaries of these holdings must be treated with caution, however, as they also appear to have been subject to later rationalisation. Even so, it does allow some indication of severalty lands. Field boundaries appear to be more reliable further north within the forest and where settlement evolved through assarts, and it was possible to plot individual holdings. The settlement pattern here was one of individual steadings scattered through the forest, though at Trough and at Bailey, these seem to have clustered forming dispersed hamlets. At Bailey a number of farms developed around the original Bailey close, named in 1276.<sup>919</sup> Not all the assarts named in the 1276 Inquisition could be identified, and some may not have developed into steadings, or where settled, farms names changed.

In Bewcastle, the dispersed settlement pattern consisted of mostly discrete farms, with the occasional small well-spaced hamlet, for example where there were churches or chapels as at Bewcastle and Kirkcambeck. The most difficult area to map was the area around Solway Moss, because of the bog burst which destroyed many settlements and completely changed the landscape in 1771.<sup>920</sup> Even without this cataclysmic event, however, it is difficult to map elements of the medieval landscape in this area, even the extent of the unenclosed mosslands are difficult to map because of subsequent improvements and enclosures. Before the settlement of the Borders, this was part of the Debateable Land, an area disputed between Scotland and England up to the final settlement in 1552.<sup>921</sup> In the medieval period, this was supposed to remain uninhabited, and serve as common pasture across the border.<sup>922</sup> In the sixteenth century, however, this area was settled by a number of local clansmen, particularly the Armstrongs, who built strong houses there.<sup>923</sup> Some farms and a few of their holdings can be identified from historic Ordnance Survey maps, though the boundaries should be treated with caution. A map drawn up for the settlement of the borders, in 1552,<sup>924</sup> shows few

---

<sup>918</sup> Graham 1913b, 47

<sup>919</sup> Graham 1913b, 46

<sup>920</sup> Gilpin 1786, 135-7

<sup>921</sup> Graham 1912, 47

<sup>922</sup> Graham 1912, 35

<sup>923</sup> Graham 1912, 37

<sup>924</sup> TNA MPF/1/257

settlements within the Debateable Land, but a second map, drawn in 1590, probably provides a more accurate picture of the level of settlement,<sup>925</sup> even though there are some mistakes in placement.<sup>926</sup> This would suggest that the landscape of this area was one of individual farms, often in the form of a strong house, with holdings carved out of the waste, particularly in the drier areas between the mosses.

Aside from the Debateable Land, this does appear to have been an area dominated by baronial influence. There were two baronial forests, Liddel or Nichol Forest, and Askerton North Moor. In addition, there were deer parks at Liddel, Kirkclinton, Bewcastle and Askerton. The bounds of Liddel Park<sup>927</sup> and Kirkclinton Park<sup>928</sup> were difficult to plot, and their extents remain uncertain, but both are probably of late thirteenth century origin. Bewcastle, first documented in the sixteenth century,<sup>929</sup> has been mapped from likely boundaries and the distribution of 'park' names in the landscape. Askerton was in existence by 1285.<sup>930</sup> It remained in use as a deer park into the post medieval period, and is marked as High Park and Low Park on early Ordnance Survey maps. The bounds of the park are still legible in the modern landscape and it could be mapped with some confidence. The preponderance of forest and park seems to have had an influence of woodland cover in this area. Today, outside of the extensive modern Forestry Commission plantations associated with Kershope Forest in particular, there is little woodland. The sixteenth century maps of the Debateable Land, however, show large stretches of woodland, particularly within Liddel Forest, but also along the banks of the Liddel Water and River Esk. Donald's 1774 Map of Cumberland does not show woodland in this area, so presumably it was removed as the area was enclosed and improved following the settlement of the Borders. He does show some woodland in Bewcastle, however, with small areas to the north of Askerton, and substantial areas within the park. This was mappable both from historic maps and from the modern landscape. Although the woodland areas have now retreated, their likely original extent is legible in today's landscape. The depiction of the woodland on Donald, and the nature of the modern woodland cover, suggests that much of this may have taken the form of wood pasture.

---

<sup>925</sup> TNA MPF/1/285

<sup>926</sup> Graham 1912, 49

<sup>927</sup> Information supplied by Harry Hawkins

<sup>928</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 102

<sup>929</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 64

<sup>930</sup> Boynton 2003, 1285, 209

## 2. *Gilsland* (Figure 6.32)

The Gilsland character area is centred on the valley of the River Irthing east of the town of Brampton, but also the valley of the Coalfell Beck, both of which provided access across the Pennines into Northumberland and County Durham. Between the valleys, and on either side, were unenclosed uplands including Bruthwaite Forest to the south. It was a landscape with a dispersed settlement pattern, but incorporating some small nucleated hamlets. The only two settlements of any size were Farlam and Milton, in the south west of the character area. Generally, the holdings of individual farms were identifiable and mappable in the pattern of enclosed fields shown on Ordnance Survey maps. As well as valley bottom settlement, this included farms and fields which had originated as assarts, occupying enclosed islands within the common waste, as at Highfield and Ceughhead to the south of Denton, and Tercrosset and Desoglin in the north. Only two very small common arable fields were mapped for this character area, both of which were still in use in the early part of the twentieth century.<sup>931</sup> The Well Field, on the northern edge of the area, may originally have stretched further west, but is likely to have originated as a small area of common arable. The field, as mapped, at Denton appears to be a remnant of the original area of common meadow, though its original extent is not known and therefore was not mapped. It is likely to have included the area to its west which, by the sixteenth century, was occupied by two farms, Low and High Nook.<sup>932</sup>

The secular and religious lordships of the valley had an influence on the character of the landscape. There were three deer parks, one belonging to Triermain at ‘Wardrengel’,<sup>933</sup> Lanercost Priory’s park of ‘Warth-Coleman’,<sup>934</sup> and Nawarth Park, which had succeeded Brampton Park when Nawarth became the seat of the Barony of Gilsland.<sup>935</sup> These were significant landscape features, and the parks of Lanercost Priory and Nawarth Castle lay opposite each other on either bank of the River Irthing. The Irthing Valley had a significant effect on the landscape character of this area, as it was the focus for settlement and enclosure. Woodland was concentrated in the valley, with the largest mappable areas at Walton and Upper Denton. Hadrian’s Wall would have formed a relict landscape feature, though it does not appear to have been a major influence on the

---

<sup>931</sup> Graham 1913a, 15-6

<sup>932</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 83

<sup>933</sup> Todd 1991, volume 2, 290

<sup>934</sup> Todd 1991, 48

<sup>935</sup> Winchester 2007, 173

medieval landscape, other than to provide an existing boundary which could be incorporated into farm holdings. At Birdoswald, however, the Wall does seem to have formed a convenient boundary between the enclosed lands of the valley and the unenclosed wastes to the north.

### **3. *Anthorn and Wedholme Mosses*** (Figure 6.33)

The second smallest character area at 84 km<sup>2</sup>, it covered the coastal mosslands of the Anthorn peninsula, Drumburgh Moss and Wedholme Flow, with the higher, settled land between. The mapped medieval landscape character included both extensive unenclosed mosslands, and cultivated land. Settlement was mainly concentrated into nucleated villages and hamlets at Bowness on Solway, Cardunnock, Anthorn, Angerton, Kirkbride and Newton Arlosh. All had clear and mappable areas of former common arable field. Between them were a few individual dwellings established on land assarted from the slightly higher grounds of the mosslands. These included Brackenrigg on Drumburgh Moss, Rogersceugh on the Anthorn peninsula, and Lawrenceholme and Wedholme in Wedholme Flow. The extent of these assarts survived as clearly legible and compact areas of less regular enclosure within the larger, post medieval mossland enclosures. On the western edge of Wedholme Flow, there was a denser dispersed settlement pattern, reflecting the exploitation of this area by the Abbey of Holm Cultram.<sup>936</sup> The establishment of the town of Newton Arlosh by the Abbey<sup>937</sup> does not seem to have influenced the overall character of the area, as it appears little different from other nucleated settlements such as Kirkbride and Bowness on Solway. There is evidence that the mosslands were well-wooded, presumably largely by alder carr or similar wet woodland. The settlement of Rogersceugh on Anthorn moss implies that there had been woodland there at some point, as the name means Roger's Wood.<sup>938</sup> In Wedholme Flow, a small area of woodland still survived in the late eighteenth century, and was marked on Donald's map. Medieval documentary sources, however, indicate that it was much more extensive and, indeed, was probably linked to the woodland of Inglewood Forest, in Westward.<sup>939</sup> Although the exact bounds of this woodland are not known, an attempt has been made to map its possible medieval extent.

---

<sup>936</sup> See Chapter 5

<sup>937</sup> Pastscape 2007, list number 9603

<sup>938</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 126

<sup>939</sup> Parker 1905, 58

#### **4. Carlisle and the Solway Plain** (Figure 6.34)

This character area covered a wide band of lowland formed in the east by the valleys of the lower reaches of the Rivers Eden, Irthing and Lyne, and in the west by the Solway Plain. It included the city of Carlisle, the town of Brampton, and the north end of the Forest of Inglewood, but it also extended west to include the settlements of Bromfield and Dundraw. It was a character area featuring nucleated settlement with associated large common arable fields, particularly along the Solway Plain. Villages tended to be regular in plan, with long crofts or strip crofts laid out behind the houses along the street frontages.<sup>940</sup> There are white spaces in this character area, where no medieval landscape character could be mapped. Some of this was around Carlisle and reflects the lack of available map evidence because of nineteenth century suburban industrial expansion. There are likely to have been areas of outfield which have not been recognised. Two have been mapped, at Faugh in Hayton and at Fingland.<sup>941</sup> There would certainly have been other areas of cultivatable, but less fertile land which would have been utilised as outfields for occasional arable. There were some discrete farms, with identifiable holdings of enclosed fields. These seem to have been concentrated in the river valleys of the Wampool, the Caldew, the Petteril, the Eden and the Irthing. Some meadow land was identified and mapped for this area, but this reflects the work done by the Rev. Graham in the early twentieth century rather than any genuine concentration of this landscape character type.<sup>942</sup> The inclusion of part of this character area within the Forest of Inglewood does seem to have influenced the extent of likely medieval woodland. Place-name evidence and previous historical research examining woodland cover has allowed an attempt at mapping woodland.<sup>943</sup> This is almost certainly an under-estimate of the actual woodland cover. Outside the forest, the main area of woodland was in Brigwood, at Brampton, which formed part of the original deer park for the Barony of Gilsland.<sup>944</sup> The woodland is shown on a 1603 map of Brampton.<sup>945</sup>

---

<sup>940</sup> Roberts 2008, 58

<sup>941</sup> Gray 1915, 232

<sup>942</sup> Graham 1913a

<sup>943</sup> Graham 1919a and 1919b, 125-30; Parker 1907; Armstrong *et al* 1950, 135

<sup>944</sup> Winchester 2007, 168

<sup>945</sup> Robinson 1983

### **5. *Holm Cultram and Westnewton*** (Figure 6.35)

To some extent, this character area is similar to that of the Carlisle and Solway Plain. The key differences, however, were the larger proportion of unenclosed waste to cultivatable land, and the more dispersed settlement pattern. Most of this area formed the core of the 'island' of Holm Cultram, which was the demesne holding of Holm Cultram Abbey.<sup>946</sup> The island was in reality two low ridges, one along the coast and one inland, separated by an area of mossland. The character area also includes a parallel area of unenclosed mossland to the east, which appears to have been wooded in the medieval period,<sup>947</sup> and the next low ridge to the east which was occupied mostly by the village of Westnewton and its common arable field and a few discrete farms and their enclosed fields, including the grange of Bromfield Hall.<sup>948</sup> This character area may have lain largely in waste before the abbey was founded and appears to have been 'colonised' by Holm Cultram Abbey, initially through the establishment of a series of granges.<sup>949</sup> Some of these granges developed into small nucleated settlements, and the abbey fostered a nucleated settlement at Old Mawbray, whilst New Mawbray, or Newtown, was established after the Dissolution by Lord Dacre to house tenants whose farms had been besanded.<sup>950</sup> The small village of Edderside, too, might be a late creation as it is not documented before 1538.<sup>951</sup> It sits within an enclosed area of straight-sided strip fields, at the end of the central low ridge. Given the physical characteristics of the field system around it, it is possible that this was an abbey-founded nucleated settlement, within an area of former outfield.

### **6. *The Ellen and Derwent Valleys*** (Figure 6.36)

South of the island of Holm Cultram, the land rises slightly, to form gently rolling countryside cut by the valleys of the Rivers Ellen and Derwent and their tributaries. In the later medieval period this was a densely settled landscape with a mix of settlement types. Nearly half the settlements were villages or larger hamlets, which meant most of the population lived in nucleated settlements. Many of the villages took the form of two-row settlements, though some had less regular forms than the villages of the

---

<sup>946</sup> Grainger and Collingwood 1929, 73

<sup>947</sup> Parker 1905, 58

<sup>948</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 272

<sup>949</sup> Grainger and Collingwood 1929

<sup>950</sup> Winchester 1987, 38

<sup>951</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 296

Solway Plain, being clustered around roads junctions as at Threapland. Associated with them were extensive common arable fields, the existence of which is well documented,<sup>952</sup> but which were mapped from HLC data. Scattered between the nucleated settlements were discrete farms, with definable holdings of enclosed fields. There was little woodland cover which could be mapped, apart from some gill woodland in the Derwent Valley shown on Donald's map of 1774, and Flimby Great Wood, which is documented in grants to Holm Cultram Abbey in the twelfth century,<sup>953</sup> and which still survives. The largest settlement in this character area was the town of Workington, at the southern end, a borough laid out on either side of the road which lay parallel to the mouth of the River Derwent close to its estuary, and which was a haven listed as one of the ports and creeks of Cumberland in 1566.<sup>954</sup>

### 7. *Westward* (Figure 6.37)

This character area was dominated by unenclosed moorland, rising to low fells at over 300m OD at its southern end. It included the whole area of Westward, the former Forest of Allerdale, but also areas which lay outside forest law. Settlement was one almost wholly dominated by discrete steadings, with the hamlet of Rosley forming the only nucleation. From the map evidence, settlement appears to have evolved and spread largely through the process of assarting, and was concentrated in the valley of the River Waver, the Wiza Beck and other small water courses. The pattern of dispersion appears to have been one of individual farms forming scattered hamlets within definable assarts within the probable woodland or waste. This was particularly the case within Westward itself, for example an assart called Brackenthwaite which was made up of five farms, close to another assart known as Craggs with up to six farms by 1578.<sup>955</sup> Elsewhere, assarts seem to have been made for individual farms, such as Tiffinthwaite, and High and Low Longthwaite,<sup>956</sup> in the north west of the area, and at Orthwaite in the south.<sup>957</sup> All had definable areas of enclosures associated with the settlements. Along the northern edge of the character area, assarts were made into the edge of woodland, leading to the development of scattered hamlets at East and West Woodside by the late

---

<sup>952</sup> Dilley 1972

<sup>953</sup> Grainger and Collingwood 1929, 18

<sup>954</sup> Newman 2013, 288

<sup>955</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 331

<sup>956</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 334

<sup>957</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 328



thirteenth century<sup>958</sup> at the same time as more nucleated settlements had been formed just to the east at East and West Curthwaite.<sup>959</sup> The mappable evidence for enclosures around the settlements was mainly for enclosed fields, but there is also some documentary evidence for small common arable fields at Thornthwaite, Brocklebank, Rosley, Rosewain and Woodside.<sup>960</sup> It is likely that similar small common arable fields were originally found throughout this character area, wherever groups of farms were established within an assarted area, but these have left no mappable trace on historic and modern maps. In the medieval period, much of the character area may have been wooded. There is evidence for woodland in the centre of Westward in the eighteenth century, but the settlement called Woodside implies that some woodland was cleared in the medieval period. Based on the distribution of place-names, an attempt has been made to map the extent of the woodland, though this is probably a conservative estimate.

#### **8. Inglewood and the Lower Eden Valley** (Figure 6.38)

Like Westward, the Inglewood and Lower Eden Valley character area was characterised by areas of unenclosed moorland some of which may have been woodland earlier in the Middle Ages. The area extends, between the Pennine uplands to the east and the Skiddaw range of fells to the west, and runs south along the Lazonby Ridge to include the small forest of Whinfell within the historic county of Westmorland. Its northern edge follows the line of unenclosed moorland which extended either side of the Petteril Valley south of Carlisle. It was an area with a predominantly dispersed settlement pattern of discrete farms and small hamlets. Apart from Edenhall, the nucleated settlements, including the small borough of Kirkoswald, were concentrated along the northern edge and in the Eden Valley, though this distribution is partly a result of the large area of unenclosed land along the Lazonby Ridge which makes up a significant portion of the southern part of the character area. Scattered farms and hamlets still predominate even in the areas of nucleated settlement, in many places distributed along the edge of common arable fields and common waste. Within the Forest of Inglewood, one of the larger areas of common arable, at Braithwaite, appears to have served the individual farms and small hamlets dotted around its edge, whilst the extensive common arable fields of Caldbeck and Hesketh Newmarket were also utilised by a series of small

---

<sup>958</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 331

<sup>959</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 329

<sup>960</sup> Dilley 1972, 257-70

settlements to the south.<sup>961</sup> The common arable fields of the Lower Eden Valley, however, were smaller, with separate field systems serving hamlets and farms, for example at Low Northsceugh and Hornsby in Cumwhinton parish, each of which had their own field systems separate from that of Cumwhinton village. These field systems were mapped from information in the HLC and the enclosed fields retain clear attributes of the former common arable within the modern landscape as fossilised aratral strips. The medieval character of this area reflects too its status as forest. There are a number of medieval forest hays, which became deer parks, including Plumpton Park or Hay,<sup>962</sup> Hay Close,<sup>963</sup> and Baron Wood.<sup>964</sup> There was also the large baronial park of Greystoke which was established by the late thirteenth century.<sup>965</sup> The mapping of the medieval character of this landscape, however, includes developments, such as the division of Plumpton Park into tenant farms supposedly following disparking in the reign of Henry VIII.<sup>966</sup> One of these farms, Thornbarrow, however, is first documented in 1380.<sup>967</sup> As a result of much of the area's status as forest, this was one of the more wooded areas of Cumberland, with extensive tree cover in Baron Wood, Whinfell and Skelton.

#### **9. *The Pennines*** (Figure 6.39)

The Pennine character area comprised unenclosed and uninhabited upland, forming a formidable obstacle to travellers. Apart from the highway from Melmerby in the Eden Valley to Alston by way of the summit of Hartside, and the ancient track known as the Maiden Way, the only routes into this area would have been paths and tracks. The only settlement which may have lain within it was Meldon Hall, on the side of Meldon Hill, which is first recorded in 1256.<sup>968</sup> This reference may only be to the hill, and the hall may be much later, perhaps developing from a seasonal settlement.

#### **10. *Alston Moor*** (Figure 6.40)

Alston Moor is one of the smaller character areas, at 150 km<sup>2</sup>, and it comprised mostly unenclosed upland. It is cut by the valleys of the River South Tyne and the River Nent,

---

<sup>961</sup> Dilley 1972, 257-70

<sup>962</sup> Hope 2011

<sup>963</sup> Information supplied by Harry Hawkins

<sup>964</sup> Graham 1927, 29

<sup>965</sup> Winchester 2007, 167

<sup>966</sup> Hope 2011, 151

<sup>967</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 206

<sup>968</sup> Smith 1967b, 109

with the small town of Alston standing at their confluence. The only other nucleated settlements of any size were Garrigill and Blagill. Reflecting the constrained nature of the valleys, the few other settlements were all individual farms or very small hamlets, distributed along the valley sides with their own, mappable holdings. The South Tyne Valley appears to have been the more settled of the two valleys, with the small village of Garrigill which was made a chapelry in 1215<sup>969</sup> and a scatter of farms. The Nent Valley, however, was not greatly settled in the medieval period in comparison to its dense settlement in the later eighteenth century. Besides the hamlet of Blagill, at the valley's north end, there was a scatter of farms at Corbygates and Gossipgate<sup>970</sup> by the late thirteenth century, and Skelgill by the late fifteenth century.<sup>971</sup> Clearly there was other settlement in the valley noted in the in the description of Alston manor in 1315 and this may have largely been clustered around the vicinity of Nentsberry higher up the valley (Jessop and Whitfield 2010, 6) A farm at Nentsberry had been assarted from the moorland waste by the earlier part of the thirteenth century.<sup>972</sup> By the sixteenth century, farms at Low Galligill<sup>973</sup> and Nenthall<sup>974</sup> had been established next to it. Far out on the moors, between the ends of the Tyne and Nent Valleys, was Priorsdale, which was first documented in 1280 as a grange of the Hexham Priory.<sup>975</sup> The spread of settlement along the valleys is likely to relate to early mining activities, as this area provided the main supply of silver to the mint in Carlisle, and the inhabitants had protected mining rights by the thirteenth century.<sup>976</sup>

### **11. West Cumbrian Coastal Plain** (Figure 6.41)

The West Cumbrian coastal plain character area stretched from Workington in the north to Millom and the Duddon estuary in the south. It comprised the lowlands between the Lake District fells and the coastline, but also included the low fells around Muncaster and the lower stretches of the River Esk where the uplands extend westwards to the coast. The topography is gently rolling towards the foothills, but more open on the coast. The coastline itself is generally low lying with sand dunes fringing the shore, but

---

<sup>969</sup> Jessop and Whitfield 2010, 5

<sup>970</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 179

<sup>971</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 179

<sup>972</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 175

<sup>973</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 177

<sup>974</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 175

<sup>975</sup> Armstrong *et al* 1950, 175

<sup>976</sup> Sopwith 1833, 19-20

there are low cliffs south of Workington, rising to St Bees Head, the highest point along the whole coastline. The medieval landscape was a mix of settlement types, though it was predominantly a dispersed settlement pattern of individual farms and small hamlets, particularly in the mouths of the valleys leading into the Lake District fells. Nucleated settlement tended to be on the more cultivatable land towards the coast, and this was also where the common arable fields were situated. These were relatively small, compared to the arable areas of the Solway Plain or Eden Valley. The common arable also tended to be discrete, laid out next to the settlements, rather than forming extensive areas of adjoining arable lands often at distance from their associated communities, as in parts of the Eden Valley. The limited extent of cultivation does not seem to be the result of the quality of agricultural land. Almost all the known common arable fields were located in areas which are now considered to be grade 3, good to moderate quality agricultural land capable of producing a narrow range of crops<sup>977</sup> which is equal to most of the better quality land in Cumbria. Given the limited areas of common arable, and the dominance of individual farms and hamlets over larger nucleated settlements, the geomorphological factors governing landscape character were clearly less important than other influences. The explanation may be found in the pattern of lordship and tenure in this area. North of the River Esk lay the Barony of Egremont, to the south was the Barony of Millom. In both areas, there were a number of freeholds held by the ancient payments of cornage and seawake,<sup>978</sup> suggesting perhaps that an older dispersed settlement pattern was overlain by a more recent pattern of nucleations and common arable fields. This was also an area with significant monastic holdings. St Bees Priory and Calder Abbey, which were within the area, held large holdings including several granges in the vicinity of their precincts, and much of the land around Bootle was held by Holm Cultram.<sup>979</sup> It seems in this area, monastic holdings contributed to the overall dispersed nature of the settlement pattern, perhaps helping to re-emphasise an older pattern of discrete farmsteads.

### **12. The Fells** (Figure 6.42)

The Fells is the largest medieval character area, covering 1,978 km<sup>2</sup>. It included the whole of the Lake District massif and extended eastward across the Tebay Gorge to include the northern end of the Howgill Hills, the Pennines and Stainmore. Although

---

<sup>977</sup> MAFF 1988, 9

<sup>978</sup> Winchester 1987, 18-20. Cornage was a type of rent dependent on the number of horned cattle, seawake was a payment in lieu of a coastal guarding service

<sup>979</sup> Grainger and Collingwood 1929

dominated by mountain and moorland, this area is cut by steep-sided dales where most of the settlement was concentrated, mainly as dispersed farms and hamlets. The few nucleated settlements included small market towns, such as Keswick. With a dispersed settlement pattern dominating, the valleys were largely enclosed landscapes. Small common arable fields developed in the valley bottoms in some areas. This was also under the control of baronial forests and the legacy of the hunting landscape can be mapped through the deer parks. Although most of these deer parks did not survive into the post medieval period, their extents are often preserved in later field boundaries. Lordly power, both secular and religious, was expressed in the medieval landscape throughout this character area. In the western Lake District valleys of Wasdale, Ennerdale, Buttermere and Borrowdale, and in Mallerstang in the Pennines, the settlement pattern evolved from vaccaries into tenanted farms in the later medieval period.

### **13. Eden Valley** (Figure 6.43)

The Eden Valley, and the lowland west of the Lazonby ridge, formed a large area of well settled farmland broken up by patches of waste in the form of low moorland. Much of the cultivatable land was given over to common arable, which served nucleated settlements, including some of the larger villages in medieval Cumbria like Maulds Meaburn and Crosby Ravensworth. These very regular nucleations often had very regular two row and green plans and exhibiting evidence of their crofts being laid out in conjunction with their surrounding arable fields.<sup>980</sup> In character some of these settlements resemble the medieval 'planned' villages of Durham, North Yorkshire and parts of Northumberland. Discrete farms were scattered throughout the area, though with slightly higher concentrations in the north west on the edge of the Ullswater and Matteredale valleys of the Lake District, and where the Eden Valley rises up towards the limestone escarpment of the Orton Fells, around Crosby Ravensworth and Maulds Meaburn. This was also an area of numerous deer parks, mostly small and manorial, but including the larger baronial deer park at Flakebridge.<sup>981</sup> There was a series of granges with Shap Abbey holding a grange at Milburn and Holm Cultram one at Hale. In addition the Knight's Hospitallers held the property of Acorn Bank. The remaining granges all lay on the south-west side of the character area, close to the limestone moors, which would have provided grazing, probably for sheep farms.

---

<sup>980</sup> Roberts 2008, 77

<sup>981</sup> Winchester 2007, 168

#### **14. Furness Peninsula** (Figure 6.44)

The Furness peninsula formed a discrete and highly distinctive lowland character area. It had relatively good quality agricultural land, at grade 3,<sup>982</sup> which was reflected in a landscape with large common arable fields, surrounding nucleated settlements, as well as the towns of Ulverston and Dalton-in-Furness. Where the land rose, towards the west and north, there was a more dispersed settlement pattern of discrete farms and, in the parts owned by Furness Abbey or Conishead Priory, a number of granges. Furness Abbey had two granges, Marsh Grange and Sandscale Grange, on the west coast, where they could take advantage of the salt marshes for stock grazing. This was also an area of deer parks, including six owned by Furness Abbey, as well as the manorial parks of Kirkby Wood, Seawood and Gleaston on the east coast. There was very little woodland cover, the parks of Seawood and Sowerby containing most woodland.

#### **15. High Furness** (Figure 6.45)

High Furness was probably one of the most wooded areas of Cumbria in the medieval period. There is no direct evidence for the extent of woodland in Furness, but the existence of wood-related industry and crafts from the late medieval period required a regular and reliable source of material.<sup>983</sup> The archaeological evidence for a bloomery industry in High Furness,<sup>984</sup> controlled exclusively by Furness Abbey by 1273, is also suggestive of woodland as the furnaces required charcoal for fuel.<sup>985</sup> Coppice management was undertaken from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries,<sup>986</sup> and this would have helped to preserve the woodland cover, whilst continuing to supply the woodland-based industries. Some of the woodland was within areas managed as deer parks, of which there were three, all owned by Furness Abbey.

Settlement was sparse within High Furness, and was largely dispersed with a few nucleated settlements which appear to have grown organically. Only Hawkshead, which acted as the manorial centre for Furness Abbey within the forest, had any common arable fields which could be mapped. High Furness had over 20 granges, operating as stock farms, and some of these grew into larger settlements, such as Near and Far

---

<sup>982</sup> MAFF 1988, 9

<sup>983</sup> Newman and Hardie, 2007, 102-3

<sup>984</sup> Lake District National Park HER

<sup>985</sup> Bowden 2000, 6

<sup>986</sup> Winchester 1987, 105

Sawrey, Bouth, Colton and Oxen Park. The names of Bouth<sup>987</sup> and Oxen Park<sup>988</sup> both reflect their origins as cattle farms. Other settlement grew up in addition to the granges, presumably with the abbey's encouragement. Many of the place-names, however, cannot be dated before the sixteenth century, and it is possible that some of this settlement only came into existence after the end of monastic control in the mid-sixteenth century. In general it is reasonable to consider the whole of High Furness to be a monastic landscape in the medieval period, for Furness Abbey held most of the land, structured the farming system, managed the woodlands, controlled the iron industry and conserved and exploited its game.

**16. Cartmel** (Figure 6.46)

Cartmel is the smallest of the character areas at 74 km<sup>2</sup> and occupies the whole of the Cartmel peninsula. Like the Furness Peninsula much of the area was under the control of a monastery, in this case Cartmel Priory. The medieval landscape, however, does not appear to be particularly distinctive as a result of the monastic lordship. It was a landscape of contrasts, with large areas of unenclosed low fell and coastal mosslands, and stretches of common arable fields. The common arable was in two areas, the first in the northern part serving the nucleated settlements of Low and High Newton, the second to the south of Cartmel Priory and around the villages of Allithwaite, Cark and the small borough of Flookburgh. There were also some discrete tenanted farms.<sup>989</sup> Cartmel Priory had only three granges within the character area, all positioned on the coast to take advantage of grazing land on the salt marshes.

**17. Kendale** (Figure 6.47)

This large character area covers most of the land between the historic county boundary between Yorkshire and Westmorland in the east and Windermere in the west. The northern limit is defined by the unenclosed fells, and to the south it follows the edge of an area of lower lying, more open countryside which forms the South Kendale character area. Kendale itself was characterised in the medieval period by substantial quantities of unenclosed waste, with Limestone low fells to the west and glacial drumlins to the east, and also an expanse of unenclosed mossland within the Lyth Valley which occupies a large part of the centre of this character area. Medieval Kendale's landscape was characterised by dispersed settlement, mostly comprising discrete farms. There were

---

<sup>987</sup> Whaley 2006, 41

<sup>988</sup> Whaley 2006, 259

<sup>989</sup> Tait 1908, 143-4

more nucleated settlements in the south, on the east side of the Lune Valley in the gently rolling countryside created by low drumlins and between the Limestone crags to the west and moorland to the east. There small common arable fields were found, the largest one mapped belonging to the village of Natland, south of Kendal the baronial centre and the largest town in medieval Westmorland.

There are large areas of white space within the landscape of this character area, where there is no evidence for land use in the medieval period, but these areas are known to be settled and enclosed by the late eighteenth century. Certainly in the area to the north of Kendal, which formed its own character area on the map of the late eighteenth century landscape (the North Kent Valley) settlement had expanded significantly by the later eighteenth century, but the evidence for medieval settlement is sparse. It is unclear whether this is a true reflection of post-medieval settlement expansion or a result of the nature of the available evidence. Many of these white spaces were probably areas of unenclosed waste. In Lupton, in the southern part of this area, the lack of mapped settlement evidence is at least partly caused by the difficulty in identifying the location of grants to Cockersands Abbey, which held much land there.<sup>990</sup> It is likely, then, that in the medieval period, this was an area unenclosed moor and low fell, some of which was doubtless being assarted. The view that much of the area was sparsely settled and agriculturally marginal in the medieval period is perhaps supported by the large number of deer parks within the character area. Deer parks were concentrated especially around the valley of the River Kent belonging to manorial centres, such as Heversham Hall.

#### **18. South Kendale** (Figure 6.48)

On the far southern boundary of Westmorland, South Kendale formed a character area of unenclosed low fell with some lowland mossland, interrupted by large areas of more fertile cultivated land. In the medieval period, substantial areas of common arable field existed, around Morecambe Bay and the settlements of Hale, Milnthorpe and Burton. The Lune Valley, which makes up the eastern part of the character area, also had a number of common arable fields, although these were smaller and formed discrete blocks, associated with small nucleations like Barbon. Monastic houses, including Cockersands Abbey and St Mary's Abbey in York, held granges in this area, and there were deer parks on the edges of the low fells. Primarily, however, this was a landscape of small nucleated settlements associated with common arable farming, interspersed with discrete farms or small clusters of two or three steadings.

---

<sup>990</sup> Farrer 1924, 358



### **Late medieval Landscape Character**

There is a clear distinction between the character areas dominated by a nucleated settlement pattern and those dominated by a dispersed or mixed settlement pattern in the later medieval period. One of the most distinctive character areas was Alston Moor where, even in the settled valleys, the agricultural land was suitable only for grazing and most was of the poorest quality.<sup>991</sup> Settlement in this character area developed because of the opportunity for tenants to supplement subsistence farming with an income from silver mining.<sup>992</sup> The Ellen and Derwent Valleys, Carlisle and the Solway Plain, the Eden Valley, the Furness Peninsula, the Cartmel Peninsula and South Kendale were all characterised by nucleated settlement and large common arable fields. The settlement distribution has a good correlation with better quality agricultural land, though in the valleys around the limestone uplands in the Eden Valley character area, there were also settlements in valleys with grade 4 quality land where there would have been severe limitations on the range of crops grown. This land is, however, suited to pasture, and it was here that a number of monastic granges were established which were probably dedicated sheep farms.

Better quality agricultural land was also found in areas of more dispersed settlement, for example along the west coast of Cumberland, in the area of Anthorn and Wedholme Mosses, and in the lowlands of Bewcastle and Nichol Forest, and Gilsland, with more limited extents in Kendale. Apart from Bewcastle and Nichol Forest, where there is no surviving evidence, these character areas have a mix of dispersed and nucleated settlement associated with small common arable fields. The absence of evidence for common arable fields around Nichol Forest may be the result of early post medieval reorganisation. Bewcastle and Nichol Forest, Gilsland and Kendale had large areas of unenclosed common waste in the late medieval period. Inglewood and Westward were similar in settlement pattern to the West Coastal Plain, but with some large common arable fields which probably reflected the better quality of agricultural land.

The Forest of Inglewood is set apart from the rest of the study area by the large area of unenclosed waste on land capable of regular cultivation. The land use of Inglewood must have been the result of a deliberate policy to retain large areas of uncultivated land and woodland cover probably for both hunting purposes and to retain royal control over valuable timber resources. Furness, too, had significantly greater woodland cover than

---

<sup>991</sup> MAGIC 2013, agricultural land classification

<sup>992</sup> Sopwith 1833, 19-20

other areas and its dispersed settlement pattern was clearly a reflection of a landscape dominated by monastic granges, with a few tenanted farms. Apart from the Pennines, which was virtually devoid of settlement, the Alston and Fells character areas were the least densely settled. Valley-based dispersed settlement grew in both areas in the medieval period but whereas silver mining provided the stimulus in Alston, in the Fells stock farming was the primary factor. There both monastic granges and vaccaries assisted the process of settlement expansion.

## Chapter 7: Discussion and Conclusion

*'It lyeth among moor and hills, and was antiently for the most part unmanured, came by this name in our language, for such barren places which cannot easily, by the painful labour of the husbandman be brought to fruitfulness, the northern English men call moores, and Westmoreland is nothing else but a western Moorish country.'*<sup>993</sup>

### Introduction

Observers have always attempted to characterise the nature of an area's landscape, as shown in the above quote from Daniel Fleming's 1671 view of Westmorland.

Characterisation as a landscape analytical technique, shared by various disciplines such as geography, ecology and archaeology, has only developed in the last 50 years.<sup>994</sup> The intention of this study was to take a characterisation-based approach, using the late-eighteenth century county maps of the antecedent counties of Cumbria, to reconstruct the likely settlement and field patterns of the late medieval landscape. This study looked specifically at the potential of the late-eighteenth century county maps to form the basis for a digital map of the eighteenth century landscape of Cumbria. This map was then used as a baseline for a map regression which facilitated an interpretative reconstruction of aspects of the late medieval landscape. By using a Cumbria-wide and 'top-down' approach, the aim was to produce a broad-brush picture of the Cumbrian landscape in the two periods in order to analyse settlement patterns and fields systems. There were two main products of this research: a map of the landscape character of Cumbria in the late-eighteenth century, based primarily on contemporary county maps, and an interpretive map of the landscape character of Cumbria in the later medieval period.

One of the key aims of producing the maps was to aid an analysis of the development of rural settlement patterns and field systems from the later medieval period through to the late eighteenth century. In particular, the maps provided the tools with which to compare the landscape character between the two periods and to analyse the nature and extent of change, especially settlement pattern and density. The maps provided overviews of landscape character, and how that character had evolved from the later medieval period through to the late eighteenth century. This enabled a comparison to be made with the historic character of the modern landscape, recorded by the HLC project, and to assess which elements contribute to an inherited medieval legacy.

---

<sup>993</sup> Duckett 1882, 1

<sup>994</sup> Wessex Archaeology 1993, 8

With the data provided from the late-eighteenth century county maps, supplemented by the enclosure maps and other primary and secondary sources, it was possible to produce a generalised characterisation map of Cumbria at the end of the eighteenth century. The character map of later medieval Cumbria, however, does contain white space, where no definitive evidence for settlement and field systems was identified. The county-scale of this study meant that there had to be a reliance on easily accessible sources, particularly published primary sources. Thus, it is likely that more detailed research at a parish or township scale would enable some of the gaps in the data to be filled. The mapped extent of the common arable fields, for both the later medieval and late eighteenth century maps, should be considered to be an approximation, as some reliance had to be placed on the HLC mapped data which could not always be verified from other sources. Despite the incomplete coverage, this study has brought together for the first time a wide and disparate range of historical cartographic, documentary and published data, in a digitised map relating to the landscape character of Cumbria. It has provided a mechanism with which to compare and contrast the landscape character of a study area with a widely varying topography and geology. It has also demonstrated the validity of the technique of combining HLC methods and map regression as a mechanism for investigating the later medieval landscape. It has demonstrated its applicability to any area which has appropriate post medieval map coverage.

### **The Medieval Landscape of Cumbria**

One of the aims of this study was to test the accuracy of the hypothesis that the late-eighteenth century county maps to a degree reflected the landscape characteristics which existed in the later medieval period. With regard to settlement and associated features such as the network of roads which connected them, this hypothesis appears to be proven. The extent of unenclosed land on the county maps, when enhanced by other map sources, also provides a broad impression of the likely extent of unenclosed land at the end of the Middle Ages. Other landscape characteristics, such as woodland distribution and the nature and distribution of field systems, cannot be inferred to any great extent from the late-eighteenth century county maps for Cumbria.<sup>995</sup> It should not be assumed that these maps provide an accurate representation of the late-medieval landscape, but they do provide a baseline for its investigation and interpretive reconstruction. The most significant enhancement to the baseline data was provided by

---

<sup>995</sup> Elsewhere, the county maps can be more useful for indicating the distribution of, at least, common arable fields, such as in Norfolk (MacNair and Williamson 2010)

enclosure and estate maps. These helped to reveal the existence and extent of some former common arable fields, as well as areas of historic enclosures. This information was not consistent across the study area but helped to confirm and, in some cases improve, the interpretive information on field systems taken from the HLC. The period between *c* 1600 and *c* 1770, though short, is one of significant political, social and economic change, which is reflected in the landscape. The processes of change were rapid, fuelled by population growth<sup>996</sup> and, especially from 1660 onwards, agricultural innovation<sup>997</sup> and the beginnings of globalisation.<sup>998</sup> Significant though these processes were, they were far less dramatic than the association of population growth and industrialisation that occurred in the period immediately following the creation of the county maps. Taking a map regression approach, using earlier post medieval estate maps, allows the processes of landscape change in the intervening centuries to be observed and highlighted through vignettes. These maps, along with place-name evidence and late-medieval documentary sources, facilitate an enhancement of the baseline data derived from the late-eighteenth century county maps. It is this enhancement which provided the basis for an interpretive reconstruction of the late medieval landscape.

The interpretive overview of the late medieval landscape cannot be seen as a ‘point in time’ statement. Rather, it is a cartographic representation of aspects of landscape character, which physically existed within a broad chronological framework between *c* 1300 and 1600. The overview enables historical processes to be visualised and plotted, such as common arable field farming, assarting and upland settlement formation. With regard to settlement, it has allowed a greater degree of analysis of the geographical variations between nucleated and dispersed settlement patterns, than has previously been possible. This analysis was used as a comparator with other analytical settlement data sets, such as Roberts and Wrathmell’s work on rural settlement.<sup>999</sup>

The creation of a digital map for the late medieval landscape was based on the distribution of unenclosed land and settlement. To this data layers were added on the distribution of enclosed land, common arable fields, woodland and parks. The evidence for these layers was taken largely from secondary and published primary documentary

---

<sup>996</sup> Wrigley and Schofield 1981, appendix 3; Clay 1984, 27-8

<sup>997</sup> Johnson 1996, 87-90, 206-211; Williamson 2000, 111-114; Aston and Bettey 1998

<sup>998</sup> Newman 2001, 6;

<sup>999</sup> Roberts and Wrathmell 2000

sources, enhanced where possible by early post medieval manuscript maps. Information on specialist settlements, such as granges and vaccaries, added greatly to identifying and plotting the location and extent of dispersed settlements in particular. There was little evidence on the actual extent of the holdings, and these had to be mapped using boundaries shown on modern and historic Ordnance Survey maps, dependent upon the legibility of landscape features of likely medieval origins, such as field patterns and boundary shapes.<sup>1000</sup> Only those features which could be verified by independent sources contributed to the map of medieval landscape character.

In mapping the medieval landscape a distribution of common arable fields in Cumbria was plotted for the first time. Plotting the likely extent of common arable fields assisted the understanding of the nature of common field farming across Cumbria, as well as the distribution of different types of common field systems and their relationships to settlement forms. It does not replace or even contradict earlier research,<sup>1001</sup> but has built a little upon it, and provided a graphic overview. The mapping of the late medieval landscape has also provided an impression of the extent of woodland, although it is likely to be an under-representation, as the landscape-scale of this study meant it was not possible to plot many small areas of gill woodland, even if they could be identified. This study has also produced a distribution of deer parks, based on the research of others.<sup>1002</sup> It has enabled a visualisation of the impact of specialist stock rearing and hunting on the landscape. It provides an analysis of lordly land-use in an upland area where different approaches to land management were necessary to respond to the challenges of a difficult terrain, in contrast to the management practised in either champion areas or in lowland 'ancient' countryside. The mapping has also been able to bring together a distribution of monastic lands, indicating the prominent role played by the monasteries, both in the control of land and in the encouragement of settlement expansion, especially in relation to discrete farmsteads.

There were areas for which no mappable data was found, resulting in white space on the map. The intention was to produce a map of reliable data, the quality of which could be verified, rather than trying to produce a complete coverage of the late medieval landscape. The issue of white space was addressed to an extent, however, by taking a characterisation-based approach to the late medieval landscape. This involved the sub-

---

<sup>1000</sup> See Chapter 6

<sup>1001</sup> Elliott 1959, 1960; Dilley 1972 and Roberts 2008

<sup>1002</sup> Mostly based on the personal research of Harry Hawkins

division of the study area into late medieval landscape character areas. Sufficient information on settlement, waste and field systems was mapped within this study to allow this. The character areas provided a Cumbria-wide, landscape-scale overview and prompted questions concerning diversity, differences and similarities.

The landscape character areas can be overlain with other data sets such as geomorphology and compared to other types of bounded areas mapped within this study, such as forests. This has allowed some broad conclusions to be drawn concerning the underlying factors behind regional difference. The landscape of the study area in the late medieval period was dominated by unenclosed land, the majority of which was common waste, and much of this was managed as forest or chase. The reason for this was at least partly topographical, with the Lake District massif dominating much of the centre, the Pennine chain occupying almost all of the eastern edge of the study area, and the two areas of upland being joined by the north end of the Howgill Hills in the south-east. Elsewhere, low moorland, mosses and poor soils account for many large areas of common waste, such as the Lazonby Ridge between the Lake District and the Pennines, and Anthorn Moss and Wedholme Flow on the Solway Plain. Geomorphology is not the only explanation behind such land use, however, as in some instances there are clear cultural associations. Patterns of lordship had an influence, for example on the predominance of unenclosed land and woodland in Westward, which became part of the Forest of Inglewood. The overall character of the Forest of Inglewood was dominated by unenclosed common waste with a mix of dispersed settlement and enclosures with small common arable fields, yet the agricultural land classification shows that most of this area is grade 3 and capable of crop production. This landscape pattern was found in a band which extended eastward from the edge of the Lake District to the Pennines, and took in the Lazonby Ridge, forming its own character area identified within this study as Inglewood and the Lower Eden Valley. An analysis of the landscape character map of the late medieval landscape reveals factors which influenced its development, other than geology and soils. East of the Lazonby Ridge, for example, part of the landscape lay within the Barony of Gilsland, an estate which appears to have been already long established by the time it was granted to Hubert de Vaux in 1157/8.<sup>1003</sup> It has been suggested that the vast common wastes within the Barony formed the de Vaux hunting reserves, which were known as the forest of Gilsland by 1256, even though no royal

---

<sup>1003</sup> Todd 1991 8-9

grant for a baronial forest survives.<sup>1004</sup> The character of the landscape within this area, therefore, appears to have been directly influenced by its management as hunting preserves, both in the Forest of Inglewood and the Barony of Gilsland.

The High Furness character area was also forest, though as part of a religious estate owned by Furness Abbey. This, too, seems to have been a significant factor in the development of its landscape character, when compared with neighbouring areas of similar geology and topography, such as the area of limestone low fells east of Windermere. Within High Furness, the settlement pattern was sparse, dominated by farms run directly by the Abbey as granges. Its main distinguishing characteristic, however, was the extent of its woodland, which would have been encouraged and managed not only for the hunt, but also because it was a valuable resource for woodland industry which was encouraged by the monks. The use of woodland for craft industries included charcoal production for iron bloomeries, a process which continued and grew after the Dissolution and into the post medieval period.

Within the Cumbria HLC, an attempt was made to measure the legacy of past landscape inheritance. These included field systems, boundaries and shapes. An attempt was made to assess the legibility of medieval legacy in the modern landscape, both in terms of its readability and the level to which it survived. This formed part of the HLC's role as a planning tool for landscape assessment. The very idea that the modern landscape, and even the late eighteenth century landscape, inherits much of its character from the Middle Ages has been challenged frequently. A number of leading academics consider the landscape to be primarily a product of the post medieval period.<sup>1005</sup> Williamson specifically contends that, '*the formation of the landscape archaeological record, however, is primarily a product not of the Middle Ages but rather of the post medieval period*'.<sup>1006</sup> What the HLC suggested, at least in Cumbria, was that this view under-represented the still-traceable influence of the Middle Ages, especially in relation to settlement layout, rural settlement relationships and field pattern and shape. Exploring this was an aim of the current study, and it has shown that the medieval legacy was especially manifest in the later eighteenth century landscape. In Scotland, the idea that the settlement pattern of the eighteenth century had been relatively static since the

---

<sup>1004</sup> Todd 1991 73-4

<sup>1005</sup> Palmer 2007, 1

<sup>1006</sup> Williamson 1998, 7



Middle Ages, has been effectively, and correctly, challenged.<sup>1007</sup> The extension of this challenge to much of England, however, is not appropriate, because in Scotland the ‘*late-eighteenth century improvement of the countryside radically altered the rural settlement pattern*’.<sup>1008</sup> Even so, in parts of Cumbria, most notably in the Bewcastle and Nichol Forest character area, the situation appears to have been akin to that in Scotland. In this character area, two phases of post medieval settlement replanning were carried out, and have masked the evidence for the medieval landscape.<sup>1009</sup> This area borders lowland Scotland and today noticeably shares landscape characteristics with it.<sup>1010</sup> For the most part, however, the study area did retain strong inherited medieval characteristics in its post medieval landscape.

### **The Eighteenth Century Landscape of Cumbria**

The baseline evidence for the analysis of the later medieval landscape was a map of the eighteenth century landscape, based primarily on the existing Cumbria HLC data set, tested and verified against data taken from the late-eighteenth century county maps and near-contemporary enclosure maps. This resulted in a composite map of the late eighteenth century landscape. The principal attributes of the map were settlement, woodland, unenclosed land, enclosed land and roads. Unlike the mapping for the medieval period, the map of late-eighteenth century Cumbria, whilst not a point in time depiction, does represent a snapshot of the landscape over a relatively short period.

The map still shows a landscape dominated by unenclosed land, much of which was held in common as it still is today.<sup>1011</sup> The farming landscape, however, was predominantly one of enclosure, with very little cultivatable land remaining under common arable fields. The mapped settlement pattern shows a distribution which was similar to those depicted by Roberts and Wrathmell<sup>1012</sup> and derived by them from mid-nineteenth century Ordnance Survey maps. The evidence for the impact of industry on the landscape in general, and on the development of new settlement in particular, is evident on the eighteenth century digital map, especially in Lancashire-over-Sands and on the west Cumberland coast near Whitehaven. For the most part, however, the map

---

<sup>1007</sup> Dalglish 2003, 27

<sup>1008</sup> Newman 2001, 120

<sup>1009</sup> See Chapter 6, character area 1, Bewcastle and Nichol Forest

<sup>1010</sup> C. Newman 2009, 200

<sup>1011</sup> Straughton 2008

<sup>1012</sup> Roberts and Wrathmell 2002

depicts a landscape still awaiting the full effects of industrialisation, especially in most of Cumberland. It is this lack of industrial character which most strongly distinguishes the late eighteenth century landscape from the mid-nineteenth century landscape mapped by Roberts and Wrathmell.

The mapping of eighteenth century landscape attributes allowed the identification of landscape character areas. The underlying effects of the topography of the study area were strongly influential in defining the character areas of the Lake District Fells and Valleys and the western boundary of the Pennines. This topographical effect was also noticeable in the character areas mapped for the later medieval period. Broadly, there is considerable similarity between the character areas for the eighteenth century and the medieval period. For the most part, the boundaries of the character areas on the coast, from the Cartmel Peninsula in the south to Anthorn and Wedholme Mosses in the north, are little changed. This is true, also, of the upland area on the eastern boundary of Cumbria, formed by the character areas of Gilsland, the Pennines and Alston.

The boundary continuity for the character areas of the eastern part of the study area from the medieval period to the eighteenth century are largely a product of topography. This is an area dominated by the Pennine hills, with areas capable of settlement restricted to narrow valleys, both around Alston and the upper reaches of the Irthing Valley in Gilsland. The reason for the continuity of large parts of the boundaries in the character areas of the west coast, however, requires further explanation. The most northerly character areas were dominated by large areas of unenclosed mosses and scattered farmsteads, with few nucleated settlements. Apart from an intensification of individual farms and cottages by the later eighteenth century, the overall settlement pattern remained the same, and mosses were not enclosed until after the late-eighteenth century county maps had been produced. The character areas along the west coast were partly self-defining, with the edge of the Lake District fells forming a natural boundary inland to the east. The division between the medieval and late-eighteenth century character area of the west coastal plain with the character area to the north, called the Ellen and Derwent Valleys for the medieval period and Workington and Broughton Moor in the late eighteenth century, was drawn along a change in settlement pattern. The Ellen and Derwent valleys had a nucleated settlement pattern associated with large areas of common arable, including outfields. By the later eighteenth century, the nucleated settlement pattern remained and intensified as the coal industry began to develop and Workington grew as a port. On the west Cumbria coast, even with the

beginning of some industrial development and the consequent growth of more nucleated settlement, it remained an area of discrete farms and cottages densely scattered across the countryside.

The boundaries of the High Furness character area also remained virtually unchanged from the medieval period to the late eighteenth century. Like the west coastal plain, some of this may have been attributable to the natural boundaries of Coniston Water and Windermere to west and east, but it also maintained significant landscape character differences from the areas surrounding it. The main landscape attribute which set it apart was the relatively large areas of woodland, with a dispersed settlement pattern. The woodland, which was probably encouraged in the medieval period for both hunting and industry, became an essential resource for the production of charcoal in the post medieval period. The settlement pattern remained one dominated by individual farms and small hamlets in the late eighteenth century, but intensified in density.

The medieval character area called The Fells draws together upland landscape from the Lake District massif, through the northern edge of the Howgill hills to the bottom end of the Pennine range at Stainmore. Unenclosed mountain and moor was the dominant feature, with a sparse settlement pattern. By the late eighteenth century, the settlement pattern had varied sufficiently, mainly through intensification, to divide Stainmore, Mallerstang and the northern edge of the Howgills into three separate character areas distinct from the Lake District. The Howgills were joined with the upper Lune valley to the north, which was considered to be part of the Eden Valley character area in the medieval period, as the piecemeal enclosure of common fields had created an enclosed landscape with a mixed settlement pattern linked to unenclosed grazing lands in the hills to the south. This naturally divided the Mallerstang and Stainmore areas from the Lake District Fells, and the first two areas were distinguished from each other by differences in settlement density.

The main areas of change between the medieval and late eighteenth century character areas were in Kendale and in the Eden Valley, Inglewood Forest, Carlisle and Solway Plain. In the late eighteenth century, Kendale is considered to have been divided into two character areas, with the division to the north of Kendal, where a band of new discrete settlements in the form of farms and cottages were created in the post medieval period. This area, distinguished as the North Kent Valley character area, had a significantly higher density of dispersed settlement than the area to the south. In the medieval period, however, this part of Kendale appeared little different in settlement

density. The main distinction was further south, where a group of nucleated settlements, interspersed with some individual farms and small clusters of dwellings, were set amongst a band of common arable fields. By the late eighteenth century, these common arable fields had been enclosed, and there was little to distinguish this area from the rest of Kendale to the north. The changes in the boundaries of character areas which covered the Eden Valley, Inglewood, Carlisle and the Solway Plain relate mainly to changes in the distribution of common arable fields. The process of piecemeal enclosure from the end of the medieval period up until the late eighteenth century, acted to blur the differences in the sizes of remaining common arable fields. This would also have resulted in more characterisation emphasis on the differences in settlement pattern by the late eighteenth century, for example where there were greater densities of dispersed settlement, and also those areas with greater proportions of unenclosed waste, such as Inglewood.

It is clear from both the medieval and late eighteenth century characterisation, that topography was an overriding influence in many areas. This should not surprise in a region where topography is still a significant feature of the modern landscape character. Where there are differences between the medieval and late eighteenth century character, this can sometimes be attributed to discrepancies in the availability of data between the two periods. Nevertheless, there are real differences in some areas, that are illustrative of processes of change, such as the reduction in common field farming in the post medieval period and the consequent progress of enclosure.

### **Discussion**

The methodology adopted in this study of combining HLC and map regression as a mechanism for investigating the later medieval landscape is applicable to other areas. It does rely on a reasonable availability of relevant post-medieval maps and a consistent coverage of accurate and trigonometrically surveyed maps. As such maps only date from the late eighteenth century, this means that for some places such as Scotland, the relevance of this approach would be undermined because of the significant landscape changes experienced there between the later medieval period and the late eighteenth century.<sup>1013</sup>

Like all HLC-based approaches, the methodology is capable of being scaled-down and being used at a more local level. In such cases, it would be essential to have a good

---

<sup>1013</sup> Dalgliesh 2003, 27; see also Dodgson 1998 and Aitchison and Cassell 2003

coverage of eighteenth century and earlier estate maps. These would have to provide a comprehensive coverage for the defined study area. Such a survey could be carried out for the Barony of Gilsland in Cumbria, for example, where there is total map coverage dating to the early seventeenth century.<sup>1014</sup> These maps, and the survey which accompanies them, were the subject of partial analysis in the early twentieth century.<sup>1015</sup> The maps provide details of individual holdings, both in common and severalty. Although lying beyond the scope of this study, two of the maps have been georeferenced, and this could be carried out for other maps in the collection. The drawback is the poor condition of some of the maps, which make details difficult to read. The potential exists, however, to develop a digitised, reconstructed and characterised depiction of the Barony of Gilsland in the early seventeenth century.

For Cumbria, the use of this methodology can be considered an alternative approach to a familiar subject. The medieval landscape of Cumbria has received relatively comprehensive coverage by Angus Winchester.<sup>1016</sup> His approach is that of an historian, where specific examples are examined in detail and conclusions are either implicitly or explicitly extrapolated from the particular to the general. This standard historical approach has the benefit of sound evidence for specific and spatially limited examples, but can be challenged when such evidence is used to make generalisations across wide areas of landscape, where both physical and social conditions may vary. The approach adopted in this study seeks to address variability<sup>1017</sup> by being a top-down overview of the landscape, interpreted from a consistent baseline.

The purpose of this study was not to produce a definitive, all encompassing examination of the later medieval to eighteenth century landscape, which is an impossible and pointless task, but to provide a different perspective to the traditional historical approach to landscape development.<sup>1018</sup> Taking an HLC-derived approach has achieved this. The weakness of this study's method is that, where it gains in consistency, it lacks in detail. This study's HLC approach and the traditional historical approach, however do appear to be complementary and combining them helps to provide a more complete picture of a regional landscape and of the developmental processes within it. In particular, this study has been able to illuminate more clearly the processes of settlement

---

<sup>1014</sup> CCA DHN/C713-001 to DHN/C713-013

<sup>1015</sup> Graham 1907, 1920, 1926

<sup>1016</sup> Winchester 1987

<sup>1017</sup> Johnson 2007, 124

<sup>1018</sup> Turner 2007, 45

formation in Cumbria, especially for discrete farmsteads scattered across the landscape. Furthermore, it has facilitated the development of a map of Cumbria's late medieval landscape components where no such map existed previously and in so doing provides a landscape context for site specific archaeological data.