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Recent publications in local history 171
‘Historians in general have long ignored the potentialities of our subject. And when they have taken notice they have, with one or two exceptions, tended to see architectural history as a handmaiden to the documents, enlivening the page with a picture or providing a snippet of information on a minor point. That architectural history may be a partner, that it may reveal trends or developments which the documents are ignorant of, or unequivocal about, is an idea rarely entertained’ (Eric Mercer)1

Introduction
This article provides an overview of some important developments in vernacular architecture studies and a commentary on the relationship between this relatively recent area of research and the discipline of local history. In some respects this division is artificial, for the two disciplines are closely related. Moreover, some scholars of vernacular architecture view themselves as local historians first and foremost and see the evidence of the built environment primarily as a vehicle for developing a more profound understanding of local communities. Similarly, some local historians study vernacular buildings as a logical extension of their engagement with the documentary record and, as I will emphasise, the activities of local historians have been instrumental in establishing and driving forward the academic study of vernacular architecture at national and regional level. Like every discipline, the study of vernacular buildings has evolved a specific terminology—a kind of technical shorthand—which enables researchers to name key structural features and to communicate across regional divides. This often confuses those new to the subject, but it should not dissuade local historians (or anyone else) from engaging with the research data, since there are excellent and beautifully-illustrated handbooks which guide the user through the terminology and the techniques used to investigate and date buildings.2

The technical aspect of the study of vernacular buildings may be one reason why local historians have not always given the built environment the attention it deserves. Many only pay lip service to the buildings which survive in particular communities (in the manner bemoaned by Mercer above) by including a handful of historic black and white photographs of street scenes or by providing superficial insights based on a cursory examination of the structural evidence (an examination often limited to the exterior of the buildings in question). There are, of course, exceptions. Nat Alcock’s People at Home: Living in a Warwickshire Village, 1500-1800, published in 1993, combines what might be termed a ‘traditional’ local history approach with a superb, analytical study of the surviving buildings of Stoneleigh.3 A recent example is the wonderful Burford: Buildings and People in a Cotswold Town, published by members of the Oxfordshire Vernacular Buildings Group in collaboration with the Victoria County History in 2008.4 On the whole, however, the exemplary treatment of the archaeological evidence of the surviving vernacular buildings found in these books sets them apart from what might be termed ‘mainstream’ local history.
Before readers jump to the defence of local history and local historians, let me say, firstly, that although much of my own research focuses on buildings I consider myself a local historian, and secondly, that the very mixed success of local history in integrating the research and methodological approaches of vernacular architecture studies is not entirely the fault of local historians. Much of the blame must rest with historians of vernacular architecture. By focusing on the details of vernacular buildings to the virtual exclusion of anything else, they have unwittingly created barriers to communication with those in related fields such as local history. Rather than reaching out to local historians, the subject of vernacular architecture has tended towards insularity—which in turn has isolated vernacular architecture studies as a separate discipline and estranged it from those working in related fields, an estrangement which Eric Mercer bemoaned in the opening quotation.

This is quite perverse as well as rather sad. It is hardly controversial, after all, to point out that because vernacular buildings reflect the area in which they are built, they in many ways embody the ‘local characteristics’ or the ‘local character’ of any locality. Thus, when one crosses the divide between the Fens of East Anglia and the Jurassic Belt of midland England the transition is marked in particular by a change in relief and the change in building materials employed in the historic building stock. However, local historians are not alone in frequently failing to place vernacular buildings in a sound local context. Buildings historians and vernacular architecture specialists once again deserve some criticism on this count, for they often ignore the landscape setting or context in which the buildings they study are located. They thereby diminish the intimate relationship which once existed between ‘building’ and ‘place’, and, in doing so, have created an unhelpful divide between the built environment and the wider historic landscape. This is unfortunate, since variations in historic housing stocks and the modern distributions of vernacular buildings can only be fully understood by placing both in a meaningful landscape context. Individual vernacular buildings (whether granaries, barns, mills or houses) can only be fully understood through examination of their precise ‘local context’—in particular the local economy which they were designed to accommodate, the size and status of the resident household and, crucially, the landscape setting which often determined the disposition of structures within a tenement or farmyard, and the presence or absence of decorative elements.

In this article I have drawn on a range of evidence, but my work as lecturer in local and regional studies at the University of East Anglia means that many of the examples used are East Anglian. However, the principles discussed have a wider application, and one of my key concerns is that local historians and vernacular architecture specialists, wherever they are based—he it in the north, west, south or east—should develop and maintain a reciprocal dialogue and engagement which also cuts across professional-amateur boundaries. A great deal of cutting-edge research into vernacular buildings can be readily accessed in journals such Vernacular Architecture (produced by the Vernacular Architecture Group or VAG). Buildings historians and local historians alike should be aware that much valuable research into the built environment has been pioneered by specialists in related fields—agricultural historians, economic historians, historical geographers, archaeologists and dendrochronologists. As well as shedding new light on individual buildings and building assemblages, their work provides profound insights into the context in which buildings were created. They help us to develop a sense of place.

**A sense of place**

Most of us develop such a sense of place but find it difficult to articulate this abstract concept. For some, ‘place’ is about relationships with others—family, friends and
and for many it emerges from interaction with the local environment, with its weather, relief, and unique disposition of woods, roads, greens, heaths, fells, hedges and fields. But one of the most important factors in developing a sense of place is the built environment—the particular combination of materials, styles and periods of building which give localities their unique character. Before the arrival of high speed, efficient transport systems, which enabled building materials to be rapidly and cheaply conveyed between and within regions (irrespective of their appropriateness), a sense of place was even more profoundly reflected in the buildings in which people lived and worked. It is odd, therefore, that historians of vernacular architecture—that type of architecture which is more wedded to ‘place’ than any other—often give detailed consideration to the plans of buildings yet little or none to the surrounding landscape. Studies of vernacular architecture often touch briefly upon geology, because it relates to the building materials in a district, county or region, but, with some notable exceptions, they rarely attempt to relate historic housing stocks (or modern patterns of survival) to historic variations in soil quality, or the consequent variations in farming regimes and social structures.

This criticism can be levelled even at recently published studies of vernacular architecture which, while excelling in relaying the minutiae of structural forms and materials, are less successful in examining or explaining the economic and social factors which prompted their creation or survival. Regional and sub-regional variations in historic and modern distributions of vernacular houses can only be properly understood by developing an awareness of such variations, although understanding the landscape context within which vernacular buildings were erected is as important at the ‘micro’ level as at the ‘macro’. At the level of the parish or even the individual property, vernacular houses may exhibit characteristics which reflect their physical location or role within the local economy. Crucially, these characteristics do not only reflect the availability of different building materials. They are, instead, the product of a more complex set of factors. Foremost among these is the type of farm attached to a farmhouse. Though it is glaringly obvious, local historians and buildings historians often overlook the fact that farmhouses were more than just houses: they were also units of production in which agricultural produce was stored, processed, finished and often (in the case of beer) sold on the premises.

As Thirsk has shown, certain types of agriculture allowed farmers sufficient flexibility on a day-to-day basis to engage in part-time industrial activities. Though discouraged by central government, the process of rural industrialisation accelerated dramatically during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and it became usual for craftsmen in rural areas to operate a farm, and for farmers to engage in industrial manufacture. For farmers, part-time engagement in industry provided a useful supply of ready cash. The wares produced in rural areas were often of a lesser quality (the best stuffs being made in the towns and marketed to a wealthier clientele) but as levels of rural wealth increased so too did the demand for such goods. Arable farming was labour intensive and left little time for part-time employment, but in pastoral areas rural industries such as weaving found what Thirsk has termed a ‘congenial home’. In pasture-farming areas, ‘people had time on their hands that could be devoted to industrial work, and … they also had the freedom, and the land, to attract additional workers if their industry flourished’.

Evans found that in the ‘wood-pasture’ areas of East Anglia, where pasture farming and dairying, in particular, were dominant, part-time employment in rural industries was a key factor in maintaining the prosperity of the local economy: ‘The importance of by-industries as one of the main factors which made it possible for wood-pasture
regions to support a high density of small farms which provided their owners with a comfortable standard of living, cannot be over-emphasised. In the South Norfolk claylands many farmers supplemented farm incomes by engaging in by-industries, reflected in the number of spinning wheels and looms recorded in their probate inventories. The development of dual income strategies inevitably had implications for the way in which houses were organised. There is some evidence, for example, to suggest that in South Norfolk the provision of double butteries reflected the increasing importance of commercial brewing among yeoman farmers. Similarly, attics with dormer windows made an early appearance in local farmhouses. This subtle yet important change may reflect the use of attics as a weaving facility, something very common in the City of Norwich. These idiosyncrasies should be taken into account when interpreting surviving houses in any area where a pastoral economy resulted in a tendency towards dual occupations. Again, local historians, with their finger on the pulse of local industrial occupations, are well equipped to provide key insights into the linkages between farming, industry and the organisation of domestic and commercial space.

Tom Williamson has recently argued that more research should be focused on the relationship between the size of farmhouses and that of their farms. This relationship might be complex and indirect, and confused by factors such as the extent of common grazing, but establishing broad estimates is potentially achievable in areas where good documentary sources exist. My research in Norfolk has demonstrated that farm size is a crucial factor in the survival of farmhouses. In a study of eight parishes a consistent relationship emerged between survival of pre-1750 properties and the size of the farms attached to them. Put simply, ‘surviving early houses (of pre-1750 date) were owned by a better class of landlord and were lived in by a more substantial and (in all likelihood) a more polite group of respectable, well-to-do tenants than was the case with respect to post-1750 properties’. Indeed, survival was far more dependent on farm size than on tenure. Even in East Anglia, where free tenure was far more prevalent than in most parts of the country, copyhold was the norm in the eight parishes in question and very few surviving early houses were owned by freeholders. Owner-occupation appears not to have been an important factor in survival. On the contrary, surviving houses tended to be sub-let.

However, continuity of function was as important as farm size in ensuring survival. Properties which remained as farmhouses into the nineteenth century were much more likely to survive into the twentieth than those which had lost that status. Their continuing role as the foci of generally large working farms and their function as a ‘draw’ for well-heeled tenants meant they escaped the subdivision and downgrading which awaited many other properties. These findings reinforced my earlier research which revealed a direct relationship between the complexity of messuages, as depicted on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century maps, and the survival of these messuages as residential plots. Simple messuages containing a farmhouse and no other ancillary agricultural buildings were notably less likely to survive into the twentieth century than complex messuages with two or more structures. These discoveries suggest that much can be gained by placing individual buildings and larger groups into their proper geographical, economic and social context. They also support Chris Currie’s assertion that survival is determined less by variations in housing at the time of construction, and more by a selective process of attrition in later periods.

The status of owners is another key consideration. Some gentlemen, for example, were able to disengage from farming and, instead, to sub-let their land for a cash rent, or to loan money at interest within the local credit network. Thus Hugh Painter, yeoman,
and Thomas Chieney, gentleman, of East Dereham in Norfolk farmed holdings of between 80 and 100 acres and had possessions of similar value. But while livestock and crops made up nearly 50 per cent of Painter’s wealth, they accounted for only 10 per cent of Chieney’s, for he had invested over 80 per cent of his entire worth in the local credit market. One worked for his living while the other had his capital do it for him. Gentleman farmers like Chieney could do without the plethora of service rooms required by ‘hands-on’ yeomen like Painter, so their houses looked very different. Yeoman houses were, in turn, often quite dissimilar to those of husbandmen. A study of service rooms listed in Norfolk probate inventories has shown that, for example, larders, wool houses, quernhouses, storehouses, brewhouses and sculleries, often listed in yeoman inventories, do not appear in those of husbandmen or labourers. These peculiarities within the Norfolk housing stock may appear inconsequential but in fact have significant implications for the way in which household activities were organised, and on the development of the historic housing stock more generally.

Greater attention should also be given to the original landscape setting within which buildings were erected, since this has often changed greatly over time because of processes such as parliamentary enclosure and modern development (see fig.1). Williamson has pointed out that ‘most houses, especially on the southern [Norfolk] clays, originally stood on the edges of commons and were often viewed at close quarters—and from different, and a greater range of, perspectives—than now. Such patterns of movement and access need to be reconstructed if we are to appreciate, for example, the different treatments given to the different facades of a house’. Understanding the original disposition of features such as routeways, gardens, home closes and farm buildings is also crucial in reconstructing the landscape setting of farmhouses. How important, for example, was the spatial arrangement of service rooms (such as butteries, dairies, pantries, bakehouses), living rooms and outbuildings for the smooth and efficient operation of the farm economy? Was a particular spatial proximity between house and barn favoured and, if so, why? Recently, historians of vernacular architecture have begun to give greater attention to the ways in which social space inside houses was used, applying archaeological techniques such as ‘planning analysis’, but the study of how houses relate to farmyards and the secondary structures within them has been neglected. We might also ask about the importance of wider environmental factors. A Herefordshire study demonstrated a close relationship between the orientation of hall houses and prevailing winds in the Middle Ages. Was this normal in other localities, and to what extent did such environmental factors continue to influence the orientation of farmhouses once the open hall and cross-passage had disappeared? The case for developing a greater understanding of the ‘micro-landscape’ context of vernacular buildings is compelling and one with which vernacular architecture specialists and local historians need to engage more systematically.

Formalism

The discipline of vernacular architecture studies has been (and arguably continues to be) dominated by traditional approaches which focus primarily, and often exclusively, on the structural forms of those buildings which still stand in the modern landscape. But Chris Currie warns that it is dangerous to assume that the surviving houses of a given area are truly representative, and Eric Mercer argued that the obsession with structural forms (which he termed ‘formalism’) meant that the study of structural detail became an end itself, which in turn undermined the development of a healthy interaction with historians (including local historians) and archaeologists working in
related fields of enquiry. He suggested that, as a result, the wider implications of vernacular architecture studies had remained largely unfulfilled,22 a view reinforced by recent research by Chris Currie demonstrating that little progress has been made in progressing interdisciplinary studies of vernacular architecture in the past 40 years.23

Mercer also drew attention to what he labelled ‘Generalised Regionalism’, an obsession with a division of the country into Highland and Lowland zones ‘each with its age-old elements giving rise to traditions seen almost as Laws of Nature, eternal and unchanging’. As he was acutely aware, this over-simplified division obscured the major variations in landscape and building traditions within regions: the similarities between areas in different zones were often greater than the dissimilarities. He pleaded for research ‘into those differences and variations within the zones which might be of value to wider readers’, a point which should not be lost on local historians.24 Ever since the study of vernacular architecture in Britain was pioneered by S. O. Addy and C. F. Innocent at the turn of last the century,25 building historians and archaeologists have expended considerable energy in attempting to classify buildings or divide them into readily identifiable groupings. As one scholar has recently pointed out,

1. White Cottage, The High Common, Wacton, Norfolk: this well-preserved farmhouse built in the late-fourteenth century stands on the edge of the 160-acre High Common. It is a classic example of an open hall farmhouse and is set within the kind of ‘wood-pasture’ landscape synonymous with the claylands of central East Anglia. It is impossible to understand how a building like this functioned without first appreciating the significance of its location and the availability of extensive areas of common grazing which enabled relatively small farms to be profitable (Adam Longcroft)
‘classifying buildings into ‘types’ constitutes the largest body of analytical material produced on urban and rural buildings’. One of the first distinctions to be drawn was that between ‘lowland’ and ‘highland’ building traditions but as research progressed it became apparent that variations within each zone were so pronounced as to make the distinction virtually meaningless.

The temptation to classify structural elements is reflected in the many attempts to organise key features into rudimentary typological sequences. Perhaps the best-known example is the huge body of work on cruck roofs. Another example is the study of plan forms. As part of the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments survey of Cambridgeshire, Peter Eden produced a new framework which he felt reflected the variety of vernacular houses encountered in the field. First published in 1968 in the volume for West Cambridgeshire, it was a classification based on plan-forms. Eden divided the plans seen in surviving houses into twelve distinct types: A, B, C, and D contained open halls and were medieval, while H, I, J, K, L, S, T and U were post-medieval. The publication of the North-East Cambridgeshire volume (1972) saw the addition of two further classes of post-medieval plan (F and G). Eden’s classification is reproduced here in full (fig.2). He acknowledged that classification has its pitfalls: ‘A body of material, such as the small houses of West Cambridgeshire, is in fact a continuum, any classification of which entails arbitrary division’. The validity of typologies is largely semantic since most buildings are the product of many separate phases of construction and are ‘rarely without the peculiarities which encourage us to think of them as deviations from their type’. Labelling buildings can thus disguise the true complexity of their historical development and diversity. Eden himself recognised that buildings with identical plans could look and be used very differently and noted that activities in houses ‘are not necessarily assigned to constituent rooms in a standardised way’. In 1968 he also published an essay which sought to demonstrate that the alphabetic classification of post-medieval plan forms, developed in the light of his experience in Cambridgeshire, had considerable potential for the study of houses across a much wider geographical area, a theme which he further developed the following year in a publication for the Historical Association. Eden’s classification had considerable impact on vernacular architecture researchers in the early 1970s and greatly influenced the RCHME surveys of South-East and North Dorset.

However, research in areas more distant from the South East revealed the limitations of Eden’s classification when applied to housing stocks less influenced by East Anglian building traditions. Regional studies published by the Royal Commission in the 1980s, in areas outside South East England, showed that it had little relevance, so it was abandoned. The RCHME survey for Northamptonshire proposed an entirely new classification because that ‘devised to deal with the lowland area in RCHM, Cambs I and II proved not to be directly applicable to the houses in the Jurassic stone belt’. In his study of the houses of Hertfordshire, J.T. Smith discovered that houses of one build conforming to a type were extremely rare. Rather, ‘the notion of types arising mainly through alteration’ was closer to reality. He concluded that what was really needed was a ‘typology of transformation’. Thus, after initial acceptance, Eden’s classification fell into disrepute and disuse. A system devised for lowland Cambridgeshire was found to be ill-suited not only to upland, pastoral areas in the north and west, but also to less distant counties such as Hertfordshire.

However, despite their limitations, classifications like that proposed by Eden and, more recently, by myself do enable scholars to make sense of complex bodies of information and to shift from the particular to the general. This process of generalisation enables us to create order from a potentially unruly assemblage and to identify patterns or processes requiring explanation. Classification is not an end in itself, but a means to an end. Local historians need to develop a greater awareness of the research in this area in order to
develop a better understanding of the buildings in their own localities. Furthermore, establishing the underlying rationale for variations in plans and room-usage requires a deeper understanding of the documentary record, and in particular sources such as probate inventories. Here local historians have an important role in progressing our understanding of how vernacular buildings actually functioned and why those of one locality differ from those of another.

We should resist the temptation to shoehorn vernacular buildings into pre-existing classifications and respect the fact that buildings are constructed by individuals with a wide range of needs. Sometimes, this results in unconventional or even downright weird solutions. It is important to remember, however, that one unusual house, or even a series of them, does not negate the value of a classification—unless, of course, these buildings share sufficient similarities to justify their recognition within a revised classification as a hitherto unrecognised type.

Research by local historians into vernacular buildings undoubtedly has the potential to shed new light on wider themes of social, economic, agricultural, and cultural history. However, to achieve this local historians need to ask the right questions of the evidence. For instance, why were certain types of vernacular building adopted in particular areas at a particular time and at a particular social level? Addressing such questions requires an approach which considers individual buildings and groups of buildings within the context of regional and local variations in farming economies and social structures—a good reason (if one were needed) for local historians to work together, and where possible across parish or even county boundaries—and to extend their studies to encompass distinctive farming regions or sub-regions.

**Vernacular thresholds**

As Currie was keen to emphasise in the 1980s, those vernacular buildings which survive in our modern landscape are not necessarily representative of the wider housing stock which existed at any given point in the past. Ronald Brunskill had
previously drawn attention to this by articulating the ‘vernacular threshold’, a key concept which few local historians have articulated or given proper emphasis in their studies. Brunskill used a simple graph to illustrate the fact that buildings which survive from a given period only provide partial insights into the true nature and complexity of vernacular construction, and these insights become less reliable and more fragmentary the further back in time we go (fig.3). Take the pattern of survival in the city of Norwich and the county of Norfolk. Norwich had a population larger than that of York during the Middle Ages, but only 214 buildings survive from before 1700 and these are mostly larger structures associated with a tiny social elite. Only twelve buildings predate 1500, all associated with a wealthy merchant class. The smallest surviving pre-1500 building in the city, Pykerell’s House on St Mary’s Plain, was built by Thomas Pykerell, mayor. With a ground area of some 95 m² it is between four and five times larger than the average size of excavated houses in Norwich. Recent detailed investigation of the surviving houses in the small Norfolk market town of New Buckenham failed to identify any building from before 1400 and those from the fifteenth century are important buildings of high status. We know next to nothing about the two and a half centuries of building which followed the town’s creation in the mid-twelfth century. In Norfolk standing buildings dating from before 1300 are very rare indeed and are heavily skewed towards the largest and grandest structures.

One could argue that to understand those buildings which lie above the ‘vernacular threshold’ (i.e. those which survive) it is crucial to understand those which lie below it—which have failed to survive and exist only as archaeological features below ground. Unfortunately, what one might term the genealogy of the extant building
stock has often been overlooked. I have recently considered the place of clay-walled buildings in this genealogy. It is a category of buildings which is little understood precisely because in most areas medieval examples have been entirely eradicated by later phases of rebuilding.44 Since clay-walled buildings do not survive from before 1400 we must look elsewhere for evidence of their geographical range and form. Documentary sources provide a potentially rich avenue for research. Unfortunately, as Mercer and Currie have pointed out, the potential of the documentary record remains largely unfulfilled.45

The second key source for the study of medieval clay-walled buildings is the archaeological excavation reports conducted on medieval sites from the 1950s to the present day. Several excavations took place on deserted village sites in Norfolk in the 1960s and ‘70s, such as those at North Elmham, Grenstein and Thuxton,46 and large-scale urban excavations were conducted under the auspices of the Norwich Survey, a ground-breaking and ambitious interdisciplinary study. Others took place in King’s Lynn and Great Yarmouth. As in most other counties, excavations in Norfolk have been limited to large medieval boroughs on the one hand and small deserted village settlements on the other. Between these two extremes of success and failure are numerous surviving villages and small market towns. Christopher Dyer points out that at any time between 1270 and 1525 there were at least 600 small towns with populations of less than 2,000, with in total around 400,000 people or a tenth of the population.47 These places have received comparatively little attention from archaeologists despite their obvious importance.48 As most archaeologists will testify, retrieving reliable information about medieval buildings is often hampered by the poor preservation of contemporary layers, especially on street frontages which have been subjected to repeated redevelopment over many centuries. Clay buildings are particularly difficult to identify within an excavation, for their remains are usually fragmentary or poorly preserved. Identifying evidence of clay walls requires a very keen eye. However, enough data exists to allow me to construct a coherent picture of the emergence and development of a clay-walled building tradition in medieval Norfolk. This demonstrates the value of excavation evidence in reconstructing patterns of building and identifying building traditions which predate those visible in the modern landscape. Local historians have a rich seam of data to mine here, though it is all too often overlooked, partly because of its technical complexity and partly, one suspects, because of the dry and inaccessible manner in which archaeologists often present their findings.

Central to the debate concerning ‘vernacular thresholds’ are the factors which determine the survival of some buildings and the destruction of others. Excavations by Wrathmell at the deserted medieval village site of West Whelpington in Northumberland revealed a series of buildings which seemed to conform remarkably closely to the vernacular tradition of the area as revealed by surviving houses. He suggested that they should be viewed either as ‘permanent’ structures that failed to survive because they could not be adapted to meet changing housing standards or, alternatively, as examples of ‘semi-permanent’ building which ‘occupied the gap between impermanent earth-fast buildings and fully permanent structures’.49 Wrathmell argued that the distinction between ‘semi-permanent’ and ‘permanent’ construction was essentially that of a shifting balance between cost and maintenance: ‘the peasant farmers of Northumberland constructed low cost buildings which would stand for centuries provided that they were subject to a high degree of maintenance and repair. They are thus distinguished from permanent dwellings which involved high cost and a low level of maintenance’.50 The concept of semi-permanent
construction is not easy to assimilate and some would argue that it is inherently contradictory—either a building is permanent or it is not. It is also difficult to reconcile the survival of clay houses with Wrathmell’s argument about the cost of maintenance. Clay-walled houses required careful and continuous maintenance (especially with respect to the external render), but this was extremely cheap and simple to execute, requiring few specialised skills. However, I believe that the most important element in Wrathmell’s argument is the concept of ‘adaptability’: a building will survive only if it capable of being easily adapted to accommodate changing standards of living or shifting expectations of domestic comfort.

The centrality of ‘adaptability’ to our understanding of vernacular thresholds was reinforced by Chris Currie, who questioned the assumption that a direct link existed between the survival of numerous houses of a given date in a region and the economic prosperity of that region. He proposed, instead, that the survival of vernacular houses may be determined less by contemporary variations in regional prosperity and housing quality than by extraneous forces which selectively destroyed early houses. The implication was that small differences in attrition rates could mean dramatic differences in survival. Currie postulated not only that the richest areas could have the fewest surviving houses but also that the earliest surviving houses in an area may not have differed significantly in construction and quality from their lost contemporaries and predecessors. It is not necessary, he argued, to assume that the earlier houses were less robustly constructed than later ones: far more important was the form buildings took and their potential for adaptation.

This begs the question: were most medieval houses permanent structures which failed to survive through ill-luck or external factors, or were they essentially impermanent buildings which possessed characteristics that critically undermined their longevity? The requirement for continuous maintenance of clay-walled buildings seems unconvincing as the principal cause of their disappearance, since numerous cob [mud] buildings of late medieval date have survived in Devon, Somerset and Cumbria. The catastrophic attrition of medieval houses in many areas may therefore be the product not of a failure of long-term maintenance but of a fundamental lack of adaptability. As Currie has argued, the ‘superstructure’ of medieval buildings determined their ability to survive—not their foundations, quality of craftsmanship or quality of materials. He identified a new fashion for higher eaves and taller proportions as a critical factor in the near total disappearance of pre-1350 houses in Devon. There, low-eaved cruck houses were rebuilt or replaced by high-eaved cruck houses during the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In Worcestershire, too, surviving cruck houses were built sufficiently high to accommodate inserted upper floors. The survival of cruck houses in Devon was therefore determined less by the ability of sophisticated foundations to withstand gales and resist rot and decay, than by the ability of buildings to accommodate changing expectations of domestic comfort and access to first-floor space in later periods. Basically, the height of buildings played a vital role in determining whether they survived.

This interpretation, which places the height of buildings at the centre of discussions about survivability, is supported by Alcock’s study of crucks in England. He noted that fourteenth-century crucks survive in far fewer numbers than their fifteenth and sixteenth century counterparts even though remaining examples suggest that they were of comparable quality. Though evidently built to last for centuries, ‘they were intended for single-storey houses, and this has led to their wholesale replacement’. In Lancashire, Yorkshire, Cumbria, and Northumbria, where cruck houses remained truly single-storied, few survive from earlier periods. Research by Dave Stenning into
medieval aisled halls in Essex revealed that these structures, although based on high-status examples, were imitated relatively low down the social scale from a fairly remote time in the Middle Ages. Crucially, aisled halls have survived in considerable numbers in the county while halls associated with cross-wing buildings have not. Stenning suggests this is probably because aisled halls provided ‘the ideal framework for a modest cottage’. Pearson has suggested that a large number of well-built but low and possibly aisled buildings in Kent were destroyed after the Middle Ages. Built during the economic depression of the first half of the fifteenth century, they were on a less grand scale than their late fourteenth-century predecessors and less suited to subsequent adaptation: ‘as a result most of them have been engulfed in later alterations or swept away’. The central messages to emerge from all this are that size does matter after all and that economic slumps may in the past have resulted, temporarily at least, in the building of what may be viewed as ‘semi-permanent’ houses which were later replaced by ‘permanent’ examples.

The key to the disappearance of the medieval houses in many areas is almost certainly that the vast majority were of single-storey construction. Such houses had a built-in disadvantage when it came to adaptability: namely, their limited capacity to accommodate changing patterns of domestic living. It is likely that when two-storey living became fashionable in the sixteenth century, those who could afford to build according to the new fashion could also afford to use more advanced and expensive building materials such as brick and stone. In Norwich, the abandonment of clay building in favour of flint rubble ground-floor walls with timber-framed upper storeys occurred abruptly in the early 1500s. Fire was undoubtedly an important factor in this sudden change. Two major fires in 1507 alone destroyed a reported 718 houses (perhaps 40 per cent of the properties in the city). As the vast majority of roofs were of thatch, the fires would have destroyed clay houses as well as those of timber construction. However, although the fires were probably not selective in terms of their impact, they offered a chance to start rebuilding with a ‘clean sheet’. The city authorities learned an important lesson from this experience and the subsequent rebuilding programme was deliberately and systematically executed in stone, flint, brick and, crucially, non-combustible tile as the preferred roofing material. Despite the inevitable shortages of building material which must have accompanied this rebuilding of England’s second city, clay walls were eschewed in favour of more fashionable alternatives which also lent themselves to two-storey designs. By the mid-1500s the standard method of construction combined a rubble-built, fireproof ground floor, with a jettied timber-framed upper storey and a fire-resistant (and comparatively light) pantile roof. Those clay-walled buildings dating from the first major phase of rebuilding in the city (in 1300-1450) which had managed to survive a second wave of rebuilding between 1470 and 1530, were eradicated during a third which is now dated to 1670-1730.

While some medieval buildings were robustly constructed and have survived to the present in various parts of the country, these are exceptional examples, on a larger scale and capable in later centuries of adapting to and accommodating changing standards of domestic comfort and a fashion for two-storey living in later centuries. But the medieval clay-walled houses of Norfolk, for example, were essentially ‘impermanent’, single-storey structures ill-equipped to accommodate such changes. For single-storey buildings like these (and those built from other materials like timber), changing fashions and domestic organisation required demolition rather than adaptation. In Norfolk, as in many other counties, the widespread adoption of more fashionable materials in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—particularly flint and brick—contributed to the wholesale replacement of earlier buildings.
Hoskins and the ‘Great Rebuilding’

W.G. Hoskins, in so many ways a key figure in the development of local history, also helped to legitimise vernacular architecture studies (though he never used this phrase himself) by using evidence from vernacular buildings to demonstrate wider changes in society. His postulation of a ‘Great Rebuilding’, first published in 1953, has been described as ‘one of the most influential concepts in the development of vernacular architecture’. It fired the imagination of a generation of academics at a time when the study of vernacular buildings in England was in its infancy. Few attempts had been made to record surviving buildings systematically or to place them into a meaningful historical context. Although pioneering books by Addy and Innocent had been published half a century earlier, the only reliable field-based studies that Hoskins was able to cite were those of Barley in Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire, Fox and Raglan in Monmouthshire, and Walton in the Yorkshire Dales. By drawing on these and his own observations over many years Hoskins identified what he believed to be convincing evidence for a ‘Great Rebuilding’ between 1570 and 1640. Although there were areas of England (in particular the four most northerly counties) where the rebuilding process appeared to begin much later than this, these were seen as exceptions to a wider rule. He felt that the Great Rebuilding took two main forms: the rebuilding of existing houses and fresh building on new sites. The emphasis on each varied from place to place, with modernisation characteristic in some parts of the country and complete rebuilding in others. Notwithstanding these variables, Hoskins felt that the evidence for a Great Rebuilding between 1570 and 1640 was abundant and inescapable ‘from Cornwall up to Lancashire, and from Herefordshire across to Suffolk’. He identified three principal causes of this Great Rebuilding.

First, there were rising levels of wealth among the middling classes of rural society, in particular ‘the bigger husbandmen, the yeomen and the lesser gentry’. In Wigston Magna, a parish which he studied in enormous detail, building was spearheaded by a peasant aristocracy which he defined as ‘a class of capitalist peasants who owned substantially larger farms and capital resources than the general run of village farmers’. Second, he saw the growth in population during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as inextricably linked with the Great Rebuilding, but a lack of reliable population statistics for the period left him unsure of the nature of the relationship. And third, Hoskins viewed the increasing desire for privacy as one of the defining characteristics of the Jacobethan period. Privacy had formerly been enjoyed only by the upper classes and its filtering down to ‘the masses’ constituted a marked departure. He placed the Great Rebuilding within a sequential model of long-term social and economic change, arguing that ‘The sequence in England seems to be: Savings—rebuilding and enlargement—decreased mortality and perhaps higher fertility—rise of population—new building and development of congestion—rise in mortality rates’.

The ‘Great Rebuilding’ between 1570 and 1640 quickly became a key assumption within the fledgling discipline of vernacular architecture studies. The power of Hoskins’s ‘Big Idea’ lay in its simplicity and its apparent universality. The theory and the surviving buildings seemed to produce a good fit and provided a convenient framework for future research. Crucially, the theory also seemed to provide a convincing parallel to the research of social and economic historians which by the 1940s had identified the emergence of a new and prosperous ‘middle class’ in England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For example, had described the period between Elizabeth and the Restoration as ‘a great age for the rural middle class’. As Matthew Johnson has argued, Hoskins’s theory ‘was thus
elevated from the status of a plausible hypothesis to that of a key principal assumption’ and it continued to influence the thinking of historians at regional level into the 1960s and 1970s.67

There is little evidence to suggest that Hoskins subscribed to Marxist theories of social and economic change, but little doubt that his ideas were influential among those who did. His linkage of the Great Rebuilding with an emergent group of middle class ‘capitalist’ farmers was in tune with the Marxist belief in an inevitable and universal transition in all societies from feudalism to capitalism. Although the first national study of English vernacular architecture, written by Eric Mercer in 1975, contained no direct reference to the theory of the Great Rebuilding,68 Mercer’s own ‘Big Idea’—that regional differences in building styles and chronology could be explained by a single process of change that simply began and ended at different times in different parts of the country—was itself derived from Marxist ideology and could be viewed as a natural extension of Hoskins’s original theory.

Hoskins rested his theory on buildings which were dated by inscriptions of one sort or another. It was implicit that these ‘dated’ houses were representative of the wider housing stock. However, by the mid-1970s it was becoming apparent that the chronology of regional change was far more complex than Hoskins had originally envisaged. In 1977 Bob Machin studied the existing information relating to dated buildings in the RCHM archive and the Department of Environment statutory lists of buildings. A stark truth emerged: there was absolutely no evidence of a Great Rebuilding between 1570 and 1640. Instead, Machin discovered that the period between 1660 and 1739 was far more important, with every decade producing more dated houses than even the peak decade of the pre-Civil war period. A postulated ‘Great Rebuilding’ had therefore to be redated to around 1690.69

By the 1980s it was also apparent that the rebuilding process varied considerably both in chronology and in the form that it took from one area to another, and that these variations were often marked even within individual counties or agricultural areas. Pearson showed that in the Lancashire Pennines members of the lesser gentry and better-off yeoman farmers were building substantial stone farmhouses from the 1590s and that this building process continued right through the seventeenth century. She also identified a pattern to their distribution which was caused by varying farming economies, differences in social structure and differing levels of economic development within the study area.70 As more regional or county-based studies were published, the limitations of the Hoskins theory were thrown into increasingly stark relief. In her study of medieval houses in Kent, Pearson again revealed not one but two periods of rebuilding, the first spanning the period 1460-1520, and the second the period 1570-1700. The high levels of building activity in the late Middle Ages in Kent serve to illustrate the fact that the accumulation of wealth necessary for new building, and also the impact of later waves of destruction, varied in scale and chronology quite profoundly from place to place within a single ancient county.71

As the number of buildings dated by the science of dendrochronology increased so our understanding of the chronology of rebuilding became more precise. Recent analysis of tree-ring dates has revealed some quite unexpected patterns. While there appears to have been a major increase in the building of high status rural houses in the first third of the fourteenth century, this pattern is not repeated amongst the builders of rural vernacular houses. Instead, they seem to have ‘increased in number slowly but surely, with the main flowering occurring from the mid fifteenth-century onwards’.72 Significantly, the tree-ring dates reveal that in urban and rural areas alike
there was a marked decline in building of all sorts during the sixteenth century—which is at odds with Hoskins’s chronology.75

Hoskins accepted that the nature of rebuilding varied from place to place and that it embraced the complete rebuilding of old structures, the modernisation of existing dwellings, and fresh building on new sites.76 The first and last categories are self-explanatory and usually easy to detect in the field, but upgrading or modernisation presents us with a problem—it is difficult to draw simple distinctions between the kind of rebuilding which Hoskins may have envisaged, and other forms of rebuilding that some might look upon as ‘ephemeral’. Nat Alcock has suggested that the replacement of open hearths and the provision of upper floors constituted the major step from medieval to modern living and should be viewed as the defining characteristic of ‘Great Rebuilding’. 77 However, others have argued that the notion of a rebuilding in any period is essentially misleading since ‘houses, though built in period A, are altered in period B and improved in period C’.78 Since later alterations invariably disguise or conceal evidence of earlier building phases, it is often impossible to be sure which is the most important. This process of constant adaptation has been identified in virtually every part of the country where detailed analysis of surviving houses has been conducted, from Lancashire in the north to Guernsey in the south. Hoskins saw the ‘Great Rebuilding’ primarily in terms of a shift away from open hall construction to multiple-storey construction, but this is probably too narrow a basis on which to gauge either the nature or the chronology of the rebuilding process.

In Norfolk, for example, the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries witnessed the widespread replacement of thatch with pantile, conversion from mullion to sash windows, and the frequent re-skinning (usually in brick) of earlier flint or timber-framed houses. Consider New Buckenham, a medieval market town characterised by a timber and thatch building tradition throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but much of the evidence where disguised beneath nineteenth-century brick facades and pantiled roofs. Other market towns in Norfolk, such as Hingham, Aylsham, Attleborough and Wymondham, apparently experienced a similar process of ‘gentrification’ and so also have towns in other counties. It could be argued that the impact of these changes on an individual house would not have been sufficient to justify the use of the term ‘rebuilding’, or at least not in the sense in which it was used by Hoskins. And yet it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the cumulative effect of these modifications was quite profound, not only in terms of the architectural appearance of many market towns and villages, but also of the long-term survival of vernacular buildings. Local historians must be aware of the difficulties inherent in identifying phases of ‘rebuilding’, for the real picture is rarely straightforward.

When first proposed half a century ago Hoskins’s ‘Big Idea’ served a useful purpose in galvanising research into vernacular architecture at national and regional level. The ensuing debate has been fascinating and prolonged. By the 1960s Barley was convinced that the idea had had its day, a view firmly endorsed by Bob Machin in the 1970s and reinforced by Matthew Johnson in the 1980s: ‘there was no single ‘Great Rebuilding’ in any sense: rather, the changes we observe from 1560 and 1640 … were but part of a much longer process involving the whole transition between medieval and modern England’.79 Half a century of detailed recording makes it clear that the process of rebuilding differed so greatly in its chronology, form and extent from place to place that the term itself has become meaningless, and perhaps an obstacle to progress. The dated houses on which Hoskins based his theory are shown to be unrepresentative, and his explanations of the causes of rebuilding are at odds with the field evidence in many areas. Linking rebuilding and population increase seems more
problematic now that a massive increase in new building across the country has been dated by dendrochronology to the second half of the fifteenth century and first part of the sixteenth, when the English population was relatively static or even in decline. Matthew Johnson has argued that we fail to understand the meaning of the building process if we focus solely on building rates and economics, at the expense of contemporary attitudes to the organisation of social space in buildings and the ways in which this governed social relationships between members of the household and within the wider community (see illustration on back cover of this issue).

Hoskins would have had little time for the jargon employed by theoretical archaeologists, but he would not have been hostile to the basic premise of their arguments—that we should place people and human behaviour centre stage if we are to understand fully the buildings we are recording; to comprehend their meaning as elements of material culture; and to return vernacular architecture studies to the mainstream of social, economic and cultural history. There are already signs of a belated renaissance. Recent studies which draw on the principles of ‘access analysis’ and ‘survival rates’ suggest that research into vernacular buildings is beginning to adopt a new trajectory in response. Vernacular architecture specialists are beginning to articulate more explicitly the theoretical foundations of their discipline. Pat Ryan has suggested recently, for example, that Hoskins’ Great Rebuilding should be reconceptualised not as a single phenomenon, as its originator viewed it, nor as an unbroken continuum of building as proposed by Machin, but instead as a part of a cyclical ‘Housing Revolution’, adding that ‘It is better, perhaps, to see it as a peak in the cycles of a continuum rather than the beginning of a continuum’.

Final thoughts…

This article is a personal account of the development of vernacular architecture studies and some key themes or research strands within the discipline. Others with an interest in vernacular buildings might present a very different picture, identifying a different dynamic with the field of local history. But one central fact is undeniable: local historians and scholars of vernacular architecture have much to learn from each other. Indeed, the two groups need each other more than ever. Both are in full-scale retreat in universities and continuing education programmes (a shift driven by changes in government funding), so professionals, academics and amateurs in both camps need to find new synergies and ways of working together. Fortunately, there are reasons to be optimistic. There are more volunteer-led local history groups than ever before, and the same could be said of county-based buildings groups. Bodies such as the Norfolk Historic Buildings Group, founded in 2000, are producing research and publications of a very high standard. There is an opportunity, therefore, to develop closer links and even to integrate efforts within the context of coordinated research projects. Recent publications on smaller towns reflect a shift towards a more ‘holistic’ interdisciplinary approach—studies of Burford and Winchelsea being prime examples. Local councils are devoting considerable resources to facilitating research into vernacular buildings, as evidenced by the recent high-quality volume on Hampshire houses and a wider study of regional timber-framing techniques partly funded by Essex County Council. In recent years there have been important publications drawing on regional case studies, under the auspices of the Council for British Archaeology and English Heritage, and the first national study of town houses. Moreover, important classes of documentary evidence, such as the hearth tax returns, are being systematically analysed and published on a county basis. Of equal value to local historians and scholars of vernacular architecture, these studies illustrate
the tremendous value of documentary records in shedding new light on historic housing stocks.\textsuperscript{88} However, there has been no national study of vernacular architecture in its widest sense since Eric Mercer’s landmark volume in 1975.\textsuperscript{89} It is to be hoped that when such a study does appear, it embodies a cross-disciplinary approach drawing not only on the considerable body of data produced by vernacular architecture specialists since the mid-1970s, but also on local history sources and research conducted at local level by individuals and local history groups. But for this to happen, a new reciprocal dialogue, conducted in new forums and using new media, must be established and maintained between building historians and local historians.
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The Baptist churches and society in Leicestershire 1951-1971

GERALD T. RIMMINGTON

Introduction

Like all churches in an increasingly secular age the Nonconformists in England during the twentieth century have experienced decline in membership. D. W. Brogan, in his *The English People*, noted that after 1906 the decline of Nonconformity was ‘one of the greatest changes in the English religious and social landscape’. The Baptists, who with the Methodists and Congregationalists constituted the mass of Nonconformity, illustrated the trend. By 1902 membership reached 377,747 and in 1906 had advanced to 434,741, the highest number of Baptists ever recorded. But this was followed by a decline, to 418,608 in 1911; by 1950 Baptist membership had been reduced to 208,888 and by 1960 to 200,100. Baptist decline was inevitably apparent locally, and this article attempts to trace and explain the changes in membership in the representative county of Leicestershire during two post-war decades.

During the 1950s and 1960s Leicestershire Baptists could look back with considerable pride on the developments of the previous century. In 1851 there were 47 General Baptist churches in the county with seating accommodation for 12,467, and twenty Particular Baptist ones accommodating 4,365. In 1881 Leicester alone had fifteen Baptist churches, with a total membership of 3,059, while in the county as a whole membership increased from 7,836 in 1892 to 10,024 in 1908, and 10,080 (in 69 churches) in 1916. Since then there had been a decline—by 1941 a 5 per cent reduction to 9,614 members—though the number of churches had increased to 76 because of efforts to establish the denomination in new housing estates. In 1951 the Baptists were still a significant force, with 78 churches and a total membership of 8,247, or 1.3 per cent of the county’s population of 631,077.

The Baptists looked to the future with confidence, as the major Nonconformist entity in the county, with concepts of initiation, organisation, styles of ministry and forms of worship that were markedly different from those of the Established Church. Traditionally the Baptists had no hierarchy. As with the Congregationalists and some Methodists, the idea of episcopacy was not acceptable. The Baptist Union was no more than a free association of churches and not all Baptist churches were affiliated to it. By ordination ministers were set apart to preach, to preside at Holy Communion, to be pastors, to take their part in church administration, and to lead in mission, but none of these functions was exclusive to the ordained ministry. All churches were free to use any style of liturgy or no liturgy at all. Infant baptism was eschewed in favour of believer’s baptism which, it was argued, had a greater scriptural authority. Many Baptist churches, however, admitted unbaptised people into membership on profession of faith. Was it possible for a denomination of this kind not only to survive in the late twentieth century, but also to make a significant contribution to church life in an age when, it was predicted, there would be strong challenges from the supporters of church unity, both inside and outside the Baptist ranks?
Decline in membership

Statistics indicate that nationally the pre-war decline in Baptist membership continued after 1945. Membership figures fell slightly from 207,101 in 1951 to 198,597 in 1961 (-4 per cent). Thereafter the decline accelerated, by 13 per cent, to 173,350 in 1971. On the other hand, the number of fully independent churches, though falling from 2,149 in 1951 to 2,085 in 1971, was offset by the listing of 395 ‘branch’ churches in 1971. There were more places of worship (testimony to an increased level of activity), but fewer people in membership in them. How was this national decline reflected locally? Table 1 shows that Leicestershire was a stronghold of Baptist membership compared with other East Midland counties. Of a total regional membership of 17,650, 8,247 (46 per cent) were in Leicestershire. Even between 1961 and 1971, when losses in Leicestershire (-30 per cent) were much greater than in the other counties, 47 per cent of all the Baptists in the region were in the county. In terms of the number of churches, losses were more than offset by the creation of ‘branch’ churches. Leicestershire was able to retain its position as the stronghold of the denomination.

Table 1  Baptist churches and membership in Leicestershire and other East Midland counties 1951-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>county</th>
<th>year (number of churches in italics)</th>
<th>1951</th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1971*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEICESTERSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8247</td>
<td>7160 (-13%)</td>
<td>5008 (-30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DERBYSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2907</td>
<td>2602 (-10%)</td>
<td>2169 (-17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINCOLNSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1535 (-13%)</td>
<td>1373 (-11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTTINGHAMSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4517</td>
<td>4048 (-10%)</td>
<td>3176 (-22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td>2149</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>2085+395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207,101</td>
<td>198,579 (-4%)</td>
<td>173,350 (-13%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In 1971 branch churches were listed separately (e.g. Leicestershire +7)

Leicester had more Baptist churches than any other town in the region, 18 in 1951. However, as with other denominations, the places of worship in the city centre, the so-called ‘downtown’ churches, were under threat because of slum clearance and the movement of population to the suburban fringes. The Congregational churches in Bond Street, Oxford Street and London Road, for instance, were all closed down during this period, so that by 1966 Congregationalism ceased to be represented in the city centre. Similarly, only one centrally located Methodist church survived. The Baptists had six ‘downtown’ churches in 1951, but three closed by 1971 and the others lost many members. Altogether membership in ‘downtown’ churches declined from 877 in 1951 to 677 in 1961 (-22 per cent) and by 1971 there were only 233 members.
As table 2 indicates, there was considerable membership loss from the Victorian suburban churches. In 1951 there were six, with 2,106 members, but during the 1950s these experienced a decline of 17 per cent and in the 1960s a catastrophic drop of 66 per cent, with only four churches. These losses were mainly in areas from which people were moving to newer suburbs. Victoria Road Church, for example, was close to substantial houses that were turned into offices as the inhabitants, no longer able to afford servants, moved on. The most successful churches were the six established in pre-1939 suburbs. Of these Clarendon Park, Stoneygate and Aylestone retained their membership, while Braunstone (which absorbed most of the city centre Friar Lane congregation) increased substantially. Altogether these churches increasing membership from 734 in 1951 to 797 in 1961 and declined only slightly to 773 between then and 1971. The three post-war congregations in the new suburbs at Stocking Farm, Scraptoft Valley and Eyres Monsell accounted for 56 members in 1961 and 96 in 1971. Scraptoft Valley, however, never become a viable church, though the other two were able to become locations for new buildings.

Table 2  Baptist membership in Leicester 1951-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>type of church/location</th>
<th>1951</th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1971</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOWNTOWN</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>677 (-22%)</td>
<td>233 (-66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTORIAN SUBURBAN</td>
<td>2106</td>
<td>1738 (-17%)</td>
<td>538 (-66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERWAR SUBURBAN</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>797 (+9%)</td>
<td>773 (-3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST-WAR</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3717</td>
<td>3268 (-12%)</td>
<td>1685 (-48%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Altogether within Leicester there were modest losses, of 12 per cent, between 1951 and 1961, but the losses in the next decade, from 3,268 to 1,685 (-48 per cent) were disastrous. In Leicester the rate of population increase slowed in the 1950s and after 1961 showed a slight decline, but it might be expected that there would be successes in the rapidly urbanising communities on the city’s periphery. However, table 3 indicates that although seven such communities, with a population of 22,678, had a Baptist membership of 610 in 1951, by 1961, when their population had increased by 47 per cent, membership had declined by 2 per cent. Between 1961 and 1971 there had been a further substantial increase in population to 51,270 (+54 per cent), but Baptist membership only increased by 2 per cent. It is clear that Baptists were increasing their membership in line with population in some areas, but not in others.

What of the position further away from Leicester and its influence? In the five other towns with Baptist churches membership declined substantially during the 1950s at a time when population was increasing rapidly. During the next decade, when overall population increased by only 4 per cent, the losses were reduced to 9 per cent. As table 4 shows, losses were slight in Market Harborough and Melton Mowbray, which were still predominantly market towns, but greater in industrialised Loughborough and Hinckley.

In communities where employment was mainly in coalmining or granite quarrying, both population and membership were fairly stable during 1951-1961. However, although population increased overall by 12 per cent during the 1960s there was no
corresponding increase in membership, which fell by 30 per cent: table 5 demonstrates these trends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>year (total population in italics)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLABY</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSBY</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTESTHORPE</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKBY MUXLOE</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYSTON</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHETSTONE</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quantification of membership in agricultural villages is much more difficult, because records were often not kept updated; it is only possible to measure changes where the records are complete. It is clear that there was great difficulty in maintaining membership in farming communities. Young people tended to drift away because there was better-paid work in urban areas in an era of full employment. At times, as at Foxton, the small membership consisted mainly of one enthusiastic extended family. There were also problems with spiritual care. In the nine agricultural communities listed in table 6, only Arnesby and Broughton Astley were able to afford full-time ministers. Attempts by the superintendent minister to group the others in order to support a minister often met with failure.

It is clear that, as far as membership was concerned, both locally and nationally, the 1950s were more hopeful than the 1960s. When reviewing the national situation in 1957 Dr. Ernest Payne, the general secretary of the Baptist Union, noted that ‘heartening figures are the fruit of the quickened evangelistic activities of our churches and the church extension movement which is taking place in many parts of the country’. Callum Brown also noted that 1955-1959 was ‘a period of religious revivalism mirroring a general emphasis in Britain on family, home and piety’. As if to confirm this, W.J. Grant, the Baptist Area Superintendent for the East Midlands, reported that in his district there were sixteen new ventures in the 1950s.
### Table 4  Baptist membership and population in Leicestershire market towns 1951-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ASHBY-DE-LA- ZOUCH</th>
<th>HINCKLEY</th>
<th>LOUGHBOROUGH</th>
<th>MARKET HARBOROUGH</th>
<th>MELTON MOWBRAY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>50 (-3%)</td>
<td>222 (-21%)</td>
<td>537 (-31%)</td>
<td>167 (-7%)</td>
<td>95 (-2%)</td>
<td>1107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>46 (-8%)</td>
<td>227 (+2%)</td>
<td>473 (-12%)</td>
<td>162 (-3%)</td>
<td>96 (-)</td>
<td>1004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ASHBY-DE-LA- ZOUCH</th>
<th>HINCKLEY</th>
<th>LOUGHBOROUGH</th>
<th>MARKET HARBOROUGH</th>
<th>MELTON MOWBRAY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>5826 (+28%)</td>
<td>15492 (+32%)</td>
<td>34731 (+XX%)</td>
<td>10400 (+11%)</td>
<td>14053 (+13%)</td>
<td>80502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>7460 (-7%)</td>
<td>20397 (-1 %)</td>
<td>45875 (+XX%)</td>
<td>11535 (+11%)</td>
<td>15914 (+13%)</td>
<td>101181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>8311 (+11%)</td>
<td>20290 (+1%)</td>
<td>42655 (-7%)</td>
<td>14150 (+23%)</td>
<td>19465 (+22%)</td>
<td>104871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5  Baptist membership and population in some Leicestershire mining and quarrying communities 1951-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>COALVILLE</th>
<th>DESFORD</th>
<th>HUGGlescOTE</th>
<th>IBSTOCK</th>
<th>MEASHAM</th>
<th>MOUNTSOReLL</th>
<th>NEWBOLD VERNON</th>
<th>ROTHLEY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>319 (-4%)</td>
<td>42 (+5%)</td>
<td>176 (-5%)</td>
<td>64 (+42%)</td>
<td>66 (-20%)</td>
<td>62 (-5%)</td>
<td>30 (-)</td>
<td>53 (+20%)</td>
<td>812 (-1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>198 (-38%)</td>
<td>25 (-40%)</td>
<td>97 (-45%)</td>
<td>53 (-17%)</td>
<td>68 (+3%)</td>
<td>38 (-39%)</td>
<td>50 (+67%)</td>
<td>40 (-25%)</td>
<td>569 (-30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>COALVILLE</th>
<th>DESFORD</th>
<th>HUGGlescOTE</th>
<th>IBSTOCK</th>
<th>MEASHAM</th>
<th>MOUNTSOReLL</th>
<th>NEWBOLD VERNON</th>
<th>ROTHLEY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>4226</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>4613</td>
<td>5337</td>
<td>2766</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>3668 (-13%)</td>
<td>2300 (+16%)</td>
<td>3378 (-27%)</td>
<td>4954 (-7%)</td>
<td>2728 (+1 %)</td>
<td>62 (-5%)</td>
<td>30 (-)</td>
<td>53 (+20%)</td>
<td>812 (-1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>3390 (-8%)</td>
<td>2921 (+27%)</td>
<td>3345 (-1%)</td>
<td>4707 (-5%)</td>
<td>3515 (+33%)</td>
<td>38 (-39%)</td>
<td>50 (+67%)</td>
<td>40 (-25%)</td>
<td>569 (-30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>COALVILLE</th>
<th>DESFORD</th>
<th>HUGGlescOTE</th>
<th>IBSTOCK</th>
<th>MEASHAM</th>
<th>MOUNTSOReLL</th>
<th>NEWBOLD VERNON</th>
<th>ROTHLEY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>5337</td>
<td>2766</td>
<td>4613</td>
<td>5337</td>
<td>2766</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>4954 (-7%)</td>
<td>2728 (+1 %)</td>
<td>3378 (-27%)</td>
<td>4954 (-7%)</td>
<td>2728 (+1 %)</td>
<td>62 (-5%)</td>
<td>30 (-)</td>
<td>53 (+20%)</td>
<td>812 (-1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>4707 (-5%)</td>
<td>3515 (+33%)</td>
<td>3345 (-1%)</td>
<td>4707 (-5%)</td>
<td>3515 (+33%)</td>
<td>38 (-39%)</td>
<td>50 (+67%)</td>
<td>40 (-25%)</td>
<td>569 (-30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6  Baptist membership and population in some Leicestershire rural villages 1951-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARNESBY</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-15%)</td>
<td>(-9%)</td>
<td>(+33%)</td>
<td>(+21%)</td>
<td>(-43%)</td>
<td>(+12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILLESDON</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+33%)</td>
<td>(+21%)</td>
<td>(+8%)</td>
<td>(-16%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROUGHTON</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1523</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+33%)</td>
<td>(+9%)</td>
<td>(-30%)</td>
<td>(+7%)</td>
<td>(-23%)</td>
<td>(+12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTLEY</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-21%)</td>
<td>(+11%)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOXTON</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+130%)</td>
<td>(+7%)</td>
<td>(+130%)</td>
<td>(+7%)</td>
<td>(+8%)</td>
<td>(+130%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT &amp; HARBY</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+10%)</td>
<td>(+10%)</td>
<td>(+6%)</td>
<td>(+10%)</td>
<td>(+17%)</td>
<td>(+24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG WHATTON</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(+38%)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(+38%)</td>
<td>(+38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTON AND KIMCOTE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+17%)</td>
<td>(+4%)</td>
<td>(+17%)</td>
<td>(+4%)</td>
<td>(+36%)</td>
<td>(+16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYMESWOLD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>822</td>
<td></td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-13%)</td>
<td>(+7%)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(+14%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>7360</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>8259</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>8560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-5%)</td>
<td>(+12%)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(+12%)</td>
<td>(-22%)</td>
<td>(+4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evangelism and the new churches

Plans for the development of new Baptist churches had begun in 1942. By this time the government was beginning to outline strategies for post-war house-building. The aim was the elimination of squalor in inner urban areas centres and the redistribution of many people to the ‘healthier’ fringes of towns and cities. Writing in 1971 of Leicester, R.H. Evans noted that ‘in the last 25 years the … corporation has built nearly 20,000 houses, two-thirds of its total stock’. Most of these new houses were peripheral to the existing urban area and there was concern that the new suburbs should be served by Baptist churches. In the early 1950s improvements were made to that at Aylestone and work was initiated at the Stocking Farm estate on the northern fringes of the city. This was soon followed by a new church on the edge of the Eyres Monsell estate, in conjunction with the Stoneygate church. The Kirby Muxloe church, which had been destroyed during the war, was rebuilt. In Coalville the London Road Baptists moved from the town centre to Charnborough Road, on a new housing estate on the edge of the town.

Because of the way in which the Baptists were organised extension work was never easy. They had no national funds for the purpose and little was available locally, except where churches had been closed and the building and site sold. To provide a church at Stocking Farm church, for instance, £5000 was available from the sale of the Belvoir Street building, unused since 1940. However, priorities had to be established—
Stocking Farm had 1000 houses and a population of 3500, but Eyres Monsell had 5000 houses and 15,000 people. In both it was decided that the development of worshipping congregations should precede the erection of buildings, which were in any case likely to be held up by post-war restrictions on new construction.

Accordingly Alex Wright, who was completing theological training at Spurgeon’s College in London, became the Stocking Farm minister in September 1954. By December of the same year there were about twelve potential members, and Wright stated early in 1955 that ‘the Sunday school was doing extremely well. There were 94 names on the roll, and 14 on the teaching staff. The evening services were small but encouraging, and the women’s meeting was going along nicely’. In July 1955 he reported 260 children, eighteen teachers, one hundred members in the Girls’ Life Brigade, and seventeen in the women’s meeting. The Leicester Baptist Association, which included representatives from all the denomination’s churches in the area, and which sought to co-ordinate activities, decided to continue with plans to erect a building at Stocking Farm, but the financial position had deteriorated. In April 1956 it was noted that a further £3000 would be needed, and there were no funds available for Eyres Monsell, while money was also needed for rebuilding the church at Braunstone, where services were taking place in a hut.

The development of the Baptist church at Eyres Monsell had, therefore, to be different from that at Stocking Farm. The Stoneygate church agreed to sponsor it, and the whole estate was canvassed. Services and Sunday school work began in March 1957, and by September 1959 the leader, R.J. Roberts, reported that ‘on special occasions it was possible to gather as many as a hundred people’. In the following year there was agreement to purchase a site for a church and manse, and an associate minister, attached to Stoneygate but with responsibility for Eyres Monsell and Glen Parva, was appointed. At Scraptoft Valley, where there was no Free Church representation, a project was jointly sponsored by the Uppingham Road Baptist Church and Abbot’s Road Congregational Church. Worship was organised at the local primary school, but it was hoped that the closure of the city centre Abbey Gate Mission would provide funds for building and that the city council would provide a site. This scheme never prospered, and before long was discontinued.

Outside Leicester there were attempts to found new churches on housing estates in Hinckley, Loughborough and Market Harborough, but none was viable because they all suffered from the problems Alex Wright noted at Stocking Farm: ‘there is great indifference to every communal effort of every kind, social as well as religious’ and ‘there was by the nature of the families occupying the estate a dearth of young people old enough to accept responsibility’.

The role of Sunday schools

In the early post-war years it was accepted that to establish a church it was necessary to begin with a Sunday school. In all the newer congregations there were large numbers of children and relatively few adults. A lay preacher who visited Coalville’s Charnborough Road in the 1950s recalls that halfway through the service the children left for their Sunday school lessons, leaving fewer than twenty adults scattered around the nave. Since the late nineteenth century the assumption was that children would grow up to become professing Christians and renew the church, an easier option than organising outdoor rallies or standing on doorsteps trying to evangelise adults. There were still many parents who, while not practising Christians themselves, appreciated the values inculcated through Sunday schools. However, it was soon realised that ‘only
ten per cent of those in Baptist Sunday schools stayed involved in church life beyond the age of fourteen”. This was perhaps unsurprising. H.T. Thorn, president of the East Midlands Baptist Association in 1965-1966, noted that much of the teaching was deplorable. ‘There are still churches’, he stated, ‘where the wrong people teach. It’s not their fault. They have been press-ganged into it because no-one else will do it’. Whereas Albert Eaton, the evangelical Anglican vicar of St. Peter’s, Leicester, met with and trained his teachers each week, little if any training was offered by his Baptist counterparts. The East Midlands Baptist Association organised an ‘Easter College for Teachers’, but it attracted teachers from only 31 churches out of 219 in the region. Consequently, Thorn added, ‘6 out of 7 [children] left us, without any commitment to Christ … They also left us with the conviction that religion is to do with the past, and not the present’.

The situation was made worse by the tendency for a Christian-centred culture to be rejected by a greater proportion of the population. There was a general loss of pupils from Sunday schools; between 1951 and 1971 the number attending Baptist Sunday schools in England dropped by 33 per cent, from 228,532 to 152,682. In Leicestershire in 1951 there were 6,898 pupils, but by 1961 this had fallen to 6,054 and in the following decade the figure fell rapidly, to only 4,495 in 1971. Work patterns had changed. People were employed for fewer hours; they were more prosperous, and many of them were now car owners. They were more inclined to take their children for outings on Sundays. If the Baptists were to maintain their place on the religious map of Leicestershire they could not continue to rely upon Sunday schools to provide new membership in the churches.

Spiritual care

There were other obvious problems. In the 1950s and 1960s an increasing proportion of young people were proceeding to university or other forms of higher education, and this might have been reflected in the people who came forward for ordination. However, few graduates appeared in the ranks of the ministry—there were fewer in 1971 than in 1951, as table 7 indicates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1951</th>
<th>1971</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>graduates</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theological college training</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-collegiate Baptist Union examination</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no recorded training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 1971 evidence shows that there had been no appreciable change in the qualifications of Baptist ministers over two important decades. Within the churches there was a residue of prejudice against graduates. In the 1930s in the county as a whole, only 8 per cent of ministers had been graduates, and many deacons believed that ‘ministers empty churches by degrees’. Moreover, by 1971, there was a crisis in the perception of ministry. As Alec Gilmore pointed out, ‘social services seemed to a large extent to have taken over from the traditional role of the minister’. M.J. Walker also noted that ‘social work was taking an unprecedented importance in the life of the community, supplanting the church from its traditional pastoral concerns’. J.H. Rigg
widened the debate, commenting that ministers had ‘the burden but not the power, office without prerogative and responsibility without authority’. Economic prosperity and better job opportunities discouraged ambitious young people from seeking a vocation in the ministry in any denomination; there were many other possibilities opening up for professionally qualified people.

There were also problems about the spiritual care of small country churches, which were not congenial for young ministers, who often had the problem of serving groups of churches whose individual congregations did not always agree with each other. Yet those which insisted on remaining totally independent were rarely able to afford the services of a full-time minister. Emmanuel in Leicester shared a minister with the quarrying village of Croft, but such an arrangement was unusual; most village congregations had to make do with a lay pastor or a miscellany of lay preachers, of varying quality. Lay pastors, however, were diminishing in number, partly because some were serving churches that would soon disappear because of lack of membership. Preaching to ever-decreasing congregations was discouraging.

By 1971 there were 44 lay pastors in Leicestershire, four fewer than in 1951. Some were well-educated, thoughtful and well-organised, such as R.J. Roberts, who ‘nursed’ the Eyres Monsell development until it was secured the services of a full-time minister. Others, however, were much less competent. In 1958 the committee of the East Midlands Baptist Association, anxious that rising educational standards should be reflected in the appointments made, requested churches to ‘exercise discrimination’ in making appointments. They wanted to ensure that lay pastors ‘should be Baptists in good standing, versed in Baptist principles and history [who] should be encouraged to link themselves with the Lay Preachers’ Associations and to study for the Baptist Union Diploma’.42

In 1952 the Leicester Baptist Association expressed concern about ‘the poor state of the Lay Preachers’ Association’, and insisted that ‘an effort must be made to recruit young men to become effective lay preachers’.43 Little was accomplished until 1957, when the new area superintendent, W.J. Grant, initiated classes for lay preachers, leading to the Baptist Union Certificate in Christian Knowledge. By 1962 a correspondence course was established and it was reported that ‘a fair number’ were officially recognised.44 There was a brief burst of enthusiasm. The number of Leicestershire lay preachers increased from 98 in 1951 to 126 in 1961 but then fell back to 96 in 1971.45 Nevertheless in 1965 it was still being reported, of the pastorless churches, that ‘because their services are taken by a succession of lay preachers there is often no clear and regular scheme of Christian teaching’.46 It was a situation unlikely to appeal to increasingly well-educated people from whom new membership was being sought.

Disunity

There were also problems about church unity. Dr. Ernest Payne, general secretary of the Baptist Union from 1951 to 1967, was a tireless worker for ecumenicity,47 but the main sticking point was the acceptance of bishops. In a sermon preached during 1953 at St. Paul’s Cathedral, Hugh Martin, a leading Baptist, admitted that ‘many Free Church people could see that episcopacy had value, but could not agree that it was essential’.48 It was always difficult for a non-hierarchical denomination to negotiate with an episcopally-organised entity such as the Church of England. The Congregationalists abandoned their individual church independence to form a more hierarchical organisation, which eventually led them to merge with the Presbyterians and Churches of Christ to form the United Reformed Church, but the Baptists resisted this possibility. Indeed it was virtually impossible for them to agree on an alternative organisational style. Well-represented in Leicester were the many
conservative evangelicals who disagreed with the Anglican concern for pursuing unity with Roman Catholicism as well as with other Free Churches. For them the Pope was the anti-Christ, and they wanted nothing to do with Roman Catholics or those who discussed unity with them. Within the Baptist Union, some argued that Baptists, in order to pursue unity more effectively, needed "structural embodiment in association, synod and national assembly", with the stress on interdependency rather than on independence. Others, however, thought that 'inter-church authority over local churches would break the New Testament pattern’. One Baptist minister noted that there were two schools of thought, which was ‘dissipating its energies in a fratricidal shooting match between them’.49

Leicestershire Baptists tended to echo these disagreements. The LBA meeting in February 1965 noted that a rally on ‘Christian Unity’ had been organised at the De Montfort Hall in Leicester by the Independent Evangelical Churches. It was commented that, since the people concerned did not join in any ecumenical activities organised by the Leicester Council of Churches, there was doubt about their motives, and a specific complaint was made about Melbourne Hall’s appointment of a minister’s assistant who was neither an ordained minister nor a person trained in a Baptist College.50 Melbourne Hall (which had been an Evangelical Free Church affiliated with the Baptist Union since F.B. Meyer founded it in 1881) took this as an adverse criticism of its increasingly fundamentalist stance, and later that year its representatives at the LBA had resigned. It then left the LBA and the Baptist Union.51 Melbourne Hall was closely involved with the Baptist Revival Fellowship, which produced the publication *Liberty in the Land* (1964). Through this the conservative evangelicals, believing that they were facing ‘a point of crisis in our denominational life’, expressed their hopes for ‘future spiritual and ideological solidarities [that] would transcend “denominational frontiers”’, but later they saw themselves as a ‘pathetically small minority pitted against the secular world’ which, they believed, was invading the church through theological liberalism.52 Its departure underlined the disunity among Baptists, which did not impress intelligent would-be members interested in church unity. Neither did this episode reduce tensions among Leicestershire Baptists. Some churches, such as Whetstone, maintained a conservative evangelical stance while remaining within the Baptist Union.

These damaging theological controversies continued throughout the period. Every time a controversial religious statement appeared in the news Baptists took sides. Whether it was John Robinson’s *Honest to God* or Michael Taylor’s address, ‘How much of a man was Jesus Christ?’, at the 1971 Baptist Assembly, passions were roused on both sides of the liberal-fundamentalist divide.55 In Leicester, following Taylor’s address, Bernard Monk and Jim Findley, ministers at Stoneygate and Eyres Monsell, were excited by his ‘honest and open exploration of the meaning of the gospel’, and hastened to say so. Those of a more conservative disposition were in agreement with the Baptist Revival Fellowship Committee, which stated that they ‘could not remain in constitutional association with those who could not affirm categorically that Jesus was God’.54 Theo Bamber, a determined fundamentalist, even ‘foresaw a new Nonconformity standing outside any “artificial scheme for unity”’.55 Had the numerous debates been conducted in terms of a quest for truth they might have reaped a spiritual harvest, perhaps even an increase in membership numbers, but usually the exchanges were vitriolic, leading not to unity with other denominations, but to divisiveness among the Baptists themselves. M.J. Walker observed wryly that ‘many Baptists turned their backs on any pilgrimage towards catholicity, choosing instead sectarianism’.56 This was as true of Baptists in Leicestershire as elsewhere.

**Immigrants**

While Baptists were disputing among themselves the urban landscapes of Leicestershire were changing, because of the influx of many West Indians, some of whom had been...
Baptists in their Caribbean homelands. In Leicester many settled in the Highfields area, where St. Peter’s became virtually an Afro-Caribbean church. Nash and Reeder note that ‘the evangelical churches on London Road and St. Peter’s Road are important foci for the community’. Most of the Baptist churches were distant from areas where the new migrants were living and the retreat to the suburbs by the major Nonconformist denominations tended to deprive the Afro-Caribbean community of membership. They preferred instead to found their own black-led churches in the areas where they now lived, such as the New Testament Church of God, which took over a former Methodist chapel. Randall notes poignantly that ‘of 40,000 West Indians in Birmingham, only 101 were members of Baptist churches. Many more would have been Baptists when they lived in the Caribbean’. Proportions would probably have been similar in Leicester and other Leicestershire towns. Other post-war immigration made no significant difference to Baptist membership. The 1951 census counted 1,029 Leicester people born in the USSR, 1003 in Poland, and 624 people in India. Most brought their faith with them, decreasing the inner city pool from which new Baptists might come.

The appeal to young people

The Baptist churches faced a dilemma. Membership was falling, Sunday schools failing, downtown churches closing, and there were unedifying squabbles. If witness was to survive changes were needed. Some churches, such as Stoneygate, closed their Sunday schools and turned their morning services into all-age worship. During the 1960s there was much experimenting with young people’s groups; the 1971 Baptist Handbook indicated that nationally 41,444 people aged 14-20 attended group meetings, with 1,078 were in Leicestershire. At Victoria Road Church in Leicester, during Arthur Kirkby’s ministry (1945-67), a young people’s circle met after the evening services on Sundays. Loughborough’s Baxter Gate saw a quickening of interest in youth work after the appointment of R.W. Thomson as minister in 1955. A Baptist students’ society was formed, and the young people were ‘encouraged to take services in the village churches’. Later, when the ministry to youth embraced Boys’ Brigade, Girl Guides and ‘Open Youth Work’, the hope was that some young people ‘would be drawn into closer association with church life’. Similarly Vernon Moss, the long-serving minister at nearby Woodgate, ‘took an active interest in young people’s work’, as a result of which ‘many of the leaders in the church were brought into fellowship during his ministry’. His successor in 1965, Alex Anderson, continued and extended ‘a very large youth work … and a broad pattern of activities was introduced with the help of many keen leaders’. It was noted in the Woodgate annual report for 1969 that there were 464 young people and 28 leaders. Some at least of these young people were converted and became church members.

A perceived need was for a change in service style. Some churches had never used any formal liturgy, and relied on the minister’s use of a ‘hymn sandwich’. There were, however, various formal options: Henry Bonser’s book of services, originally prepared for Hampstead Road Baptist Church in Birmingham, and revised in 1930 as Come, let us worship; the Free Church Services Manual (1927); D. Tait Patterson’s The Call to Worship, published in 1930, and revised in 1938 and 1940; and Ernest Payne and Stephen Winward’s Orders and Prayers for Church Worship: A Manual for Ministers (1960), most of the material for which was taken from Anglican, Reformed and Church of Scotland liturgies. They were used by many churches during the 1950s. There was, however, some dissatisfaction that services no longer seemed to lead to conversion or even the maintenance of faith. Cecil Radford, in his presidential address to the East Midlands Baptist Association in 1952, noted a ‘tendency towards a cultural ritual in some of our churches which is mistakenly called worship ... Worship is a spiritual exercise and
should not be a demonstration of our artistic temperament’. He accused some churches of becoming nothing more than a social club. Moreover the evening service, traditionally geared for evangelism, was disappearing as television became normal in many homes, so there was more emphasis on adapting the morning service instead. Thus the organ began to give way to the music group, hymns to choruses, and scholarly sermons to simple testimonies.

During the 1960s ‘the formalism of the 1950s was giving way to a new wave of freedom, self-expression and informality’. Callum Brown says that many congregations ‘tried to compromise with the new age of youth in the late 1960s, developing new forms of religious worship using guitars and penny whistles, modern dress and a “happy-clappy atmosphere” ’. In some churches the sermon began to give way to ‘group discussion, dialogue, choral speaking and acted parables’, though, as Walker notes, ‘Baptist churches probably indulged less than others in such experiments, saved by their innate conservatism’. The need to teach the faith to people not been brought up in a Christian environment led to lay contributions to music, the reading of lessons, the leading of intercessions, even simple preaching. It made the churches concerned more lively and appealing to younger people, but at the cost of relying more on emotion than intellect, and a more superficial theology.

Conclusion

Leicestershire Baptists were very much weaker in 1971 than in 1951. In the face of increasing secularism (which affected churches of all denominations) and disagreements between liberals and conservative evangelicals, hopes had not been fulfilled. New work in Loughborough and Hinckley had failed and many village churches were on the verge of extinction. Though Stocking Farm and Eyres Monsell had become viable churches, the only others which increased membership or held their own were the pre-1939 suburban churches in Leicester, those in the urbanised communities on the edge of the city, and those in towns such as Market Harborough and Hinckley. The withdrawal from the Baptist Union of Melbourne Hall, the largest Baptist church in Leicester, had failed to end disagreements. Fundamentalism competed with theological liberalism, and radical theology seemed to strengthen those of a conservative disposition, who were given credit for supporting ‘received Christian convictions’. Because congregations were divided, preachers tended to tread a theological tightrope, sometimes to the detriment of forceful preaching.

Some Baptist leaders, while bemoaning the general state of the denomination after two decades of hard work, noted that Baptists in Leicestershire were still more numerous than in neighbouring counties. There were rays of hope too, such as the new Stocking Farm Church, described in 1969 as ‘a very healthy cause’. Indeed, some would have been happy to disregard numbers altogether, arguing that some churches at least were adapting to a new age with challenging sermons (or other forms of presentation of the gospel), meaningful worship and social action.
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The apprenticeship of parish children from Kirkdale Industrial Schools Liverpool 1840-70

KAY PARROTT

Research on the topic of pauper apprenticeship has been limited, and mostly refers to policy under the Old Poor Law. Moreover, previous work on apprenticeship under the New Poor Law has implied that the practice virtually died out by the 1820s, findings which are contradicted by the present study which proves that children were still being apprenticed from Liverpool as late as 1870. Indentures for 900 children apprenticed from Liverpool Workhouse and Kirkdale Industrial Schools between 1841 and 1870 have been examined to discover something about the children: what provision was made for their welfare, how old were they, how long was their apprenticeship, in what trades were they apprenticed, where were they sent, and did they go as individuals or in groups. Local practice has been related to national policy as set out in the 1845 General Orders Relating to the Apprenticeship of Poor Children, and case studies highlight the experiences of individual children and two groups of apprentices—one sent to coalminers in St Helens and the other to a flax manufacturer in Bentham, Yorkshire.

Sources and methodology

The indentures were deposited in Liverpool Record Office by the Liverpool Select Vestry in 1931, and in 1945 an alphabetical index was compiled giving for each child the name, the trade to which he or she was apprenticed, and the name and location of the employer if outside Liverpool. The collection is divided into two groups: the first (629 children) includes agreements, on standard forms, to which the Select Vestry was a party; the second (270 children) are mainly on forms produced by the Board of Trade or in manuscript, where the apprentice ‘hereby voluntarily binds himself’. Information about the age of the children and length of indenture was not included, so these details have been taken from a sample group of agreements—every tenth indenture form, a total of 93. Information on the status of the child’s parents, whether dead or if they had deserted, has also been extracted, with any other potentially interesting detail. Although the collection is large it does not include all children apprenticed and the exact number would be very difficult to ascertain. There are numerical and chronological gaps, and references in minute books to apprentices not included in the collection. Although it is not clear what proportion this study represents it may be taken as large enough to draw conclusions.

Other records were also consulted: the Liverpool Parish Vestry minute book 1829-1854; Workhouse Committee minute book 1842-1844; and the Industrial Schools Committee minute books 1845-1871. Only indexed entries in these volumes were checked, but the books contain information on policy, though while noting what decisions were reached they often fail to give the reason why. Reference is often made to letters or reports read to the Committee: no details of their content is given, but the
minute books frequently refer to individual children, supplementing the information in the indentures. For three years only, from January 1867 to December 1869, there are lists of boys and girls ‘sent out’ from the Industrial Schools, giving dates and details of where they went. Additional information from these lists was added to the database. Potentially, further information could be obtained by analysing the admission and discharge book (1862-1865) and the classification registers (from 1845) for Kirkdale Industrial Schools.

Liverpool Select Vestry

In Liverpool township before 1841 the relief of the poor was the responsibility of the parish authorities—the parish committee and after 1821 a Select Vestry. Despite the passing of the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act it remained in the hands of the Select Vestry until 1841, when amid local opposition a board of guardians was elected. The new board was unpopular as ‘the system is more cumbersome and expensive and is not so efficient either to the rich or poor as the Select Vestry system’, and a special vestry meeting in November 1841 decided to apply to Parliament for a local act enabling the parish of Liverpool once again to administer its poor relief. The petition was successful: the Act was passed in June 1842 and a new Select Vestry elected in July. Unusually, therefore, the parish remained the unit of poor law administration although, confusingly, the Select Vestry was actually constituted a board of guardians under the 1834 Act.

In their first annual report (1835) the Poor Law Commissioners, who were responsible for national administration of the new Act, instructed each union to set up a proper school, with a salaried master and mistress. Ideally this would be on a self-contained site, to conform with the segregation of different categories of pauper recommended in the 1834 Poor Law Report. In 1843 the Commissioners announced the intention to
build a school in Kirkdale, about a mile from the centre of Liverpool, based on the system of industrial training provided for pauper children at Norwood in London.\(^9\) The foundation stone was laid on 25 May 1843 and the first boys were admitted on 1 May 1845. The Industrial Schools Committee, appointed by the Select Vestry, first met on 9 January 1845 and continued to do so at fortnightly intervals for the next 60 years, until cottage homes were opened at Olive Mount to care for children in a more homely atmosphere. During the life of the school it is estimated that 40,000 children were admitted and, although designed for 1200 residents, the maximum number recorded, in 1868, was 1558.\(^10\)

The indentures relate mainly to children from the Industrial Schools, but also include about fifty who were apprenticed from the workhouse before the schools opened. Under the old pre-1834 Poor Law, Liverpool had, in common with other places, regularly apprenticed orphan or deserted children. They were sent, for instance, to Quarry Bank Mill at Styal, Cheshire; to David Dale at New Lanark; and to Peel’s of Bury.\(^11\) In the year ending 1829, some 57 boys and 34 girls had been apprenticed and the following year, 54 boys and 24 girls,\(^12\) and in April 1840 reference was made in the parish vestry minute book to children apprenticed at Luddenden Foot, near Halifax; to a silk manufactory at Havannah Mills, Congleton; and to Greg’s factory at Quarry Bank.\(^13\)

**Regulating the apprenticeship of parish children**

The Poor Law Report of 1834 contained little specific detail relating to pauper apprentices and it was not until 1845 that the Poor Law Commissioners issued its *General Orders relating to the apprenticeship of poor children*, which imposed certain conditions on the parties involved, with amendments the following year.\(^14\) Children had to be at least nine years old, able to read and write (to sign the indenture at least), certified of good health by the workhouse medical officer, and suitable for the proposed trade. No premium should be given, other than clothing, for any child aged more than 14, unless disabled. This was later amended so that a premium could be given to a child under 16. The maximum term that an apprentice could be bound was eight years and they could not be bound to a place more than thirty miles from where they were living. Children under 16 years needed the consent of their father or mother, although in many cases one or more parents would be dead or have deserted the child. No child over 14 could be bound without his or her consent. Duties imposed on the master included teaching the child their trade; providing food, lodging, clothing and medical care; and ensuring that the child attended church and school on a Sunday. Provision was also made for the child to be brought before a board of guardians at set intervals or when required to do so. Apprentices over the age of 17 were originally to be paid a weekly remuneration, but this stipulation was cancelled in the 1846 amendments. These duties, with others, were to be incorporated into the indentures signed by both master and apprentice—the majority of parish indentures in the Liverpool collection are on standard forms printed for the Select Vestry, incorporating the various orders issued by the Poor Law Commissioners. However article 25 of the orders specifically excluded ‘the apprenticing of poor children to the sea service’ and the majority of the non-parish indentures in this collection apprenticed children as seamen or fishermen. The extent to which the Select Vestry complied with the orders of the Commissioners is examined below.

As an example of a specific case we can consider William McGrath.\(^15\) On 3 April 1844 the churchwardens and overseers of Liverpool Select Vestry gave notice of application to the justices of the peace in Ashton-under-Lyne to allow the indenture of McGrath to
Samuel Hawley, a grocer and provision dealer of that town. Hawley had written to them on 30 March, in a flowing and flamboyant hand, to inform them that he would travel to Liverpool on 17 April to complete the formalities. McGrath was 14 years old and was apprenticed for a term of seven years. He had been in Ashton-under-Lyne for some time, presumably for the usual trial period, and on 22 February the Workhouse Committee had received a letter from him ‘expressive of his gratitude and satisfaction at being so comfortably placed, and wishing a suit of cloathes for Sunday to enable him to attend chapel’, a request which appears to have been readily granted. Whether William completed his apprenticeship is unclear, as Hawley died in the spring of 1851, just as the indentures were due to expire. There is no trace of either Samuel or William in the March 1851 census for Ashton-under-Lyne.

Premiums and terms of apprenticeship

Under the Old Poor Law a premium was frequently paid by the parish when apprenticing children. Economically this made sense, as it was cheaper to apprentice a child at a premium of, say, £5 than to maintain him or her in the workhouse until adulthood. In December 1843 the Liverpool Workhouse Committee were still recommending that ‘a small premium … be paid weekly or otherwise as may be agreed upon’, and in the following January the Committee resolved that premiums should not exceed £10 for boys and £5 for girls. However by 1850 the Industrial Schools Committee had adopted a different approach, stating that the payment of premiums ‘is objectionable and ought as far as practicable, to be abolished’, except in unspecified special circumstances. In the sample group there is only evidence of two premiums being paid—one of £3 15s for a boy apprenticed to a boot and shoemaker in 1849 and £5 for one apprenticed to a cordwainer in 1848—but there is no explanation as to why these payments were made. Boys apprenticed to seamen were not included in the 1845 orders and were typically paid an allowance, rising in value through the years of their apprenticeship. Richard Dickinson, bound to the South American General Steam Navigation Company, was paid a total of £40 over four years, but William Gill, apprenticed to David Lawson Cargill, received only £22 for the same length of service. They were also expected to provide their own ‘sea bedding, wearing apparel and other necessaries’.

In the sample group, the age at the time of apprenticeship was included on 78 of the 92 indentures (see Table 1). The 1845 orders stipulated that no child under the age of 9 should be apprenticed and the Select Vestry adhered to this—the youngest children were 12 years old. Three of these were girls working in textile factories and one was a boy apprenticed to a boot and shoemaker in Liscard (Wallasey). The optimum age for apprenticeship was 14. The 1845 orders also said that no child should be bound for more than eight years and in the sample group only one child was apprenticed for this term (to a plumber and glazier) and none for longer. Table 2 gives the lengths of terms served by the sample group for different trades and shows that seamen and factory operatives generally served shorter periods, typically four or five years, than tailors or boot and shoemakers who served six or seven years in trades potentially requiring more skill. Sometimes employers who took groups of children were able to dictate the terms of their apprenticeship. Thus Hopwood and Sons, cotton spinners of Burnley, negotiated the length of the terms to 6 years or until the age of 19, although they also agreed to pay the children ‘a certain portion of their earnings’ during their final year. Children appear to have been allowed a trial period with their potential master, ranging from one to three months. William Elliott, tailor, and Joseph Barker, shoemaker, of Tarvin, Cheshire, both had boys sent on trial for one month in October.
1851. These must have been successful, at least in the short term, as John Cameron and William Hughes were bound in December that year.  

Table 1 Age when starting apprenticeship [sample group]  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although a premium was not paid to a prospective master, children were provided with clothing as a payment in kind. There are references in the Industrial School minute books to the ‘usual outfit’ being supplied when indentures were signed, but no definition of what that was. In their 1840 report the Poor Law Commissioners acknowledged that suitable clothing should be supplied to children brought up in the workhouse, when leaving for service or apprenticeship ‘as is usually possessed by young persons not being paupers, in similar conditions’. In 1856 the Industrial Schools Committee resolved that boy apprentices should be supplied with a new ‘Carragen’ suit, instead of the former corduroy, as well as the suit they already had and when the binding was complete they would receive a third, made to the specification of the master tailor of the workhouse and supplied at a cost of £1. Occasionally money was given instead of the normal workhouse clothing. In 1863 Peter Breen, apprenticed to Mr Quinn of Worcester, was allowed the value of an apprentice outfit in money. Employers sometimes requested items of clothing for their apprentices. James Hobson, a silk manufacturer of Congleton, apprenticed a group of girls and in February 1854 asked that they should each receive an extra bonnet and shawl. The request was granted, though the authorities were slow in supplying the items—he had to repeat his request the following May.

Before a child was apprenticed the Select Vestry completed an ‘Apprentice Report’. A few have survived and are kept with the relevant indenture. The form included information on the child and the potential master, the parent’s consent, certificates signed by the medical officer relating to the child’s health, by the master of the Industrial Schools on their suitability for the proposed trade, and by the relieving officer giving his approval. The business premises were visited and if found to be ‘conducted in a respectable manner’ were approved by the relieving officer. The form was signed by the master and the child, indicating a willingness to enter into the contract and also demonstrating the child’s ability to write his or her name. The process suggests that the Select Vestry made some efforts to provide suitable places for children and that there was some investigation into potential masters. Not all requests for apprentices were approved, although the reasons are rarely given. In November 1860 James Moore of Rawtenstall and John McWilliam, a tailor of Glossop, were both refused permission to have apprentices. An application by J.S. Sutcliffe, a manufacturer of Sowerby Bridge, for an unspecified number of children was ‘not allowed, there being none suitable’. In November 1856 an application by Raws of Bacup was refused, ‘Bacup being beyond the prescribed limit’ of 30 miles, although a similar application by H. Nuttall, a tailor from Newchurch in Rossendale, was initially refused as being ten miles beyond the limit but subsequently accepted after the vestry clerk sought approval from the Poor Law Board.
Table 2 Trades and length of indentures (sample group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>trade</th>
<th>length of term in years</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baker and confectioner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basket maker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boot and shoemaker, cordwainer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chimney sweeper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coal miner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confectioner and eating house keeper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factory operative</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fisherman</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hairdresser</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housewifery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>painting and paperhanging</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>painting, gilding and signwriting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pawnbroker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plumber and glazier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saddler</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seaman</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silk manufacturer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tailor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>watchmaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On occasions in the 1840s the Industrial School had difficulty in finding positions for all the children old enough to leave. In 1843 it was agreed that an advertisement should be placed in a local newspaper stating ‘that there were a number of boys and girls usefully educated, twelve years and upwards, fit for any employment’.30 In the following January advertisements were also placed in the *Midland Counties Herald* and ‘other papers in the manufacturing districts’, and circulars and posters advertising for apprentice seamen were displayed in the merchants’ offices and the Sailors’ Home.31

Among the parish indentures are those for 21 children apprenticed to coalminers. One wonders how hard their working life must have been, given the conditions in the mines. In September 1844 the Industrial Schools Committee received a letter from William Stock, on behalf of John Stock and Brothers of Stanley Colliery, St Helens, requesting ‘say twenty or thirty boys’ to be apprenticed to them. This was shortly after the 1842 Act which banned women from working underground and Stock explicitly states that ‘They would be required to do the work which Girls have hitherto been employed to do, vis to draw the coal from the miners to the wagon road”—it sounds very much as though the colliery owners were looking for a new source of cheap labour. Stock attended the Committee meeting to give further details, describing the working day, ‘from 6 o’clock am to 4 pm, with frequent holidays’; how lunch would be taken down to the apprentices (presumably they were below ground for 10 hours); and the fact of ‘the mines being very well aired few accidents from fire damp had occurred and non recently’. After ‘considerable discussion’ Stock’s request was approved and an arrangement was made for him to return the following Monday to select the boys.32 Unfortunately the indentures for these boys have not survived so we
do not know how many went, but presumably the arrangement was considered satisfactory for the colliery owners and the Select Vestry, for in 1850 a further six boys were apprenticed to Peter Stock, colliery owner.33 This appears to be the first instance under the New Poor Law of children being apprenticed in a group.

Welfare

Some effort was made to check on the welfare of children after they were apprenticed. A return (now lost) was compiled for all children leaving the Industrial Schools between January 1851 and November 1852, giving details of their known whereabouts and ‘their present condition and such other information concerning them as may be ascertained’.34 In 1868 the Out Door Inspector reported that he had made visits to about fifty children in the Chorley area, ‘from which it appeared that the children are in nearly every case giving satisfaction to their employers’.35 However not everything could have been satisfactory and one wonders what pressure was put on the children to give the response expected. The lists of children sent out from the Industrial Schools between January 1867 and December 1869 were checked against the parish indentures and entries for 122 of them were found. These lists were annotated after their completion, although it is not clear how long afterwards. Most children have ‘S’ in the remarks column, which appears to indicate that they were still with their master and giving satisfaction, but half a dozen are qualified by comments such as ‘careless’ or ‘has been discontented and insubordinate’. Twelve had left without notice, four had gone to friends or relatives, and nine had found another situation, indicating that 20 per cent had left their original master—though perhaps we should be surprised that the percentage is not higher, given the children’s circumstances.36

No allegations of ill treatment were substantiated in the minute books, although accusations were sometimes made. In September 1866 Sabina Bebb, one of several children apprenticed to Helliwell’s, bobbin manufacturers of Blackburn, charged her master with ‘ill usage’. The matter was dealt with by the local magistrates and the girl returned to the Industrial Schools.37 Sometimes the Committee declined to become involved on matters of welfare. When J. Halstead, a joiner of Rossendale, wrote in May 1866 requesting that his apprentice, William R. Mayor, should return to the Industrial Schools, ‘his eyesight having become impaired’, the Committee ‘under the circumstances of the case’ refused the request—one wonders what became of William.38 Children did, however, often return to the Industrial Schools, the most usual reasons being ill health, unsuitability for the work or misconduct. John Routledge and Edward Roberts were sent back to the Industrial Schools in December 1856 for misconduct and then transferred to the workhouse, presumably as a punishment.39 In May 1868 the managers of Bentham Mills sent back M.A. Anderson and were allowed to have another girl in her place, as she was ‘constitutionally unfit for mill work’.40

The 1845 orders required masters to ensure that apprentices under 16 years of age attended church every Sunday, within a reasonable distance of where they lived, ‘according to the religious persuasion in which they have been brought up’, and this regulation was incorporated in the parish indentures form.41 There are occasional references in the Industrial School minute books to problems over this regulation. In May 1858, for example, William Mutch complained that his brother-in-law, William Melling, apprenticed in Liverpool to a pawnbroker John Wood, was ‘kept in close confinement on Sunday’. A letter from the boy was read to the Committee, but after further investigation it was decided “that no serious grounds of complaint exists...
against Mr Woods'. Roman Catholic children apprenticed to Messrs Spence and Moore of Burnley refused to attend church, and problems also appear to have arisen at the flax mills in Bentham and with the cotton spinner Joseph Travis of Greenfield, Saddleworth, but the minute books are disappointingly vague about the details.

Table 3 Parish indentures: trade groups (boys and girls)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRADE</th>
<th>girls</th>
<th>boys</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>TRADE</th>
<th>girls</th>
<th>boys</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>baker</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>grocer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basketmaker</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>hairdresser</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blacksmith</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>joiner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bobbin manufacturer</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>miscellaneous</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boot and shoemaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butcher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>painter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carver and gilder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>pawnbroker</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chimney sweep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>printer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coalminer</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>saddlery</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cotton manufacturer</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>seaman</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domestic service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>silk manufacturer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>soapboiler</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dressmaker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>spirit dealer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estate agent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>tailor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farmer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>watch trade</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flax manufacturer</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>wool manufacturer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>108</strong></td>
<td><strong>521</strong></td>
<td><strong>629</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>108</strong></td>
<td><strong>521</strong></td>
<td><strong>629</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trades

To which trades were the children apprenticed? There were marked differences between those indentured by the parish and the others, with a much greater variety of trades among the former. In this analysis trades were divided into groups. Thus, boot- and shoemakers also include cloggers, boot closers, cordwainers and shoemakers, while all trades relating to watchmaking were grouped, as were those relating to grocery, including provision dealer, grocer and baker. Trades such as whitesmith, market gardener, hatter, druggist and cork-cutter, with just one or two representatives, were grouped under ‘miscellaneous’. Table 3 gives the number of children in the different trade groups, showing that the most common trades for individual apprentices were boot and shoemaker (123) and tailor (82). Gore’s street directory of Liverpool for 1865 lists about 750 boot and shoemakers, plus 50 clog and patten makers, and 550 tailors, so there was obviously a demand for such trades, although the size and scope of individual businesses varied. Not all these children were apprenticed in Liverpool—of those apprenticed to boot and shoemakers eighteen were sent to Birkenhead, six to Glossop and three to Hindley.

Another important group relates to the textile trades, including cotton, flax, silk, wool and bobbin manufacture. The larger numbers in these trades are accounted for by groups of children being apprenticed together, an aspect considered in detail below. Other significant trades include hairdressers (30) and pawnbrokers (29), most of these children being apprenticed in the Liverpool area, and the watch trade (25), long
established in both Liverpool and the Prescot area. In contrast the non-parish indentures are dominated by children apprenticed as seamen, representing 213 out of a total of 270 in this group. This is probably because apprenticeships to the ‘sea service’ were specifically excluded from the 1845 orders of the Poor Law Commissioners. There were marked differences in the trades to which boys and girls were apprenticed. Table 3 also shows the trade groups for parish indentures, divided into boys and girls. Of a total of 629 apprentices, only 109 were girls: they were more likely to have found work in domestic service, without the need for apprenticeship. Those girls who did serve were mostly in the textile trade, sent in groups to work as ‘factory operatives’.

Family groups

Many children in the Industrial Schools had brothers or sisters who were also inmates. By sorting the database it is possible tentatively to reconstruct some family groups and show if such children were apprenticed together. This is easier with less common surnames, but dates which are reasonable close can be another clue. There are instances of siblings being apprenticed to the same master: thus, Nicholas and Thomas Dowling were both sent to John Hoyle, cotton spinner, at Wheelton near Chorley on 12 January 1869, and James and William McLoughlin were apprenticed to the colliers Mercer and Evans of Ashton-in-Makerfield on 29 December 1868. Sarah Blackwell went to Edmund Ashworth and Sons, cotton spinners at Egerton, on 19 June 1866 and her brother William followed on 30 June 1868. Four members of the McCall family were apprenticed from the Industrial Schools; Mary and Ellen went to John Hoyle on 12 January 1869, Joseph went to John Jones, boot closer of Liverpool on 12 July 1864 and Arthur to Richard C Stananought, estate agent of Seaforth, on 2 June 1868.

It has generally been assumed that most children apprenticed by Poor Law guardians were orphans or had nobody to look after them, and this is borne out by evidence from the sample group. The parental status of 47 children is known, and of these only six parents (five mothers and one father) were present to sign the indenture, or make their mark, giving permission for their child’s apprenticeship. In the case of five children one parent was dead and the other had deserted, and in two instances both parents had deserted. However in the vast majority of cases both were dead and the child’s sole source of support was the workhouse system.

Where did they go?

The majority were apprenticed locally—of 629 children with parish indentures, 166 were apprenticed in Liverpool and 268 within five miles. Table 4 shows the most common trade groups and the distance from Liverpool that children in these groups were apprenticed. The majority of children apprenticed individually in the commonest trade groups, such as boot and shoemaking, hairdressing or pawnbroking, were indentured within five miles of the city. The watch trade was exceptional because its focus was Prescot, six miles from Liverpool. However, a few children were individually apprenticed some distance from the city. Two boys, Hugh Paul and John Simpson, were apprenticed in 1868 to Joseph Milton, a clogger in Dowlais near Merthyr Tydfil; in 1870 Patrick Butler was apprenticed to Henry Wynn, a gunlock-maker in Birmingham; and the same year Thomas Paton was bound to a shoemaker in Blaydon, County Durham. Perhaps there were family connections with these areas which led to the children being sent so far away? The map shows the comparative distribution of children with parish indentures in England and Wales, although the
picture is distorted by those children apprenticed in groups in the textile trades some distance from Liverpool.

As noted, only five of those with parish indentures were apprenticed as seamen, compared with 213 of the non-parish indenture children. They were therefore sent to a wider geographical range of places. The majority, 140 of the 213, were apprenticed to Liverpool firms, but other children were sent to Anglesey and Aberdovey in Wales; Appledore, Brixham and Salcombe in Devon; Maryport, Whitehaven and Workington in Cumberland; and Glasgow and Irvine in Scotland. Some were sent to the United States and Canada—four went to New York, five to New Brunswick and eighteen to Newfoundland—but one does wonder about the two children who in 1855 were apprenticed as seamen to Thomas Wright in the unlikely location of Croydon!

The case of Robert Skipsey

Robert Skipsey was one of six boys apprenticed to John Helliwell, bobbin manufacturer of Stansfield, near Todmorden, on 4 June 1861.46 Aged 13, he was bound for seven years and his indenture states that he was in good health, although both his parents were dead. However, on 26 April 1862 the Industrial Schools Committee received a letter from Helliwell and Sons, relating to the treatment of the apprentices and indicating that Skipsey and two other apprentices, John Welsh and Henry Thomas, had absconded and made their way back to Liverpool. The vestry clerk was instructed to reply, but no further detail is given and there is no way of knowing why they absconded or if they were returned to their employer. With his unusual surname it was possible to trace Skipsey in the census returns and fill in some other details of his life. The 1851 census suggests that he was born in Leeds, the son of Matthew and Mary Skipsey, and had a sister Eliza. From the date of his indenture he was probably in Kirkdale Industrial Schools at the time of the 1861 census. He has not been traced in the 1871 census but in 1881 Robert Skipsey was living with his wife Susannah and daughters Mary Jane and Rose Ann in Blackburn. His occupation is given as ‘bobbin turner’, the same trade to which he had been apprenticed in 1861, so this is perhaps an example of how the cycle of pauperism could be broken.

Group apprenticeships

Under the Old Poor Law it was common for orphaned or deserted children to be apprenticed in groups to factory owners, often at a considerable distance from their original parish.47 Apprenticing children was cheaper than maintaining them in the workhouse for extended periods, while sending them to another area had the additional advantage of changing their place of settlement to the new parish, thus relieving the original place of any potential poor relief burden. In the late eighteenth century most of the factories and mills were dependent on water power to drive machinery and in many cases this power source was distant from major population centres. A supply of child labour from workhouses apparently provided a neat and inexpensive solution to a number of problems.

However by the 1830s attitudes had changed and the post-1834 Poor Law Commissioners, wishing to promote the principle of ‘Less Eligibility’, whereby pauper apprentices should not be seen to have any advantages over their non-pauper contemporaries, opposed parish apprenticeships.48 Changes in legislation prompted a general shift away from child labour, making pauper apprentices less attractive to
employers and less readily available. Sidney and Beatrice Webb, writing in the early twentieth century, stated that 'Changes in the distribution of textile manufactories and in the character of the machinery, together with increasing legal restrictions, had practically killed ... the device of wholesale apprenticing of pauper children to capitalist manufacturers'. Rose suggests that even in Liverpool the practice of apprenticing groups of children was in decline after the 1820s due to a decrease in demand from mill owners. She states that 'by 1833 hardly any mill employed them', and that in 1847, when the last child at Quarry Bank Mill completed his apprenticeship, this was 'almost twenty years after most firms had moved exclusively to free labour'. However, as this study shows, the practice continued until at least 1870.

The first reference in the Industrial Schools minute books to the apprenticeship of a group of children does not relate to the textile trade, but to those, referred to earlier, sent to the coal mines of John Stock and Brothers in 1846. Ten years later, in 1856, A. Hill, manager of the Bromborough Pool works of Price and Co., candle
Table 4 Parish indentures: trade groups and distance from Liverpool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>trade group</th>
<th>distance in miles from Liverpool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blacksmith</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bobbin manufacturer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boot and shoemaker</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coalminer</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cotton manufacturer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flax manufacturer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grocer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hairdresser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miscellaneous</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pawbroker</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silk manufacturer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tailor</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>watch trade</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wool manufacturer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

manufacturers, requested forty boys aged between 14 and 16 years as apprentices—presumably the local Wirral Poor Law Union was unable or unwilling to supply this number. The Industrial Schools Committee ‘resolved that the above application in all respects be acceded to’.52 Unfortunately the indentures for this group have not survived.

The majority of other children apprenticed in groups were in trades relating to textiles, and their occupation is always described as ‘factory operative’ on the indentures. The practice increased from the mid-1850s, reaching a peak in the 1860s. These children were frequently sent some distance from Liverpool—to Clifton, Burnley and Giggleswick in Yorkshire; Prestbury in Cheshire; and Clitheroe, Bolton and Whalley in Lancashire. Although the 1845 orders stipulated that a child should not be apprenticed at a distance of more than 30 miles without permission of the Poor Law Commissioners (from 1847, the Poor Law Board) it seems that when the Select Vestry wrote to seek approval it was invariably given and was a mere formality. Thus, in January 1861 a letter from the Poor Law Board approved apprenticeship of children to John Holgate, cotton spinner of Waddington, Yorkshire; James Cowban, cotton spinner of Burnley; and Messrs Lawrence Wilson, bobbin turners of Whalley, Lancashire, although it did draw special attention to certain articles in the orders.55

Of 629 parish indentures, 203 are for children apprenticed in groups. In contrast to those apprenticed individually, many more girls were sent to manufacturers and this is shown in table 5—some 97 of 108 female apprentices were sent in groups as ‘factory
The youngest were Jane Heath and Catherine Travis, apprenticed to W.E. Foster and W. Fison, worsted spinners of Burley-in-Wharfedale, Yorkshire, aged only 12, although the average age, 13, was only slightly higher.

**Table 5  Apprentice groups by trade**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRADE GROUP</th>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Group total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bobbin manufacturer</td>
<td>J H Wilson &amp; Co</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Helliwell</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilson &amp; Sons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coal miner</td>
<td>Benjamin Walker</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Stock</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cotton manufacturer</td>
<td>Edmund Ashworth &amp; Sons</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hector Christie</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Hargreaves</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Holgate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Hoyle</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John P Parke</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R Moorby &amp; Sons</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thos &amp; J Heaton</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Bracewell</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Hargreaves</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flax manufacturer</td>
<td>Bentham Mills Co</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silk manufacturer</td>
<td>James Hobson</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wool manufacturer</td>
<td>W E Foster &amp; W Fison</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
<td><strong>203</strong></td>
<td><strong>203</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bentham Mills Company, High Bentham, Yorkshire**

In March 1867 a group of 28 children (22 girls and 6 boys) were apprenticed to the Bentham Mills Co., at High Bentham, Yorkshire, flax manufacturers. Bentham had developed as a weaving centre in the late eighteenth century when Messrs J., T. and W. Hornby began importing Baltic flax to the area via Lancaster, spinning yarn for sailcloth. In 1866, just before the arrival of the Liverpool apprentices, the mills were sold to the Bentham Mills Company, after the previous owners, the Waitman family, experienced financial difficulties. The shareholders of the new company included a number of leading Quakers, such as Joseph Rowntree of York, who, with others, signed all the indenture forms.

Henry Kay, the Out Door Inspector, reported favourably to the Industrial Schools Committee in January 1867 on the Bentham Mill Company’s application for apprentices. Two large cottages were equipped to accommodate twenty of the children, although the boys and girls were to have separate quarters and not take their meals together. A housekeeper (one of the mill workers) and his wife were appointed to look after them, receiving 5s 6d per head for ‘board and attention and washing
etc.’, with rent, furniture and bedding paid for by the firm. The remaining eight apprentices were to be boarded with a ‘respectable widow’. Assurances were given that the children would attend the parish church regularly, despite the Quaker sympathies of the managers. There followed correspondence between the Poor Law Board and the Select Vestry over the details of the indentures, to ensure that all arrangements conformed with the 1845 orders. It was agreed that the children should formally be apprenticed to the managing directors of the company: William Wheeler Hoyland of Bentham House, Bentham; Joseph Rowntree of York; Ezekial Grayson the younger of Low Bentham; and Miles Constantine of Bentham. The guardians of the Settle Union, of which Bentham was part, raised no objections and the question of Bentham’s distance from Kirkdale, about 50 miles, appears to have been resolved.\textsuperscript{57}

The Poor Law Board gave permission on 19 March and the children were formally apprenticed a week later.\textsuperscript{58} The majority were aged just 13, although three were 16, and one aged 17 was just starting her apprenticeship when most of her contemporaries would have been finishing. All were apprenticed for four or five years, and most were orphans or had been deserted by a surviving parent after the other had died. Only one, Richard Cheshire, had his indentures signed by his father.\textsuperscript{59} According to information in the 1871 census the children were then boarded with local families. Some were in groups: all six apprentice boys were boarded at no.19 The Mill and four of the girls at no.20, but Martha Slack, Kate Travers and Mary Ann Turner boarded with different families. Of the 28 children apprenticed in 1867, 23 can be traced in the 1871 returns for Bentham, when the majority had just reached the end of their apprenticeship. Their actual occupations (rather than the standard ‘factory operative’ noted in the indentures) included flax spinner, scrivener in flax mill, jobber in flax mill, linen rover and linen warper, indicating that they had progressed from the simple tasks assigned to an apprentice to more skilled work. Tracing them in later years would be difficult as they could have moved from the area or, in the case of the girls, married and changed surnames.

There are indications of some problems. The Committee minute books reported in April 1867, shortly after the children arrived, that despite previous assurances they were being taken on Sundays to the churches attended by their host families, rather than going to one of their own religion. Letters were exchanged between W.W. Hoyland, managing director of Bentham Mills, and the Committee.\textsuperscript{60} The list of children discharged from the Industrial Schools between 1867 and 1869 includes the group sent to Bentham and the additional notes, made at an unspecified later date, reveal that three children, Eliza Duncan, Mary Williams and Elizabeth Tobin, had been ‘discontented and insubordinate’.\textsuperscript{61} All three were still there when the notes were made, but in the 1871 census Elizabeth Tobin was not listed in Bentham.

**Conclusion**

Although this study has been able to shed some light on the fate of the apprentices, the only sources of information are the official records of the workhouse and the Poor Law Board. We never hear the voices of the children and have no idea of their reactions to such a drastic change in their lives. Were they happy with their new employers? Were they treated well, and properly fed, clothed and lodged? Did they become part of the family or were they effectively cheap labour? How did they react on moving from an industrial city, probably the only world they had known, to a mill in the depths of the countryside at, for instance Burley-in-Wharfedale or Feizor, near Settle? At least those children sent in groups would have received mutual support from each other; individual children must have initially felt very lonely. The collection of pauper apprentice indentures, 1840 to 1870, in the Liverpool Record Office,
provides valuable information on the process of indenturing, with evidence for the welfare of the children, the trades they were taught, and where they were sent. In recent work Honeyman refers to groups of children from Leicester being apprenticed to a cotton mill in Derbyshire in the 1840s and a group from Hull were sent to Halifax as late as the 1880s, suggesting that Liverpool was not unique in still apprenticing its pauper children in this way, but comparative study of practices in other Poor Law Unions would ascertain the extent of the practice.
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Voices and faces in the rioting crowd: identifying seventeenth-century enclosure rioters

HEATHER FALVEY

Introduction

Why study early-modern enclosure riots? Justifying them as the subject of a dissertation for a post-graduate degree in local and regional history is not difficult: riots are very specific events that occurred in a particular locality. Furthermore, such events have social, economic and political significance and so can be interpreted within a range of historical disciplines. However, during the 1980s, the foremost historians of early-modern riot, Roger Manning, Buchanan Sharp and Keith Lindley, did not consider that politics was relevant. For them ‘politics’ could be defined as ‘the governmental activities of the ruling elite vested in the central state, and any state-centred disputes generated thereby’. They argued that, since enclosure riots were essentially local disturbances, the rioters had no political axe to grind. Even riots on crown estates or concerning crown-sponsored projects, such as fenland drainage, were not considered politically motivated since, it was suggested, those were attacks against the instruments rather than the agents of change. This refusal, or failure, to acknowledge the existence not only of ‘popular politics’ but also of any links between local protest and public policy emphasises the chasm that had opened up between political and social historians in the 1980s.

In 1994 Patrick Collinson called for ‘a new political history, which is social history with the politics put back in, or an account of political processes which is also social’. He urged historians ‘to explore the social depth of politics, to find signs of political life at levels where it was not previously thought to have existed’. He suggested that ‘ordinary householders and proprietors’ could appreciate the wider implications of their actions and how they might affect the wider political nation. His signposts to a new political history pointed in two directions: to vertical power relations between the man in the field and central government, that is, macro-politics; and to horizontal power relations between members of a community, that is, micro-politics. When and where these two planes intersected, politics not only became more complex but also revealed more about local attitudes, motivations and alignments. Collinson’s ‘horizontal power relations’ comprised relationships within the nation’s component local administrative units that, until then, historians had largely ignored. By altering the focus of ‘politics’ in this way, political history could be incorporated with the work of early-modern social historians.

In 1996, Keith Wrightson defined ‘politics’ as ‘the social distribution and use of power’ within any given community, thus locating politics in power relationships that existed within a locality. The ‘politics of the parish’ encompassed ‘the rich variety of political processes which can be observed in the local community’. Custom was identified as a particular focus of parish politics, for custom could be both cause and seat of contest.
In this context enclosure riots were invariably political because they occurred when some, if not all, inhabitants united against an enclosing landlord in defence of customary practices and rights. However, research into the enclosure riots that took place in Duffield (Derbyshire) and Whittlesey (Isle of Ely) has revealed that some rioters were willing and able to interact with central government. The fact that their overtly political remarks were reported and recorded demonstrates, at the very least, that the authorities were aware of, or concerned about, rioters’ attitudes towards authority. Similarly, by their very existence, petitions to parliament from commoners involved in enclosure protests display their political awareness and appreciation of the authority and power of both Houses. This paper introduces some of the people who were caught up in the riots at Duffield and Whittlesey and reproduces examples of their conversations. Some of these reveal the ‘politics of the parish’ at work during moments of tension within the community; others a somewhat astonishing awareness of central politics. But first I ought briefly to define ‘enclosure’ and ‘riot’.

In a detailed discussion of early-modern enclosure, Joan Thirsk has defined it as ‘the appropriation to one person of land which had previously been at the disposal of the whole community throughout the year’. Frequently the land that had been enclosed would then be rented out to individuals, whether local men or outsiders. In both Duffield and Whittlesey the landowner enclosed a large area that had previously been part of the common waste. At Duffield, the duchy of Lancaster, acting on behalf of Charles I, enclosed one-third of each of the three wards of the ancient forest known as Duffield Frith—in all, some 1,800 acres. At Whittlesey, following the drainage of 18,000 acres of common fen, roughly 8,600 acres were allotted to manorial tenants and other recipients, the remainder to the lords of the manors of Whittlesey and the drainage adventurers.

It is important to remember that commons were not freely accessible to all. In law, only manorial tenants possessed common rights and had access to commons: their tenancies, and the dues that they paid to the lord of the manor, entitled them to pasture animals, take fallen wood to repair their homes and fences, and the like. Furthermore the number of animals that they could graze and the amount of wood that they could take were frequently regulated by local custom and tenants might be expected to pay a nominal charge for exercising those rights. In practice, however, where commons were large—hundreds or even thousands of acres of common waste in woodlands, forests and fens—poor inhabitants (those who were not manorial tenants) were permitted access to those commons and so could graze a few sheep or a cow, collect fallen wood, berries and other foodstuffs. It should also be noted that although some enclosures were made arbitrarily by landlords, many were made by agreement and, in theory, were supported by the majority of the tenants. However, it appears that such ‘agreements’ were often signed only by those tenants holding the majority of the land, and those might be few in number. Nevertheless, this means that opposition to enclosure was not necessarily unanimous. Individuals who had benefited from the changes in local agricultural practice welcomed these ‘improvements’—for example, some of the manorial tenants and all of the individuals who leased land within the new enclosures—but many others objected to them. The coalitions that arose between inhabitants as a result of their attitudes towards enclosure reveal quite clearly the micro-politics at work within that community.

**Opposing enclosure**

Whether united or divided, it does not take much to imagine the effect of enclosure on a community: sometimes literally overnight, fences were erected, ditches dug or
hedges set, to demarcate land that was no longer accessible to manorial tenants and other inhabitants. Even so, although the adverse effects of change were (and are) frequently bemoaned, they were (and are) rarely attacked forcibly; indeed, John Walter has observed that early-modern opponents of enclosure were constrained by a ‘culture of obedience’ and that they saw riot as a last resort.\(^\text{11}\) His recent focus on grumbling has pinpointed the seed from which resistance might grow, resistance that could take various forms.\(^\text{12}\) Courses of action open to opponents of enclosure were wide-ranging: from passive acceptance, through foot-dragging, or refusal to sign an agreement, to initiating lawsuits, and ultimately to determined physical resistance.\(^\text{13}\) In early-modern England, riot might be deemed to have occurred ‘when three people gathered and broke the peace, or gathered with the intention of doing so’.\(^\text{14}\) Regarding violence that might happen during such breaches of the peace, it ‘could be interpreted loosely, to embrace intimidating words spoken by people bearing offensive weapons’.\(^\text{15}\) The definition of an offensive weapon was similarly flexible; for example, it might encompass a spade carried with the intention of filling in enclosure ditches. Since riot is a legal concept, the fact that a riot had occurred, or was alleged to have occurred, is recorded in legal records: in documents generated before or during lawsuits or trials, or in petitions to parliament in its capacity as the highest court in the land. Important sources for early-modern riot include the records of the court of Star Chamber, up until its abolition in 1641; the records of the House of Lords, after parliament was reopened in February 1640; and the archive of the court of the duchy of Lancaster.

Although many legal documents record ordinary transactions of one kind or another, others record extraordinary occurrences, that is, events or activities that transgressed the norms of acceptable behaviour. Historians of riot have been accused of writing ‘stepping stone’ history because, rather than looking at everyday, ‘typical’ events, they leap from one momentous event to another without considering what went on in between.\(^\text{16}\) On the other hand, riots provide access to historical communities that might otherwise remain closed: frequently, it is only when holes appeared within the social fabric that that fabric becomes visible in the historical record. If life was continuing as normal, shifting social and economic relationships within an early-modern community remain fairly obscure. Records of riot provide names of alleged participants; locations of unrest; and reasons for that unrest. One of the purposes of my thesis was to consider the social and economic status of known rioters at Duffield and Whittlesey as the (scant) secondary literature had made certain assumptions and generalisations, not least because earlier historians had looked at series of riots in extensive geographical regions. By concentrating on particular places, it might be possible to track down individuals and therefore gain more specific insights into the composition of a rioting crowd.

Wayne Te Brake has suggested that demonstrations and riots are ‘expressive actions’ that are integral parts of an interactive political process.\(^\text{17}\) He has described riots as ‘statements within an on-going conversation’: in some of the records of riot it is possible to eavesdrop on this conversation because voices of early-modern people caught up in riots can be heard quite clearly in affidavits (sworn statements) and in depositions. The latter are answers made by witnesses to specific questions, known as interrogatories, that were posed by commissions of enquiry set up to investigate alleged offences. It must be emphasised that those answering the questions were rarely the alleged rioters—only occasionally can rioters themselves be heard speaking—but witnesses sometimes reported the words of rioters. Within a suit, there might be one series of interrogatories posed on behalf of the plaintiff and another set on behalf of the defendant; and some of the witnesses might be questioned on behalf of both
parties. It has been argued that the voices we hear in depositions are not those of the deponents but the ‘voices’ of the legal clerks who took down those depositions; that the deponents’ words have been either sanitised or enlarged upon in order to bring them into line with the requirements of the case or suit being presented. But such arguments are not wholly convincing, not least because within one set of depositions a range of voices may be heard with a variety of pitches and in colloquial or dialect language.18

Furthermore, if lawyers did filter depositions, they did not make a very good job of it: deponents responding to a series of interrogatories often contradict themselves or each other. Frequently interrogatories were leading questions, such as: ‘Did you see John Smith break the fences of the enclosure?’. It could, therefore, be argued that even if the answering depositions were not doctored by lawyers, the original interrogatories were artificial constructs produced by lawyers in order procure particular answers; however, this is not necessarily so. Firstly, the deponent might answer an interrogatory in one of several ways: a) he (or she) might not respond to the question at all; b) he might confirm the allegation; c) he might deny it; or d) he might confirm or deny the original allegation and then volunteer additional information. Secondly, evidence from Whittlesey demonstrates that interrogatories might be constructed around statements made by an earlier witness rather than around statements dreamt up by lawyers.

**The rioting in Whittlesey**

In 1643 there was large-scale rioting in the drained fens at Whittlesey on Monday 15 and Tuesday 16 May; on the following day, Wednesday 17, further rioting was prevented only by the arrival from Wisbech of parliamentarian troops. On 29 May, John Newton, who styled himself ‘gentleman of Whittlesey’, made an affidavit concerning these events, which was presented to the House of Lords.19 Newton, both a victim and a witness of the riots, stated that

upon the 15th day of this instant May hee was present, when diverse of the Inhabitants of Whittlesey aforesaid and of other Townes and villages adjoyning amounting to the number of about one hundred persons, amongst wich were Jeffery Boyce, William White, Thomas England, Richard Mash, William Mash, James Boyce, John Heynes, William Heynes, Robert Tassell, John Tassell, William Layton, William Richar and John Wells, whoe, with Forkes, Spades, Long staves & other weapons, in a riotous manner did enter upon the Lands of the Earles of Bedford & Portland and of diverse of the Tenants and Land owners of the said Towne of Whittlesey, and there did throw downe the division Dikes, puld downe houses, cut and destroyed young Coles & Rapes and other spoyles to the greate loss and damage of the owners. And farther hee saith that George Glapthorne Esquire, a Justice of the Peace, came there and required the said persons to bee obedient to the Lawes of the Realme and to depart thence in a peaceable manner, whereupon the afore named Jeffery Boyce, James Boyce and William Mash held pitchforks against the said George Glapthorne and told him that hee was noe Justice, for hee was against the King, and was all for the Parliament, and that they would not obey him nor any Law, and many of the Company, whose names this deponent knoweth not, cryd out and sayd that shortly hee would bee served as Felton served Buckingham.
In his affidavit, Newton accused (by name) thirteen Whittlesey men of carrying weapons, destroying property and causing damage to crops; he also accused three of physically threatening a justice of the peace. The men whom he identified were probably the ringleaders; certainly their activities were conspicuous enough to make them memorable. As a direct result of Newton’s affidavit, the House of Lords issued an order demanding that the earls of Bedford and Portland be allowed ‘quiet possession’ of their lands in Whittlesey and that the rioters identified by Newton be brought before the Lords. This was done, but the Lords required additional information about the Whittlesey riots, and so interrogatories were drawn up and administered to various individuals. The depositions of nine witnesses are preserved in the Lords’ archive. Record survival can be somewhat variable: regarding interrogatories and depositions, sometimes neither survives, sometimes one or other survives, and sometimes both do. For the events in Whittlesey, not only have both survived, but also we can see the source of the interrogatories: most are based on accusations made by Newton in his affidavit. This suggests that in some, if not all, cases affidavits might be taken from one or more witnesses and then interrogatories constructed around them. On the one hand, whether what Newton said was ‘true’ or accurate is not particularly relevant: the interrogatories were framed around what he had said and subsequent witnesses answered them, either professing ignorance, concurring with, denying, or enlarging upon each question. On the other, Newton’s affidavit provides his version of events: the fact that his version was then incorporated into the interrogatories suggests that interrogatories themselves, as well as their corresponding answers, can be used as sources of historical evidence.

1. The English Midlands, showing the location of Duffield and Whittlesey (Alan Crosby)
Newton himself does not appear in any local records from Whittlesey but apparently he was leasing land in the newly drained fens since another witness reported seeing his property being attacked there by rioters.20 He was probably the man named John Newton who, in February 1642, subscribed to the Protestation in neighbouring Ramsey.21 He was certainly a local man, since he was able to identify some of the faces in the rioting crowd; more importantly, he also reported several voices, and what fascinating voices they were. The accusation flung at George Glapthorne JP, that ‘hee was noe Justice, for hee was against the King, and was all for the Parliament’ and the taunt that ‘they would not obey him nor any Law’ are rare explicit examples of political speech from enclosure rioters. Although enclosure riots were at the heart of the politics of the parish, as defined by Keith Wrightson, at Whittlesey the politics of the parish suddenly became embroiled in the politics of the nation. There is nothing in the local records to suggest that Whittlesey itself was a hotbed of political activity; however, in 1643, despite or perhaps because of its close connections with Oliver Cromwell, the Isle of Ely was a royalist enclave within the newly formed parliamentarian Eastern Association.22 It is, therefore, quite possible that the Whittlesey rioters had not assumed their royalist pose simply to counter Glapthorne’s known support for parliament, but that they were, in fact, stating their political allegiance.

Certainly the rioters’ threat that ‘shortly hee would bee served as Felton served Buckingham’ seems to support this for they were likening their stance against Glapthorne to John Felton’s assassination of Buckingham. Felton was feted in poems and ballads as a popular hero and England’s saviour because he had eradicated the duke’s evil influence over king and country.23 Violence against persons was rare during early-modern enclosure riots and the physical threat to Glapthorne with the pitchforks and the verbal threat are unusual to say the least. It is highly unlikely that the Whittlesey crowd would have carried out their threat to imitate Felton, as the repercussions within the community could have been disastrous. Nevertheless the implication is self-evident. In popular opinion, Glapthorne, like Buckingham, was a traitor to the king; his killing would be welcomed because it would terminate his unpopular activities. Interestingly, in his subsequent depositions Newton backed down from the version of events that he had given in his affidavit: later, he simply stated that Jeffrey Boyce, having a pitchfork in his hand, ‘did say unto this deponent that Mr Glapthorne was noe Justice of the peace for that he was against the king and was all for the Parliament therefore hee the said Boyce would not obey him or any orders or lawes from him’. Furthermore, Newton could not say whether any of the rioters had cried out that Mr Glapthorne would be served as Felton served Buckingham.24 Note that Newton did not deny Boyce’s words but retracted the accusation of threatening behaviour towards a JP. Perhaps he back-pedalled because such an accusation was very serious, whereas a declaration in support of the king was acceptable as yet; incidentally, although he retracted the comparison with Felton, it is unlikely to have been pure invention on his part.

And who was Jeffrey Boyce? Robert Freeman identified him as the ‘cheife actour and ringleader’ in the riots.25 In the petition that they presented to the House of Lords, the earls of Bedford and Portland identified him as ‘Jeffrey Boyce the younger’.26 There was a manorial tenant named Jeffrey Boyce who held a ‘commonable cottage’ in Horsegate but this man was Jeffrey Boyce senior, father-in-law of Thomas Astlyne.27 However, the will of John Oughtie, yeoman of Eastrea near Whittlesey, confirms that Jeffrey Boyce junior was a young single man at the time of the riots.28 Five years later, in 1648, Boyce had recently married Oughtie’s daughter, Alice, who was not yet 21. In his will, the new father-in-law stipulated that once she reached her majority, she should
receive a legacy of £80 provided that Jeffrey Boyce ‘do fullie estate the said Alice my
daughter and his wife in house or Land to the full valew or worth of the said some of
fourscore pounds’. Boyce, therefore, had to acquire property for the couple without
relying on his wife’s wealth, which suggests that at the time of the riots he was an
angry, landless young man. By the 1660s he held land in Eastrea Fen and was
bequeathed a further 20 acres there by his brother John.\textsuperscript{29} When Jeffrey died in 1666,
he called himself a yeoman, although his will gives no indication of his actual wealth.\textsuperscript{30}
In his deposition Newton identified another lippy rioter who was disrespectful to his
betters. On 17 May the crowd of rioters, estimated to be 500 strong, was dispersed by
the arrival of parliamentarian troops but some rioters were reluctant to leave. When
told to move on by Mr Francis Underwood, William White ‘swore he would not depart
untill that hee had one Mr Wisemans Inclosure throwne downe and this Deponents
[John Newton’s] likewise’. William White, like Jeffrey Boyce, was an angry young man:
he was about 25 at the time and his father Nicholas was a manorial tenant holding a
commonable cottage at Delfe End, where they were near neighbours of John Wells,
another rioter identified by Newton.\textsuperscript{31}

The voices of the deponents are no less interesting than those of the rioters. The
Whittlesey deponents fall into two categories: men who had been suspiciously close to
the action, and men whose land and property the rioters had attacked. Within the
latter group we can hear some foreign accents: from their names and responses it is
clear that some of these men were Walloons who had settled in the Whittlesey area.\textsuperscript{32}
They were not attacked simply because they were foreigners but because they and
their compatriots were leasing farms that had been established within the enclosed,
newly-drained fens. These deponents provide rare opportunities to overhear snippets
of heated conversation between rioters and their victims. When Thomas Stuttyn
admitted to being the servant of the Walloon John Designes, the rioters commanded
him ‘to take it for a warning that he should plough there noe more (meaneing the
fens) for that if hee did they would cutt off his horses leggs and this Deponents
legs also, saying that it was Commons heretofore and they would have it soe still or else
they would loose there lives’. James La Roue said that he was told not to plough any
more, ‘for if he did he should be sure not to have his cropp againe’. Peter Behague
told how a ‘greate Company’ of the rioters came to his house and ‘did threaten to cutt
off this deponents horses leggs, nay his owne leggs, if he wuld proceed to plough any
the sayd Fenns any more’. Here are very audible, graphic threats being made by the
Whittlesey rioters to several individuals. Contrasting with the fearful foreign voices,
two other deponents have local accents. Anthony Lawe and Lewis Randall, both
carpenters from Whittlesey, appear to have been in the thick of things.\textsuperscript{33} Randall
actually admitted that he was ‘present amongst the sayd riottours’ in Glassenmore on
16 May and both men were in a position to provide the names of further rioters in
addition to those identified by Newton—although admittedly they only named seven
more between them. Perhaps they too had been active participants; maybe they had
been persuaded to name names in return for their own activities remaining
unexamined. As landless, married artisans they would have relied on the produce of
the fens to supplement their income to support their families; self-preservation seems
to be the most logical explanation for these men to give evidence against their fellow
inhabitants.\textsuperscript{34}

It is reasonable to suggest that other landless men like Lawe and Randall comprised a
large proportion of the rioters but evidence relating to the identities of the Whittlesey
rioters is very limited. Although John Newton had named thirteen rioters, two of
them, John Heynes and Thomas England, were not subsequently hauled before the
Lords; so to all intents and purposes, Newton named eleven rioters. Lawe and Randall
named a further seven. Eighteen men out of a crowd numbering possibly 500 represent less than 4 per cent. Of the eighteen, only four were manorial tenants: the others were sub-tenants (of which there were many in Whittlesey), landless labourers or artisans. Although it is possible to identify most of the named men, this does not help a great deal when trying to analyse the social status of the Whittlesey rioters as a whole: the known Whittlesey rioters comprised a coalition of smaller tenants and illegal commoners and arguably the unknown majority came from the same economic strata. There is, however, other evidence to show that more substantial inhabitants had also opposed the enclosures.

The rioting in Duffield Frith

There is a larger body of evidence relating to events at Duffield. Indeed, not only are there records relating to the actual enclosure riots, but others describe strategies employed by various inhabitants of Duffield in attempts to prevent, or at least hamper, the very construction of those enclosures. In September 1633 work began on delineating the extent of each enclosure in the three wards of Duffield Frith. Normally a surveyor would simply make holes in the ground to show where the fences, hedges or ditches marking the enclosure should subsequently be placed. However, in Hulland Ward opponents of enclosure filled up the holes almost as soon as they had been made and local labourers had to be employed to re-dig the holes and immediately set stakes or stones in them. Furthermore, over several days three local men and their wives, together with a fourth woman, tried to stop the labourers completing that task too. Within the surviving narrative of these occurrences opposing voices can be clearly heard. Among other things, the three men threatened the workmen and reviled them as ‘sorie beggarlie fellowes’; the four women verbally abused the workmen and one of their supervisors, and also removed all the markers that had been set out. These incidents were reported to duchy officials: two months later, the three men were forced to appear at Westminster to answer for their actions. The authorities construed the actions against the surveyor and his assistants as direct opposition to the king since he had commissioned the enclosures.

However, rather than being cowed into submission, the Duffield commoners proved wily and evasive in their answers, demonstrating a wide knowledge of the workings of the law and a determination to repulse this attack on their common rights. John Taylor, aged 70, denied that either he or any of his male associates had abused or threatened the workmen: he identified several women who had pulled up the stakes set by the workmen but denied that he, or anyone else, had procured or encouraged their actions. Regarding the women, William Webster, aged 40, professed ignorance of either their actions or words, distancing himself from their activities, although admitting that his wife was among them. Thomas Webster, aged 26, who was ‘head burrow’ [constable] and reeve of Hulland at this time, claimed that he and his associates had approached the workmen in a ‘neighbourlie and freindlie manner’. He knew nothing of the women’s presence in the ward ‘till hee mett with them by Chaunce’ and emphasised that they had acted independently. The defendants claimed that Alice Taylor and her friends had acted entirely on their own initiative, without any prompting from their husbands. Unsurprisingly, the men were unwilling to admit to heated verbal exchanges with the crown’s agents and their workmen, let alone physical violence. However, rather than deny that any illegal acts had taken place, they denied the involvement of any legally-responsible persons. Clearly these Duffield inhabitants knew that there was a blind spot in the law regarding women.
Eventually the enclosures were established in the Frith and for several years the leaseholder and his subtenants worked their land with few disruptions. But in February 1642 rioting broke out and continued sporadically for three years. The surviving evidence for these riots comprises four sets of papers presented in three different courts over the following seventeen years. Although few details of the events emerge, the voices of some of the alleged rioters and their victims are audible. In 1647, four affidavits concerning the riots were presented to the House of Lords. Apart from the names of the leading rioters and the dates of the disturbances, the contents of the affidavits, two relating to Hulland ward and one each to Chevin and Belper wards, are virtually identical. While this might cast suspicion over the veracity of their content, slight differences suggest independent input by the witnesses; indeed, two of the variations disclose noteworthy occurrences.

First, during the riots in Chevin ward in the summer of 1642, when Robert Alsopp urged William Johnson to obey certain orders issued by the House of Lords concerning the enclosures, Johnson retorted that ‘he cared not for the Lords orders hee would throw downe the fences’.

His response emphasises not only the strength of local feeling against the enclosures but also the extent to which supreme authority might be openly defied in such situations. It would be tempting to suggest that this rioter was the scythe-grinder named William Johnson who died in 1647, as such an artisan would fit comfortably with Buchanan Sharp’s theory about the identity and social status of rioters in forests. However, such temptation should be resisted as Johnson, a gentleman, was one of the defendants in an Exchequer suit in 1659 and was then identified by two deponents as being a leading rioter in the 1640s. Furthermore, the highly political nature of Johnson’s retort had serious implications because, from his mouth, it was a threat to the authorities: someone of his status was expected to uphold the law, rather than subvert it.

Second, Ralph Aulte of Hulland Ward was the only person to mention explicitly weapons wielded by the rioters. Like Robert Alsopp, who identified William Johnson, Aulte was one of the sub-tenants who farmed land within the enclosures; like most of the deponents at Whittlesey, the Duffield deponents had been victimised by the rioters. Aulte recalled that in February 1643 certain named men and many others with ‘guns Bills and other weapons did ... Ryotously and tumultuously’ enter the premises and ‘pulled up and cut downe the Inclosures, [and] turned their Cattle into the Corne and meadow ground’. Were it not for Aulte’s evidence, it might be assumed that the rioters had been armed merely with working tools and farming implements. The allegation that the rioters possessed guns conjures up far more menacing activities, even though there is no suggestion that they had actually been fired. Intimidation by force of numbers was a powerful weapon in itself—when reinforced by firearms, opponents feared for their lives and the perpetrators, moreover, risked harsher punishment if they were convicted.

Perhaps even more frightening than firearms was the threat of fire itself, which could quickly destroy an early-modern village and its environs. Incendiarism is well known as a manifestation of protest in later centuries but explicit mention of arson being used by early-modern enclosure rioters is rare. Again Ralph Aulte is the informant, but this time in 1659. Conveying the fear that nocturnal incendiarism might inspire in the propertied, he recalls that ‘in the night time came a great Multitude of people disguised & pulled downe the fences and burned the doores of the barne’. But even this mob was not bent on attacking people: he tells how he had been ‘kept in his house’ while the destruction was wreaked outside. In order to protect their anonymity, this crowd of arsonists employed two effective strategies. They had acted under cover.
of darkness and they had come in disguise. Consequently, in relating this particular incident Aulte failed to identify any of his attackers.

Following the very first spate of rioting in 1642, Edward Syddenham, the leaseholder of the enclosures, brought an action in the duchy court against the perpetrators. In his lengthy information he provided few details of the actual riots but identified 217 people who had allegedly been involved. Some of those accused of destroying the enclosures were questioned by duchy and their statements have survived. Unfortunately, although their voices are audible, the sixteen men reveal absolutely nothing about the destruction that had occurred in the Frith. They indignantly, and somewhat impatiently, describe their fairly substantial holdings in the manor and their consequent entitlement to common in the enclosed land. They admit nothing other than their rights, although they do provide details of their place within local society.

Furthermore, in analysing the composition of the rioting crowd at Duffield, Syddenham’s list of names is not as useful as it seems. Since, in general, those inhabitants most adversely affected by the enclosure of common waste were the landless poor, it would be reasonable to assume that at least some of the rioters at Duffield were landless and poor; however, nowhere in his information did Syddenham suggest that any of the rioters whom he had identified were illegal cottagers, or squatters, or even poor. On the contrary, he claimed that all of them were either manorial tenants who had consented to the enclosures and had signed the agreements themselves or were tenants who currently held the land of others who had signed. Until recently they had all quietly enjoyed the benefits of the unenclosed two-thirds of each ward. Syddenham argued that precisely because all of the alleged rioters were legal commoners they were bound by the duchy’s decrees and orders concerning the Frith and therefore they had acted illegally when they broke the agreements. So, Syddenham’s list of ‘rioters’ may simply be a list of legal commoners (that is, manorial tenants) but this is impossible to prove in the absence of any rentals dated after 1625—although those who did make statements were certainly manorial tenants. Of course, even if some, if not all, of those whom he named had participated in the riots, it is unlikely that they were the only people who had destroyed the fences during the spring of 1642 but his argument relied on identifying the offenders as commoners.

A more meaningful, but much shorter, list of rioters can be compiled from the sixteen names given in the affidavits presented to the House of Lords in 1647. These were probably the ringleaders, men whose activities were particularly memorable. Petitions presented to courts of law were couched in expressive, and excessive, language in order to convey the wrongs done to the petitioner; nevertheless, they may reveal something of the alleged events. In the petition that he presented to the House of Lords asking for redress against the rioters, Edward Syddenham also raised the spectre of incendiarism. His was the voice of a man crying for justice against marauding hordes; a victim expecting sympathy from his peers. Reiterating the names of those men identified in the affidavits, Syddenham claimed that they were:

the cheife leaders & Incendiaries [who], with many others, have violently & Riotously broken into your Petitioner's said Possessions & Inclosures and most Barbarously cutt downe all his fences & hedges and grubd up the very Roots thereof, pulled downe his walls, felled his woods, burned and pulled downe severall houses & barnes, soe that your Petitioner hath thereby ben damnified to the value of £5,000.

In addition to its literal meaning of ‘arsonist’, ‘incendiary’ also has the figurative meaning of ‘firebrand’, one who stirs up civil strife or violence. Syddenham was
suggesting not only that the leading rioters had set fire to his property but also that they had inflamed others to protest. The sixteen men were hauled before the House, but there are no interrogatories, nor any depositions in the Lords’ archive relating to the Duffield riots: not because they are now missing, but because the Lords were unwilling to proceed with the matter. They were unsympathetic towards Edward Syddenham, who was a royalist and who had been declared a delinquent, and the Duffield men were permitted to return home.51 Part of the explanation lies in the fact that the last incident in the Frith had occurred two years previously, and, regardless of the state of fences and enclosures, the area was currently quiet; therefore Syddenham was actually petitioning for punishment and recovery of damages, rather than for the suppression of disorderly hordes. There was no present threat to peace of the country around Duffield. Most of the sixteen named Duffield rioters can be identified in local records. For example, William Bludworth, one of the ‘chief leaders and incendiaries’ in Chevin ward, was tenant of a substantial free-holding and was one of the Duffield churchwardens at the time of the riots. Richard Fletcher, one of the leaders in Belper Ward, son of the recently deceased blacksmith of the same name, was a free-holder in Belper. Thomas Milnes held a messuage and 50 acres in Duffield and had been one of the original signatories to the enclosure agreement. We have already met Mr William Johnson.

Disputes over the enclosures in the Frith did not end with the riots in the 1640s. In later years Duffield commoners tried to repossess the enclosures by both legal and illegal means and from time to time their voices can be heard. In 1663 the then owners of the enclosed thirds secured a decree in the duchy court ratifying the original enclosure agreements of 1632.52 Unsurprisingly, the injunction issued to enforce this decree was breached by numerous commoners, who pulled down hedges and fences, and drove cattle, sheep and horses into the enclosures. They subsequently defended their actions by claiming that they were entitled to pasture their animals anywhere in the Frith because they were not bound by the original agreements.53 As in earlier years, some commoners were openly contemptuous of legal authority. Robert Barker bragged that he ‘cared noe more for the said Injuncion then [he] did for the stone that was under [his] foote’.54 Francis Jackson went even further, saying that he ‘vallued noe more the said Injuncion then [he] did a paper to wipe [his] Breech’.55 The activities and words of these men and their associates demonstrate that at Duffield, as elsewhere in forests and fens, post-Restoration attempts at enclosure, or re-enclosure, encountered riotous and litigious opposition. Highlighting the importance of memory in early-modern cultures, Andy Wood has commented that in such areas ‘the experience of riot and collective litigation in defence of customary rights was ingrained within the local culture’.56 During the course of many legal disputes, witnesses were asked whether they remembered a certain event or how long they had known a certain person or place. Although written evidence was sometimes produced in court, much of the evidence comprised recollections of members of local communities. Some of those who were asked to search their memory were leading members of that community, others were known to have been witnesses to particular events or occurrences, others were asked simply because they or their families were long-settled there.

Post-Restoration voices

In conclusion, we return to Whittlesey to listen to some more post-Restoration voices, but these are not the voices of community leaders, or eyewitneses, or even long-standing inhabitants. They are the voices of football hooligans and they speak directly
to us, without being filtered through the memories of others. By the end of the
seventeenth century fenland drainage had become a fact of life. Realistically, fenmen
had little choice but to adapt to the changes that drainage had imposed on the
ancient fen landscape although some still hankered after the former status quo.
Following particularly bad weather in the winter of 1698-1699 the Bedford Level
Corporation received numerous reports of damage to riverbanks and destruction in
drained land by resultant floods. On 13 January 1699, a report from Whittlesey told of
‘great ruine’ caused by breaches in the south bank of Morton’s Leam and, if these
breaches were not speedily secured, loss of land, stock and human life would follow.57
Traditionally fen-dwellers believed that drainage works upset the natural order and
that flooding was a providential sign. It is scarcely surprising, therefore, that in January
1699 the severe flooding so alarmed inhabitants and aroused their anger that an
estimated 1,100 rioters attacked drainage works and enclosures in Deeping Level, just
north of Peterborough.58 The rioters, drawn together from various communities, had
originally gathered ‘Under Colour & pretence of Foot ball playing’.59 These riots
threatened to spill over into Whittlesey.

By a notice affixed to the bridge in the town of March, locals were invited to attend ‘a
Foot Ball play & other sports’ at Coates Green in Whittlesey on or about Tuesday 14
March.60 On Friday 3 March, a man named David Fovergue reported this notice to the
authorities and stated that at the White Hart Inn, in the town of March, he had heard
rumours that the captain of ‘the Mobb’ from Deeping would be their captain, and that
they would pull down drainage windmills and damage banks as in Deeping Fen. The
Corporation received further evidence of the planned unrest in letters sent from
neighbouring places.61 These reports were corroborated another more unusual
source: a manuscript poem, entitled ‘Poetic Address to the Marshmen to support the
Whittlesey men in the Riots’.

Come Neighbours and Friends, I hope you have more Witt
Then to be Scar’d with Such Bugbears as Pedlours Tinkers or Taylours
But Lett us be Like those true hearted boys the Sailers
And Lett us gett all things ready with our Boats –
And hast away, at the tyme appointed to the Town of Coats.
In spite of all the Justices Notes –
I pray you not to Faile.
But lett us goe thither & tell our Taile
Soe hoping that you will Agree with one consent
To meet Whittlesey boys with a Resolucion fully Bent
For that Purpose these Lines are Sent
Your Friend Anonimus62

This doggerel verse is an uncompromising invitation to riot, its lines reinforcing the
invitation in the notice that had been posted on March Bridge. In spite of the
authorities, ‘Neighbours and Friends’ were urged to ‘meet Whittlesey boys with a
Resolucion fully Bent’ and join the proposed mayhem on Coates Green. Determined
to meet the malcontents with equal resolution, the Corporation acted swiftly to deal
with the situation. On Thursday 9 March, on receipt of correspondence from the
Corporation, the privy council wrote letters to the lords lieutenant, high sheriffs and
justices of Cambridgeshire and its neighbouring counties, and to the bailiff of the Isle
of Ely, asking them to use all means necessary to prevent and suppress any riotous
assemblies directed against drainage works in the Bedford Level.63 On Sunday 12 at
Wisbech the Bailiff of the Isle and local justices agreed with thirty or forty ‘Substantiall
Inhabitants that they could trust’ that on Tuesday they would be present ‘somewhere near Coates Green’. The prompt action of the Corporation, Bailiff and justices, and the presence of the ‘substantial inhabitants’, prevented the planned assembly. The ‘football match’ never took place.

What are we to make of the ‘Poetic Address’, the only surviving copy of which is a tatty piece of paper in the Corporation’s archive? From a literary point of view, its merits are negligible. Although it clearly failed in its purpose, since the riot on Coates Green did not occur, nevertheless the surviving verse is highly significant. Firstly, it provides proof that riots might be carefully planned events, timed to coincide with particular occurrences. Secondly, it is rare hard evidence of a method by which the lower sort might be summoned to riot. Thirdly, it corroborates evidence of the organisation of football matches as a guise for rioting. Fourthly, and most importantly, this is a rare, perhaps unique, survival of manuscript verse written by early-modern rioters and thus we can hear their voices undiluted and unmediated by any third party. We do not know where the verse was found—perhaps lying on the ground, posted on a door, or even left in the White Hart at March—but nevertheless, the fact that this verse survives means that it came into the Corporation’s possession and spurred them into action against the proposed football match. The Corporation also listened to the voices in this poem.

The workings of the politics of the parish are particularly evident both in the processes leading up to enclosure and in subsequent events. Collinson’s ‘horizontal politics’ can be detected in negotiations prior to enclosure agreements being drawn up and in the various alliances forged between interest groups following enclosure. We can hear, for example, bitter voices attacking those who cultivated former common land. But the voices of other rioters reveal the existence of ‘vertical politics’ at Duffield and Whittlesey—objections to orders being issued by the House of Lords concerning essentially local matters, objections to the authority of a parliamentarian JP. Studies of early-modern enclosure riots may well be ‘stepping-stone’ history but were it not for such pathways into communities, the local impact of enclosure, a major force for
social and economic change within early-modern society, would be very difficult to reconstruct. Hearing contesting voices and identifying their owners provides a more rounded picture of that society.
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Keynote review: *Writing local history* by John Beckett

DAVID DYMOND


This book should be read by everyone professing to be a local historian. In effect it updates W.G. Hoskins’s *Local History in England* (1959), the fiftieth anniversary of which is to be marked by a major conference at Leicester in July 2009. It is indeed a worthy replacement. John Beckett is Professor of English Regional History at the University of Nottingham and also Director of the Victoria County History at the University of London, which means that he has wide experience of researching, writing and teaching the subject over many years, and is fully aware of the special character of local history in both its academic and popular forms.

The title of the book may, however, come as a surprise to many readers. It is actually concerned with the development of the subject, and might have been better called ‘A history of local history’ or ‘Approaches to local history, old and new’. In fact the first half of the book is taken up with the genesis of local history from medieval times through to the 1950s, and it is not until p.123 that we reach any discussion of ‘New Approaches’ and contemporary issues. So nobody should be under the illusion that this book discusses the coalface task of producing historical prose which is lucid, elegant and penetrating. That task is firmly left to other publications.

This is not in the least meant to imply that the contents of this book are disappointing. John Beckett goes deeper into the work and particular interests of successive generations of antiquaries, topographers and local historians than Hoskins did in 1959, and gives copious references in the form of endnotes after each chapter as well as a lengthy final bibliography. Major sections deal with pioneers such as Camden and Dugdale, the writing of county histories which climaxed in the eighteenth century, and the first histories of individual rural parishes and towns. These accounts are enlivened by helpful judgments and calculations. For example, in England by 1800 ‘only seven counties lacked an historian’, and no fewer than 116 town histories were published in the eighteenth century alone.

Local historians practising today will probably glean most from Chapters V-XII. These describe how local history fared when the professional/amateur divide, which still both bedevils and enriches the subject, opened up from the 1870s onwards. This was the time when the universities established history as an academic subject concerned primarily with national politics, with the result that local history was increasingly
marginalised and indeed disdained. Its only value to the new academics was to provide examples which illustrated the national story. At first this left the study of local history and antiquities largely where it had always been: with the leisured, educated classes of gentry, clergy and other professionals, and with the antiquarian and archaeological societies which they had founded in great numbers during the nineteenth century. Then, as Beckett recounts, the local approach to the past slowly regained respectability through new initiatives such as the foundation of national and county record societies (with which professionals were pleased to be associated), the creation of the VCH which got off to a flying start between 1899 and 1914 and, above all, by the emergence of economic history as a new academic specialism which in the hands of pioneers like R.H. Tawney and J.D. Chambers generated ‘a strong sense of place’. Another important influence from the 1920s onwards was the interest in adult education taken by a growing number of universities, in association with the WEA.

Then we are reminded of a host of new academic influences coming into play after World War II. Undoubtedly the person who most deserves the title of ‘father of modern English local history’ is W.G. Hoskins who in 1948 founded the Department (now Centre) of English Local History at Leicester University. He and other contemporaries began vigorous debates which still resound today, pressing the claims of local history as a subject in its own right, and perpetually searching for new meanings, applications and methodologies for it. They stressed the value of depicting whole communities over long stretches of time, building a ‘bottom-up’ view of society and adopting a deliberately interdisciplinary approach to the past. Above all, this meant supplementing the use of documentary evidence by the study and interpretation of local landscapes, which to Hoskins was ‘the richest historical source we possess’. As a result of these pioneering efforts, local history successfully broke away from the stifling antiquarianism of the past, and became issue-driven with its own critical methods and overarching interpretations.

A major feature of this book is a detailed account of how, since the 1950s, a whole succession of scholars have opened up new avenues within the subject. For example, whereas Hoskins largely considered the parish in economic terms, Margaret Spufford argued passionately for a balancing consideration of social, educational and religious life. The work of the Cambridge Group from 1963 onwards stressed the importance of demography as giving a broad basic shape to local communities; Alan Everitt and Joan Thirsk distinguished particular kinds of countryside or pays with their own internal patterns; John Marshall hammered away at the significance of regions and the difficulty of defining them; Phythian-Adams looked for broader societal entities and postulated fourteen cultural provinces in England. In this way Beckett shows the subject constantly moving on, diversifying and re-inventing itself, with the end-result that it can now be regarded as an academic discipline dedicated to the depiction and interpretation of all kinds of local community. Sometimes this has resulted in newer specialisms breaking away from the mainstream of local history as has happened, for example, in the cases of landscape history, industrial archaeology, vernacular architecture, urban history and the study of surnames.

One of the great strengths of Beckett’s account is that he faces head-on the implications of local history’s ‘popularity’. He traces how in the post-war period, while the foundations of modern local history were being laid by academics, the subject became ever more attractive to amateurs. A succession of useful manuals, beginning with Hoskins’ book of 1959, positively encouraged non-professionals ‘to have a go’. The trend was also stimulated by the post-war growth of adult education, the foundation of hundreds of local voluntary societies, the boom in family history, and by
what Beckett usefully dubs ‘The Sources Revolution’ as ever-growing mountains of primary and secondary sources became readily available in county record offices and local-studies libraries.

The final two sections of the book offer a perceptive and hopeful assessment of the state of the subject today. Beckett acknowledges that local history is difficult to define because of its shadowy boundaries and complexity, and that general interest in the subject is often no more than a passive quest for entertainment under the dodgy banner of ‘Heritage’. Furthermore too many untrained local historians working on their own never get beyond the mere heaping of information. Nevertheless he clearly believes that local history is the stronger for having both academic and lay practitioners—providing that the two groups are in dialogue and that, where appropriate, they work together on planned research agendas. In addition, as non-professionals strive to develop their own expertise (local historians are nothing if not aspirational), it is essential that training is made available for them at various levels ranging from introductory courses to postgraduate degrees. Amateurs who offer themselves as active researchers ensure a constant supply of new talent, and bring their own special knowledge and skills to bear on the subject. Indeed, in the course of time many go on to write and to become effective teachers of the subject, which is one of the most hopeful signs for the future.

The price of this important book is very reasonable, though the total lack of any kind of internal illustration is perhaps questionable. Another omission which seems strange is any mention of the recent spate of historical atlases for individual counties. Whatever the deficiencies of this medium, such as the tyranny of county boundaries, this is a contemporary form of publication which has already proved its worth in many parts of the country by forcing specialists to summarise their knowledge for general consumption, by stimulating new research, and by reaching a highly varied readership ranging from schoolchildren to academics. But, to end on a positive note, this impressive survey of the subject deserves to be widely read and discussed. It is a central text for all those interested in local history as it has been pursued from the later Middle Ages until the present day.
Review article:

three books on London

CHRISTOPHER FRENCH


Derek Morris’s book on Mile End Old Town was first published in 2002, to the accompaniment of some favourable reviews which are quoted here by the author in his conclusions to the second edition. The major aim of this revised version, as Stephen Porter emphasises in his preface, is ‘to complete an intensive study, looking at many aspects of the fabric, economy and society of this substantial and surprisingly varied community near to London’ over a forty-year period of the eighteenth century. Making use of a range of sources including wills, deeds, newspapers, insurance records, maps and, in particular, the land tax returns for the area, the author not only fulfils this aim but also his related aims of exploring the lives of the people (especially the ‘middling’ sort who lived in Mile End Old Town during the period) and of presenting a more positive view of the variety and dynamics of certain East End communities than the stereotypical perception of deterioration and poverty often presented by earlier historical studies.

The variety of themes in the book reflects the variety of the lives and experiences of the people who made up the local community living in the area. The chapters range over, for example, governance, religion, education, poverty, crime and punishment and leisure. The local economy is examined in detail and again the emphasis is on variety. Local trades included farming, market gardening, clock-making, ropemaking and brewing. But the area was more than just a centre of industrial and agricultural activity. At a time when England’s commercial influence was spreading to all parts of the globe, wealthy merchants, bankers, brokers and dealers settled in Mile End Old Town, with its close proximity to the Thames and the City. They developed commercial and maritime links with Europe, the West Indies, East Indies, Africa and North America and prospered as a result of their trading, shipping and financial activity. The discussion of the housing, estates, wealth and connecting networks of this mercantile group provide an interesting and well-documented case study of middle-class aspirations and lifestyles in the eighteenth century.
The wealth of detail presented in this well-produced book is supported by illuminating figures, appendices and tables. The text is fully indexed and each chapter is followed by a list of further reading (the names of T.S. Willan and G. Himmelfarb are spelled incorrectly) and archive sources used. However, these would be far more helpful if the sources quoted in the text were linked to those given at the end of each chapter via footnotes or endnotes. The author makes interesting observations and the on the nature of suburbs and their relationship to the city, but the detailed research which underpins this book could be taken further in illustrating that relationship and the distinguishing features of suburbia. Nonetheless, this is an excellent example of the value of detailed studies of individual localities and communities based on thorough archival research. It should encourage similar in-depth analyses of other areas of London.

The interlocking themes of leisure and culture provide the local historian with many interesting and stimulating research opportunities. Questions as to how communities and individuals spent their leisure time in the past, and the cultural outlets available to them, are questions which deserve—and are now receiving—serious historical scrutiny. The focus of Penelope Corfield's engagingly written short study is Vauxhall Pleasure Gardens. First opened after the Restoration of 1660, Vauxhall attracted many thousands of visitors during its 200-year history. The Gardens experienced their greatest popularity during the eighteenth century, thanks to a combination of favourable circumstances. These included good communications, the growing demand from London’s rapidly expanding population for semi-rural retreats in pleasant surroundings where they could find both entertainment and copious supplies of refreshments, and the entrepreneurial skills of the managers and owners in providing the public with what they wanted. Such factors help illuminate ‘Inventing the Brand’, the first of the three main themes explored with clarity and interest by the author. The other two themes consider ‘Coping with Competition’ and ‘Meanings and Legacy’. Increasing competition appeared in the nineteenth century, not only in the form of rival pleasure gardens at home and abroad, but also in alternative forms of entertainment. Vauxhall’s managers reacted with typical vigour, but increasing competition, coupled with the perceived problems of ‘rowdyism’, pickpockets and prostitutes and the environmental deterioration resulting from the encroachment of industrial London, inevitably resulted in ‘Farewell for Ever’ being spelled out in fireworks on 25 July 1859.

The book’s final theme, ‘Meanings and Legacy’, engages with some of the debates initiated by urban historians and sociologists. These include, for example, responses to urban change, the impact of towns and cities on sociability and social life, the importance of shared space and entertainments in helping to build urban communities, and the increasing commercialisation of leisure activities. This excellent microstudy contributes further evidence to these discussions and it deserves a wide readership. Above all, Penelope Corfield’s study can be recommended as a fine example of how to undertake research grounded in a particular locality, based as it is on clearly defined research questions, sufficient contextual material, and a full knowledge of available sources.

Vauxhall’s popularity reached its peak at the same time as that of the artist George Morland, who according to one of the authorities quoted in Marian Kamlish’s new study ‘was the most popular painter in late eighteenth-century Britain’. During his relatively short life (he died in 1804 at the age of 41) Morland’s output was not only numerically-significant but also wide-ranging in subject matter. As the many illustrations reproduced in Marian Kamlish’s book indicate, his work covered portraits,
children at play, animals, country pursuits, and public houses—in which the artist spent much of his time and money. Despite his popularity (the author estimates that by 1787 Morland was earning £1000 a year) his lavish and dissolute lifestyle contributed to increasing indebtedness. As a consequence, during the final years of his life the artist, having left his ‘Pleasant retreat’ in what is now Camden Town, continually changed his lodgings in an attempt to avoid his creditors. When he died, as the shortest but surely the most accurate of the epitaphs quoted by the author claimed, George Morland was indeed ‘Ruined by Success’.

This is an interesting and thoughtful book. It aims to ‘introduce local historians to Morland’s life and work’ and to provide art historians with further contextual material on ‘the environment within which Morland operated’. It should also encourage its readers to seek out and view the original paintings, which are clearly of variable quality. Much research underpins the book and the quality of presentation is a credit to the publishers, the Camden History Society. My only reservation concerns the overall structure of the book. It begins with very useful contextual introductions on ‘Morland and his Times’, ‘Morland’s London’, and ‘Morland’s Narrators’ and concludes with an appendix on the development of Camden Town. However, the bulk of the book is made up of reproductions of many of Morland’s works supported by quotations on these works and the artist’s life taken from his early biographers and other commentators. These quotations are supplemented by detailed endnotes which often provide the results of further research carried out by the author, in the form of additional supporting information. I would have preferred a more integrated narrative, bringing together the contextual material, the biographical quotations, and the extra information provided in the endnotes. The book also needs an overall conclusion. However, the result would have been a more traditional biography of George Morland which, presumably, was not the author’s intention. The book can be recommended to readers of The Local Historian.

CHRISTOPHER FRENCH was until recently the Director of Kingston University’s Centre for Local History Studies. He is now an Honorary Research Fellow attached to the Centre, and his current research activity is focused on suburbia and suburban society before 1914 with particular reference to the growth of the classic suburban town of Surbiton in the second half of the nineteenth century.
Each year *The Local Historian* receives so many books for review that space precludes reviewing them all separately. Everything received is included in the ‘recent publications’ pages and the annual ‘round-up’ gives me the chance to a wonderful range of excellent publications. This year the article is divided into books on different themes and using various approaches to the subject.

### Printed primary sources and reference books

Local historians often encounter Latin in documents or on monuments. *Reading Latin Epitaphs* is a useful handbook for understanding Latin in various contexts, and not only epitaphs—it contains a concise but clear section on Latin grammar, and useful tables of word endings and dates. Another reference source, especially useful for anyone working on topics connected with water, is *Rigged for River and Sea*, a glossary of terms relating to fishing and related topics. How many readers know what a *fartillfare* is (see end of article for enlightenment)?

Record society volumes are always welcome. Three received in 2008 concerned court records. *Oxford Church Court Depositions 1634-1639*, part of a project started in 1995 to calendar the surviving volumes of Oxford church court records, includes material on tithe disputes, probate, matrimonial cases and defamation. *The Court Records of Prescot 1640-1649* is a transcript of the manor court records of a market town in south-west Lancashire. There are many presentments by constables, and accounts of a number of ‘tussles’. The *Calendar of Summary Convictions at the Gloucestershire Petty Sessions 1781-1837* contains a wealth of information on the licence-holders and wrongdoers in the community. *How Bedfordshire Voted 1716-1735* prints the county’s poll books for the period, giving details of individuals, their occupations, places of abode, freehold property, and of course who they voted for. *East Lothian 1945-2000*, the sixth volume of the Fourth Statistical Account of Scotland, is a primary source in the making. It recounts the social, political and economic history of the people of East Lothian since the end of the Second World War and will be a valuable asset for future local historians.

### Places in pictures

Last year saw the usual crop of illustrated books from Breedon Publishing, extending into Scotland with *Edinburgh City Beautiful* and *The River Clyde from the Source to the Sea*. The latter, arranged as a series of walks, is far more accomplished in photography and text. Explorations are also the theme of *Walks Through History Birmingham*. Images of Wales appear in *The Changing Face of Cardiff*, which starts with prints from the pre-photography era, and North Wales from the Air, while Tempus has published Stan Beckensall’s *Northumberland from the Air*. Photograph compilations for Guildford,
Southampton and Nottingham complete this section. These books will be of interest to local people and visitors, but less rewarding for local historians.

**People and families**

We start in the medieval period with *Sir John Hawkwood*, whose exploits have been recorded in fact and fiction. Sir John, a mercenary soldier, came from Essex and after his death in Italy was reinterred in Sible Hedingham. This book strips away some of the myths surrounding him and presents a local boy who made his fortune through soldiering. Also in the medieval period is *Sir Humphrey Newton (1466-1536) An Early Tudor Gentleman*, a book which gives an in-depth picture of one of the Cheshire gentry, his life and his family in the context of local society. This book is essential reading for any local historian working on the late medieval period. The Wallop family were also members of the gentry but had political ambition. In *En Suivant la Verite* their fortunes are traced as they rose to become earls of Portsmouth. Another potential route to fortune in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was army service. *The Letters of Captain John Orrok* traces the career of a man who joined the 71st Regiment of Foot and served in India, Jamaica and elsewhere. A discussion on letters as a primary source is included and this volume will be useful for anyone searching for ancestors in the British Army or the East India Company. Those with ancestors from the Scarborough area may find information in *Scarborough MPs 1832-1906, Scarborough’s Mayors 1836-1906*. A guide to sources and record offices for those undertaking family history research in north-east Scotland is *North East Roots*. The memorial in Ripon Cathedral are described in *Who Do You Think They Were?* Finally, *In Parallel A Yorkshire Childhood* is a memoir of the 1930s and 1940s, including recollections of when the author was forced to flee from Hull during the Blitz.

**Village histories**

The book *Camden Farm and Village Life in Early New South Wales* shows that local history is in good shape in Australia. Although 1809 was the starting point for Camden, the area was populated by native Australians before this, and had been the subject of exploratory expeditions in the 1790s. By the late 1830s the settlement was divided into estates, and in 1841 a plan of the village was made showing it as a rectangular grid plan. This beautifully-written book gives great insight into the lives of the early settlers, their hopes and fears. It is fully referenced, and for family historians the origins of the settlers in England has been traced. It is a model of a village history. Turning homewards, *The Westwell Chronicles* is the detailed and well-illustrated account of a Kentish village from the Bronze Age to the twenty-first century. It has plentiful references and a full bibliography, but unaccountably the reference numbers are given at the start of each paragraph, giving the impression of numbered notes rather than consolidated text. *A History of Vernham Dean* (Hampshire) also begins with prehistory. There are interesting comparisons between Vernham Dean and Westwell. For example, in Westwell there were anti-tithe demonstrations by farmers in the 1930s, but those in Vernham Dean started in 1888. Westwell church had a chalice in 1552, but Vernham Dean did not have one until 1590. Does this tell us anything about the two communities? Again, as often before, I make a plea for a synthesis of village histories, and the use of comparative material.

Denmead is also in Hampshire, but *Unveiling Denmead’s Past* uses a different approach to village history, basing it around three topics—Ashling House, Restall’s Village Store and the Forest of Bere public house—using documentary and oral sources to describe
these. From the same county are *An Andover Miscellany* and *A History of Alton 1800-1850*. The first considers five themes (Primitive Methodism, Andover Cottage Hospital, Layton’s of Andover, Andover in the Great War, and an index of 19th century Andoverians). The Alton book is arranged chronologically by theme. These four books on Hampshire villages suggest two ways in which village history can be arranged—chronologically or thematic—but the problem with former is that early material tends to be more sparse: over 70 per cent of the Westwell text is on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Perhaps *Trading Treasures: 80 Years of Barnet’s Local History* might begin a new trend, celebrating the work of local history societies and detailing the history that they have made possible. In a similar vein *Cefn Remembered* celebrates Cefn Meiriadog Historical Society’s thirtieth anniversary. It describes how the society started, and like the Barnet book, interposes accounts of visits and lectures with the history and memories of the area. It is excellent that local history societies are celebrating their anniversaries in this way. The final two ‘village’ books have the same title: *The Lost Villages* and *The Lost Villages: a history of the Holmwoods*. The first concerns villages that are literally lost, under reservoirs, floods, military use and depopulation. It uses the memories of those who once lived in the villages, with documentary research and photographs to reconstruct the communities. The Holmwood villages have been ravaged by road building, but despite this the community spirit has remained. The effect of motorways on communities deserves wider coverage by local historians.

**Trade and industry**

Trade and industry are currently among the least popular subjects with local historians. Only six books were received in 2008. *Public Houses of Sandhurst & Crowthorne 1740-1950* lists the fifteen public houses, the landlords and their owners—only two of the pubs were free houses, the rest being tied, and as elsewhere the larger brewery concerns were buying out the local brewers by 1950. Heavy industry is represented by *Tinplate in Wales*. This industry dated from the seventeenth century, and was concentrated in the south, where it flourished into recent decades. The many tanneries of Devon have disappeared, but *Devon Leather* begins with a useful description of the tanning process and the operation of a tannery, followed by a gazetteer of tanneries using maps, documents and photographs. This is a model of how a single industry can be treated. *Kingswood Coal History* is a comparable publication, reminding us the importance of this little-known coalfield near Bristol, exploited long before the Industrial Revolution. *Alabaster* discusses the use of the soft stone, found in the Derbyshire village of Chellaston and popular for monuments before the eighteenth century (among them, Bess of Hardwick’s tomb in Derby Cathedral). The importance of mineral deposits to Chellaston in particular and Derbyshire in general cannot be over emphasised, and other less well-known rural industries would make interesting comparisons. Coal and tin were essential materials in the Industrial Revolution, but it needed inventors to maximise their effect. *The Steam Hammer Man: James Nasmyth (1808-1890)* tells the story of the inventor of a condensing steam engine and steam hammer, outlining his life and inventions in an attractive style.

**Religion**

Five books on dissenters highlight the persecution they underwent in their early days, before they were accepted into the community and their chapels became part of the local landscape. *Children of Dissent* traces the history of Quakers in Sibford,
Oxfordshire, and Wesleyan Methodists in Hook Norton, showing how their systems of belief changed over time. Mr Metcalfe’s Congregational Chapel at Roxton is concerned with the picturesque thatched chapel in this Bedfordshire village, its pastors and worshippers. A Church with a Mission celebrates the bicentenary of the Dorset Gardens Methodist Church in Brighton and the Dome Mission. Religious Dissent in Oundle shows that, in Oxfordshire, dissent in Northamptonshire came in many different forms—in this case Independents, Methodists, Baptists, Quakers and Catholics. The dissenting chapels would not have functioned without their pastors: Obituaries of Dissenting Ministers in the Gentleman’s Magazine 1801-1837 gives details of the lives and work of some, and the positions they held within the dissenting hierarchy.

Some early dissenters either left the country or died for their faith. Immingham and the Pilgrim Fathers explains that some from Lincolnshire went first to Holland to escape persecution, and then sailed on the Mayflower to America. After describing their voyage and settlement in America, the book returns to Immingham and shows how the legacy of the Pilgrim Fathers is still visible. The Seven Martyrs of Kendal chose to die for their Catholic faith. This book puts them into the context of the age in which they lived and gives biographies of the seven who died. Two books deal with other aspects of religion. The Wallace Collection shows how the Wallace family of Sudbourne, Suffolk, were associated to the restoration of Orford Church, while YMCA Norfolk 150 Years of Service reveals the long history of the association in Norwich, where it was established by 1856. The history of the Norwich and Norfolk YMCAs shows what a very worthwhile organisation it is.
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Answer: in-shore autumn herring fishing by small 'fartill' boats
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The cases discussed in these two books have much in common. Both deal with the demonic possession of children, set against a class dimension to accusations of witchcraft. In the case of Belvoir (Leicestershire) this involved accusations by the aristocratic Manners family against two of their servants, while at Warboys (Huntingdonshire) the gentry Throckmortons accused the yeoman Samuels family of bewitching their children. The sources used are ballads and pamphlets—the focus of the Belvoir case is a deconstruction of the pamphlets on this and other witch trials, relating the language used to that employed in theoretical writings on witchcraft, while the Warboys book includes as part of its narrative many long quotations from the pamphlet on the case.

At Warboys between 1589 and 1593 Sir Robert Throckmorton’s children were subject to seizures and fits, during which they accused Alice Samuels, her daughter and her husband of impregnating them with demonic spirits. The book describes in harrowing detail the hounding and torture of Alice Samuels, and the fits and catatonic trances of the rather tiresome children. The entire Samuels family was hanged at Huntingdon in April 1593. The Manners children also suffered from fits and trances. Two sisters, Margaret and Philippa Flowers, and their mother Joan were accused of bewitching them, and the sisters were hanged at Lincoln in March 1619. This is another interesting similarity between the cases—both took place within the diocese of Lincoln, and there were strong religious tensions in both instances. The Manners were Catholics in a Protestant county, the Throckmortons were Puritans, and the Samuels (described as ‘ungodly’) were perhaps dissenters. The Samuels were neighbours of the Throckmortons, and the Flowers actually lived in Belvoir Castle where they were employed as servants and washerwomen. They were not the only unfortunates in the Vale of Belvoir accused of witchcraft at this time. Three other women were said to have bewitched their neighbours in villages close to the castle—their fate is unknown, but it does seem that a witch-hunt was in operation, probably sparked off by events at the castle.

The stories are ‘rattling good yarns’ and part of a trend for authors working on witchcraft to concentrate on one particular incident. This should result in detailed studies of witches set firmly within their local environment, but in neither of these books do we learn much about the communities where the dramas were played out. The Throckmortons and the Samuels are described as neighbours, but this is not explained, and we do not learn how other neighbours fitted into the scene. The Samuels are described as yeomen, but nothing is said of how much land they held or how they farmed it, or their place in local society—though after his execution John Samuels’s goods were sold for £40, a not inconsiderable sum. In the Belvoir case we are not told how the castle household functioned, or how the Flowers, very lowly members of it, came into contact with the Manners children.

There is a growing number of theoretical books on witches and witchcraft, but more work is needed on the local context. These books show how individuals and events can be reconstructed from pamphlets, but we need to know what lies behind the pamphlets, and to examine the world of the ‘witches’ more closely. These are accessible books, but that on the Warboys witches is far more exciting to read, with an interesting structure of short chapters driving the story forward. Wicked Practices is cluttered in its design and presents a more challenging read, but both books will be essential reading for anyone interested in witchcraft in early modern England.

EVELYN LORD

Over the centuries, proximity to London has played a leading role in Hertfordshire’s development, not least because the county provided a pleasant place to live within ‘commuting distance’ of the capital. Wealthy men, therefore, frequently established themselves there, although due to varying circumstances some families stayed for only a few generations. Before the 1530s ecclesiastical landlords dominated Hertfordshire’s landscape and economy; after the dissolution of the monasteries much land changed hands and usage, some of it repeatedly. Hugh Prince’s study of the county’s parks seeks to chart these changes, his primary purpose being to examine ‘the relationship between sizes of parks and sizes of estates’. He concludes, perhaps not surprisingly, that owners of the largest estates possessed the largest parks and owners of smaller estates owned smaller parks; nevertheless, his quest takes the reader on a fascinating 500-year journey through a wide variety of landscapes and introduces them to numerous estate owners, surveyors, landscape designers and gardeners. His main source for locating and identifying the parks are several county maps produced from the late sixteenth century onwards. The information extracted from these is itself mapped and tabulated and then supplemented with details from manuscripts generated by or for the landowners concerned and also from, for example, the work of the research group of Hertfordshire Gardens Trust.

Chapter 2 assesses the fortunes the surviving medieval parks. These had been surrounded by palings, the primary purpose of which was to enclose herds of deer; initially hunting continued in the original parks and some new ones were created, but the overriding theme is one of discontinuity in ownership and therefore survival. In the late seventeenth century (ch.3) the function and appearance of many parks changed: some became timber plantations and a few were laid out as extensive formal gardens. After 1700 (ch.4) parks remained a conspicuous status symbol but deer were no longer an essential component. On many estates the landscape was now valued for its ornamental beauty, indeed six landowners commissioned Charles Bridgeman to lay out their parks. The 1750s marked a turning point (ch.5): income from estates rose due to an economic upturn, while the children of landowners survived into adulthood, assuring the future of those estates. Capability Brown was invited to landscape several parks, and Repton also designed parks in the county. Prince describes their landscapes, although sadly few traces remain today. Parks and gardens signified and displayed owners’ wealth, so after 1815 (ch.6), when landed income and agricultural returns fell, the long-term outlook was not promising. But merchants and manufacturers who had profited during this time took the opportunity to invest in property close to London and developed parks on their lands, and although many were relatively small (15 to 100 acres) they were laid out as ornamental grounds. Towards the end of the nineteenth century these new parks exhibited a great variety of styles and many boasted exotic plants from around the world. The period since 1880 (ch.7) witnessed the destruction of many parks, principally because owners could no longer maintain their estates. Today a few of the earlier parks survive in private estates, but many have been built on or survive only in truncated form as golf courses or public open spaces, although saved by the Green Belt policy.

Despite detailed descriptions of various parks at different stages of their development, this book is principally a statistical analysis of parks based on cartographic evidence. As such it would have been more accurately titled The mapping of parks in Hertfordshire from 1500. Despite the painstaking research, there is a flaw in the methodology for, as Prince himself acknowledges, the existence of some parks, particularly in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, is known from documentary evidence but they were not marked on the county maps and so have been omitted from tabulations and calculations. Furthermore, the way in which ‘parks’ were defined, both literally on maps and linguistically, changed over the centuries and it is arguable that as the earlier surveyors only delineated deer parks, early-modern ‘pleasure grounds’ may have been omitted, so the number of earlier parks may have been greater than calculated here. For example, Oliver’s map (1695) shows 35 parks in the county, but of the 34 parks mapped by Warburton in 1725, ten were not on Oliver’s map (and conversely eleven mapped by Oliver were not on Warburton’s map). But Warburton purposely delineated only those parks that were conventionally surrounded by fencing, ignoring ‘unfenced pleasure grounds of city merchants’. 
This book will be of great interest to anyone studying the general history and development of parks and landscaped gardens since 1500. However, for those interested in particular parks and gardens in Hertfordshire, it will be less satisfying because it lacks a gazetteer. Although there is a good index, it is not easy to trace the development of a specific place: for example, Moor Park is mentioned on no less than 45 different pages. The volume is well-presented with many clear maps, pictures and diagrams and is a must for garden and landscape historians anywhere—and it will hopefully encourage its readers to explore the remnants of some glorious parks rather than simply passing through Hertfordshire en route for, or around, London.

HEATHER FALVEY


Among the many remarkable women who appear in these pages is Elizabeth Williams, lighthouse keeper at Leasowe on the Cheshire side of the Mersey from 1894 to 1908. She took over the job from her late husband but, amazingly, retained the same salary. When the light ceased to be lit in 1908 Elizabeth turned to a rather more traditional female occupation and opened a teahouse for visitors. And there is Victoria Drummond, a goddaughter of Queen Victoria, who became the first female member of the Institute of Marine Engineers. She first went to sea in 1922 as tenth engineer on SS Anchises for the Blue Funnel Line, and during the war worked on convoys, receiving the Lloyds war medal for bravery at sea after she took sole charge of an engine room and kept it running while under attack.

Female Occupations has numerous strengths worth emphasising. Firstly, Margaret Ward has usefully clarified the many women’s service organisations, explaining their development, changes of names, and the relationships between them. There are some thirty such entries, from Air Transport Auxiliary and Almeric Paget Military Massage Corps, to Women’s Timber Corps and Women’s Transport Service. Secondly, we learn about the gradual (and often shockingly late and reluctant) acceptance of women into professional associations and, linked to this, the great value of the websites of those bodies as sources of information. And thirdly, several of the occupations (such as gardener or musician) reveal the evolution from amateur to professional practice, which was of great importance in creating opportunities for middle class women in the labour force.

To describing it as ‘aimed especially at family historians’ underestimates the wider value of Margaret Ward’s book. There is much to interest historians of other persuasions; indeed the reader is referred to ‘local histories’ for women picking flowers and vegetables, and women pinmakers. But discovering the information contained in its pages would be much easier if there was an index. Perhaps this was considered unnecessary in a book structured as an A-Z of occupations, but contained within the alphabetical entries are personal names (such as those quoted in the first paragraph), place-names, and additional occupational terms, including materials and equipment used, which will go unappreciated and only discovered by accident. Another criticism is the failure to give precise references for some delightful quotations: in which issue of Lady’s Realm can we read that ‘the woman motorist is in real earnest in the matter of horseless locomotion’? Some opportunities for cross-referencing are missed; but printing in bold the first three words of each entry, whatever they may be, is a mere irritation.

This is a welcome addition to an already useful list from Countryside Books. Where else could one discover that there were 21 different types of nurse?

JANE HOWELLS


As its title states, this is a book about the origins of Sunderland so, although roughly chronological, it does not aspire to be a linear account but rather to examine some periods and
episodes that shaped the town’s development, from the separate bit of land (sunderlonde) on the opposite side of the river from the famous Saxon monastery at the mouth of the Wear, into one of the leading north-east ports. The task of the authors is complicated by the fact that the area which eventually acquired the general name ‘Sunderland’ was composed of disparate places with differing histories. The England’s Past for All series, with its plentiful illustrations, approachable layout and reasonable prices, is aimed at a non-specialist readership but inevitably some aspects of Sunderland’s history are more accessible to the general reader than others. Partly it is a matter of available documentation.

The vivid picture is offered in chapter 2 of the extraordinary eighth and ninth century flowering of Northumbrian culture, based on the twin monastic foundations of St Peter’s on the north bank of the Wear and St Paul’s on the south bank of the Tyne owes much to the writings of the Venerable Bede and his contemporaries and successors, and will engage general interest because of the popular interpretation of the period on display at ‘Bede’s World’ and St Paul’s Jarrow. On the other hand chapter 3, on rural settlements, has had to be pieced together from many different sources and covers a longer time span, so will perhaps be less accessible for anyone unfamiliar with early systems of land tenure. The crucial point which emerges is that after the establishment of the Norman bishopric of Durham, with its quasi-regal powers, the lands south of the river (which included the area capable of development as a port) became the property of the bishop—hence the name Bishopwearmouth—while those on the north bank went to the Benedictine priory of Durham with only a small daughter-house where Bede’s monastery had stood … though still designated Monkwearmouth.

The records kept by the respective administrators of the lands of bishop and prior offer a remarkably detailed picture of the operation of mediaeval feudalism. Chapter 4 focuses on two episcopal estate surveys—the so-called Boldon Book, commissioned in the early 1180s by Bishop Hugh de Puiset, and the that of Bishop Hatfield almost exactly two hundred years later. The purpose of both was to assess the value of the estates in terms of episcopal revenue, in the first instance to finance a crusade and in the second to review the situation after the ravages of the Black Death. These surveys provide fascinating evidence of the changeover from feudalism based on service and dues in kind to a system in which landowners, clerical or secular, were forced to become *rentier* landlords. In the absence of comparable surveys for the prior’s lands north of the river the authors have concentrated on documents and archaeological evidence relating to the Hilton family. The still-visible ruins of Hylton castle are a reminder that even the bishop and the prior could not entirely control a powerful baronial family whose line continued from the mid-twelfth century to the establishment of a gentleman’s residence on the site six hundred years later.

The port area that became the nucleus of Sunderland was granted a charter from the same Hugh de Puiset who commissioned the Boldon Book, probably with the aim of stimulating trade, but—although this study ignores it—the bishopric shortly afterwards acquired the much better natural harbour at Hartlepool. For the next three centuries Sunderland’s main value seems to have been as a fish market and only in the last quarter of the 16th century and the first of the 17th, with the development of the salt trade by members of entrepreneurial local families and the beginnings of coal export, did the port really begin to expand and prosper. An interesting pointer to the direction of the town’s politics was that although a new charter granted by Bishop Morton in 1634 did not get parliamentary ratification, the leading burgthers implemented it anyway. Led by George Lilburne, the locally-born uncle of John Lilburne the future Leveller, they refused the royal demand for ship money and boycotted the services of the Arminian rector of Bishopwearmouth, preferring to cross the river to St Peter’s where the living was in the gift of the Hilton family and puritan preachers were welcome.

Despite much fascinating detail the section of the book dealing with the Civil War and its aftermath is likely to be the least accessible to the general reader. The parliamentarians favoured radical puritan Sunderland over royalist Newcastle but after the execution of Charles I, and the abolition of the bishopric, rivalry between lay administrators and purchasers of sequestrated estates cancelled out this advantage and the Anglo-Dutch wars of the 1650s disrupted the coal trade from both ports. The contributors conclude that ‘overall Sunderland
emerged favourably' from the upheavals but the general reader is likely to as relieved as most of the local inhabitants that stability was restored, even if it did mean the reinstatement of the bishopric.

The remainder of the book concentrates on Sunderland as a port and expanding town, making good use of eighteenth century prints which provide unique detail about the physical appearance of the river banks with their quays, ballast hills, shipyards and glassworks, the housing clustering up the hillside and the colliers in the offing out to sea. The apparently arbitrary closing date of the study (1719) was when Sunderland at last became a parish in its own right, no longer part of Bishopwearmouth. Again the burghers took matters into their own hands, and the church was already built by the time the Act of Parliament authorising the creation of the new parish had been ratified. Sunderland had arrived. Like most compilations with multiple subscribers this is a patchy book, with overlaps and repetitions that could have been avoided, but it is generous, giving space for detail and the results of specialist research. For anyone connected with, or interested in, Sunderland it is a 'must'. We await a sequel!

WIN STOKES

TOWN AND COUNTRYSIDE IN WESTERN BERKSHIRE c.1337-c.1600: social and economic change Margaret Yates (Boydell 2007 xii+338pp ISBN 978 1 84383 328 4) £55

This is not only the most important book on Berkshire for many a long day but also a significant contribution to our understanding of the transition from the middle ages to the early modern period. Setting her study across the divide, Dr Yates explains why, when and how local societies and economies in the late sixteenth century came to differ from those of the fourteenth. It should be a model for comparative studies elsewhere. The area discussed is 'Western Berkshire', part of the pre-1974 county chosen because surviving tax returns from the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries provide material for a comparative study of changes in population size and wealth distribution. Despite its small area, 18 by 27 miles at most, it contains three distinct regions with contrasting landscapes and economies: the rich arable Vale of White Horse; the Berkshire Downs devoted to sheep rearing, and the Kennet Valley with the cloth town of Newbury and its hinterland of wood pasture. Dr Yates bases her conclusions on a combination of a macro-study of the whole area and micro-studies of manors in six parishes.

A judicious discussion of the tax returns provides the skeleton of the argument, the relative changes in population size and wealth in the three regions. Case studies of six parishes, two in each region, and the town of Newbury are based on manorial rolls, whose deficiencies are supplemented by other sources such as probate inventories. These immensely detailed and painstaking analyses, including personal accounts of some lords of manors, enterprising tenants and urban industrialists, put substantial flesh on the bones, revealing local factors affecting the direction and pace of change. The structure of the book follows the same pattern. There are six chapters, the first outlining the questions to be addressed and the methodology used. The next four treat ecology, population and wealth; Newbury and its hinterland; the management of estates; and the economic activities of the manorial tenantry. The conclusion, 'The chronology of change', is followed by several informative appendices and a very full bibliography. There are three maps and numerous supporting tables and figures. The findings have a relevance beyond Berkshire. The world of 1600 was different from that of 1400 but social and economic change had already begun before the earlier date, and was not continuous or uniform over time or over the regions.

Population increase did not begin until the early sixteenth century and even then was occasionally halted by epidemics; Newbury's prosperity, based on cloth production (particularly of kerseys) began in the fifteenth century and was virtually over by 1570; enclosure, engrossing and the availability of land all proceeded at differing paces on different manors. The reasons for these and other distinctions between the communities of this area are the most important features of the book. Within a national context of demographic fluctuations and politico-religious change, Dr Yates identifies four factors which influenced the differing pace and extent of change.
First, each region had a distinctive landscape which determined the focus of its agriculture and economy. The attitude of manorial lords, whether individuals or institutions, to the management of their estates and the strategies they adopted to maximise their income, decided the date when demesnes were leased, the extent of enclosure, and the amount of engrossing by tenants. The ability and willingness of tenants to seize opportunities for advancement were also significant. A third factor, present only in the Vale of Kennet, was a prosperous town with trading connections well beyond the region. Newbury’s wealth allowed it to buck the trend of urban decline while its need for spinners and fullers added to the diverse economy of its hinterland. Finally, the role of enterprising individuals in both town and country was important. Men such as John Winchcombe II and Thomas Dolman, clothiers of Newbury, were entrepreneurs to rival Thomas Spring of Lavenham. John Yate of Charney, merchant of the Staple of Calais, and his family acquired and administered manors in addition to their trading activities. However the role of such enterprising individuals should not be exaggerated; it was neither great nor long lasting. Newbury’s prosperity had ended by the late sixteenth century, just when sustained and rapid change in the whole region was about to take off. Finally, it is particularly pleasing to find a book whose title unashamedly claims to be a local study but which justly deserves a place alongside others which are more reticent about their focus.

JOAN DILS


This important book both illustrates many aspects of singleness and also challenges many stereotypes and assumptions. Katherine Holden starts from the assertion that while historians and social scientists have viewed marital status as a vital category, it has remained largely unexamined and thus offers challenges to historical scholarship. The institution of marriage has created power relationships that have affected everyone in society. The unmarried state has been regarded in the context of the power relationship between the married and the unmarried. Historically, being unmarried was simply a stage in life either preceding or following on from marriage. The single person was viewed against the backdrop of the institution of marriage and many of the stereotypes attached to them resulted from their qualities and characteristics of being considered as the opposites, the antithesis of those of married people. Those about whom Katherine Holden writes lived under the shadow of marriage, but with her careful and thorough research she is able to show the value and significance of these lives in the period 1914-1970.

She uses a wide variety of sources: film, novels, official statistics, government reports and oral evidence. If there is a criticism of the book, it is that single men are less well represented than single women. For example, in the chapter on parenthood outside marriage, only two accounts of unmarried fathers appear—presumably they were more difficult to trace than unmarried women. The stereotypical views of single men and women found in novels, films and personal accounts are often hostile, but also contradictory and inconsistent. Spinster, a word which carries many pejorative connotations, could be silly, gossipy, sentimental, foolish, downtrodden but contradictorily, bitter, frustrated, dominating. These attitudes were at various times assumed to be the very ones which would render a woman unmarriageable. Bachelors also suffered from stereotyping: single men could be regarded as carefree, but also irresponsible, ‘mothers’ boys, and possibly lacking in manliness. It was assumed that the normal man would support a family.

There is much in the book about single women and their lives, either as mothers or acting in ‘loco parentis’: these lives were frequently beset with difficulties. There are moving accounts of the problems facing unmarried women who found themselves to be pregnant. For most of the period unmarried motherhood was regarded as sinful, but the solution to the ‘problem’ produced different and sometimes conflicting ideas. The Mental Deficiency Act of 1913 allowed unmarried mothers to be classified as mentally and morally defective if they had more than one child. If they were in receipt of Poor Relief then local authorities were empowered to detain them indefinitely in a secure institution, separated from their children. The book reminds us that not only those in authority but also families and communities endorsed this policy. Some families, however, chose a different solution and established elaborate explanations for the existence of the child. Sometimes
grandmothers claimed to be the mother, or a married sister took on the child. Increasingly, there was pressure from those who believed that 'fallen' women should be reformed and 'saved'. But the disgrace of bearing an illegitimate child persisted throughout this period and there was an almost unanimous belief that children should be born in a family where the parents were married.

There is much in the book about the immense amount of admirable work done with and on behalf of children by unmarried professional women in their role of teachers and social workers. As with almost all examples in the book, ambiguity and contradiction are apparent in attitudes to the work of women teachers. In some ways the work was seen as in the maternal sphere, involving the care of children. Women teachers were very well paid by the standards of other female occupations, and teaching could therefore be seen as a lifelong career similar to that enjoyed by men, so their work had a masculine aspect. But any attempts to act in a feminist way, by seeking equal pay, were regarded with suspicion as being unfeminine and possibly threatening to man’s position as the family’s chief breadwinner. The work done by women as nannies, governesses and health visitors is also described. Mothers who believed that only women who were mothers could understand their problems and suggest solutions did not always welcome the latter group.

There is not space here to encompass the wealth of material which Katherine Holden has collected. Her book is complex but always very readable. She has done much to show the importance of the lives and work of single people in a period when the shadow of the institution of marriage remained. This important book should have a wide readership. It is therefore a pity that at £55 it is priced beyond the pocket of many potential readers.

ELIZABETH ROBERTS

ON-LINE REVIEWS May 2009

In addition to the reviews published and printed in The Local Historian, other books are reviewed on-line on the BALH website. Please go to http://www.balh.co.uk/onlinerviews.php to access this section. All printed reviews are also published on our website. The list below gives the publications for which on-line reviews have been added in the last quarter.

NORFOLK ORIGINS 2: Roads and Tracks
Bruce Robinson and Edwin J. Rose (Poppyland Publishing 2008 95pp ISBN 978 0 946148 70 7) £9.95 (reviewed by Paul Hindle)

LIVERPOOL: a people's history

HEROES, VILLAINS AND VICTIMS OF BRADFORD

FOUL DEEDS AND SUSPICIOUS DEATHS
in Barking, Dagenham and Chadwell Heath

DEAR MISS BAIRD: a portrait of a 19th century family

THE MANOR OF BASSINGBOURNE AT TAKELEY, ESSEX
John and Nia Watkiss (Octopus Ink Publishing 2008 138pp ISBN 978-0-9560261) £6+£1 p&p from the authors, Yew Tree House, The Street, Takeley, Bishop’s Stortford CM22 6QU (reviewed by Hilary Walker)

EXPLORING THURROCK
edited by Christopher Harrold (Thurrock Local History Society 2nd edn. 2008 60pp ISBN 978-0-9558352-1-6) £7+60p p&p (reviewed by Hilary Walker)

ADDINGHAM: A VIEW FROM THE MOORSIDE
RECENT PUBLICATIONS IN LOCAL HISTORY

Only books and pamphlets sent to the Reviews Editor are included in this list, which gives all publications received between 1 November 2008 and 1 February 2009. Most books are also reviewed in this or a future issue, or on the BALH website. Publishers should ensure that prices of publications are notified. When addresses are quoted prices usually include postage and packing. Other books should be obtainable through normal book-selling channels and retail prices are quoted. The Reviews Editor is Dr Evelyn Lord, Book Reviews, PO Box 649, Cambridge CB1 0JW. Please note that all opinions and comments expressed in reviews are those of the reviewer—they do not necessarily represent the views of the editors or of the British Association for Local History.

LOCAL AND REGIONAL STUDIES

East

BREWERS AND BREWING IN HUNTINGDONSHIRE A social and economic history Evelyn Lord (EAH Press 2008 ISBN 978 0 9560384 0 1) £6.99+£1.50 p&p from EAH Press, 7 Thornton Court, Thornton Road, Girton, Cambridge CB3 0NS

COKE OF NORFOLK 1754-1842 A biography Susanna Wade Martins (Boydell 2009 ISBN 978 1 84383 426 7) £50


SUTTON HOO AND ITS LANDSCAPE The context of monuments Tom Williamson (Oxbow 2008 ISBN 978 1 905119 25 7) £20

THE WALLACE COLLECTION Jane Allen (Orford Museum 2008 ISBN 978 0 9554738 0 7) from Mrs J. Allen, Friends of Orford Museum, Bell House, Quay Street, Orford, Woodbridge IP12 2NU


London and the South East


DISCOVER STOKE NEWINGTON A walk through history (Friends of Hackney Archives 2008 ISBN 978 0 9517493 3 3) £4.95+£1.50 p&p from Hackney Archives Department, 43 de Beauvoir Road, London N1 5SQ


ESSEX PLACE- NAMES Places, streets and people James Kenble (Historical Publications Ltd, 2008 ISBN 978 1 905286 21 8) £14.95

THE FOLKLORE OF LONDON Legends, ceremonies and celebrations past and present Anthony Clayton, (Historical Publications Ltd. 2008 ISBN 978 1 905286 26 3) £18.95

THE LONDON WE HAVE LOST Richard Tames (Historical Publications Ltd. 2008 ISBN 978 1 905286 25 5) £22.50

THE LOST MANSIONS OF MAYFAIR Oliver Bradbury, (Historical Publications Ltd. 2008 ISBN 978 1 905286 23 2) £24.95

EXPLORING THURROCK ed. Christopher Harrold (Thurrock Local History Society 2008 2nd ed. ISBN 978 0 9558352 1 6) £7+60p p&p from Mrs Norma Leach, 197 Long Lane, Grays Thurrock, Essex RM16 2PT

THE HELLARD ALMSHOUSES and Stevenage Bath House (Stevenage Consolidated Charities and Stevenage Museum 2009) from Stevenage Museum, St George’s Way, Stevenage SG1 1XX

THE IMPACT OF CATASTROPHE The people of Essex and the First World War (1914-1920) Paul Rusiecki (Essex Record Office 2008 ISBN 978 1 898529 28 6) orders/more information from cro.enquiry@essexccgov.uk

LITTLE ITALY The story of London’s Italian Quarter Tudor Allen (Camden Local Studies and Archives Centre 2008 ISBN 978 1 908084 21 9) £5.99 from Camden Local Studies and Archives Centre, Holborn Library 32-38 Theobalds Road, London WC1X 8PA
THE LOST VILLAGES A history of the Holmwoods Kathy Aherton (author 2008 ISBN 978 0 9560766 0 1) £8 from author, Brook Meadow, Mid Holmwood Lane, Dorking RH5 4HE


ST ALBANS A history Mark Freeman (Carnegie 2008 ISBN 978 1 85936 188 7) £24

THE STREETS OF BATTERSEA Their names and origins Keith Bailey (Wandsworth Historical Society: Wandsworth Paper 17 2008 ISBN 978 0 904491 73 9) £7.95+£2 p&p from CHS, 1 Akenside Road, London NW3 5BS

SUSSEX TALES OF THE UNEXPECTED Five centuries of county life Kim Leslie (West Sussex County Council 2008 ISBN 978 0 86260577 3) £25 from West Sussex Record Office, County Hall, Chichester PO19 1RN

STREETS EAST OF BLOOMSBURY Survey of streets, buildings and former residents in a part of Camden ed. Steven Denford and David A. Hayes (Camden History Society 2008 ISBN 978 0 906753 18 X) £5+£1.50 p&p from Chellaston History Group, 144 Birdsal, and Arnold Pacey, ed. Arnold Pacey (Derbyshire A History of a Midlands craftsman John Young (Chellaston History Group 1990 reissue 2008 ISBN 0 906753 18 X) £5+£1.50 p&p from Chellaston History Group, 144 Swarkestone Road, Chellaston, Derby DE7 3UD

DERBYSHIRE A history David Hey (Carnegie 2008 ISBN 978 1 85936 167 2) £24

INDUSTRIAL ENLIGHTENMENT Science, technology and culture in Birmingham and the West Midlands 1760-1820 Peter M. Jones (Manchester UP 2008 ISBN 978 0 7190 7770 8) £35

MAPS OF THE WITHAM FENS from the thirteenth to the nineteenth century ed. R.C. Wheeler (Lincoln Record Society vol.96 ISBN 978 0901503 381) £30 from Lincoln RS, PO Box 9, Woodbridge IP12 3DF


RELIGIOUS DISSENT IN OUNBLE from the Reformation to the early twentieth century Julia Moss (Oundle Museum 2008 ISBN 978 0 9559629 0 1) £5.50+£1.50 p&p cheques payable to Oundle Museum Trust, from Mrs J. Moss, 10 St Peter’s Road, Oundle, Peterborough PE8 4NS


THE VILLAGE OF COLSTON BASSETT A pictorial history (Colston Bassett Local History Group 2008 ISBN978 0 9550401 1 5) £11 inc. p&p from Colston Bassett LHG, School Farmhouse, School Lane, Colston Bassett, Nottingham NG12 3FD

WILLIAM DUGDALE, HISTORIAN 1605-1686 His life, his writings and his county ed. Christopher Dyer and Catherine Richardson (Dugdale Society/Boydell 2009 ISBN 978 1 84383 443 4) £50


INGLEBOROUGH Landscape and history David Johnson (Carnegie 2008 ISBN 978 1 85936 188 7) £14.95
MEDIEVAL YORK  
Gareth Dean  
(History Press 2008  
ISBN 978 0 7524 4114 0) £17.99

THE NATURE OF THE WORLD  
The Yorkshire Philosophical Society 1822-2000  
David Rubinstein  
(Quacks Press 2008 ISBN 978 1 904446 18 7) £15.95  
from publisher, Jackson House, 7 Grape Lane,  
Petergate, York YO1 7HU

A NEW LOOK AT KINGSTON UPON HULL  
Trevor Galvin  
(Highgate Publications 2008 ISBN 1 902645 52 9) £7.50  
from Highgate, Beverley HU17 7AP

NORTHUMBERLAND FROM THE AIR  
Stan Beckensall  
(History Press 2008 ISBN 978 0 7524 4688 2) £17.99

THE PASTOR OF FISH STREET  
The journals of Rev. George Lambert, Congregational Minister ed.  
John Markham  
(East Yorkshire LHS no.57 2008 ISBN 978 0 900349 57 7) from Paper 4U Ltd., Station  
Rise, York YO1 6HT

A NEW LOOK AT KINGSTON UPON HULL  
Trevor Galvin  
(Highgate Publications 2008 ISBN 1 902645 52 9) £7.50  
from Highgate, Beverley HU17 7AP

THE PASTOR OF FISH STREET  
The journals of Rev. George Lambert, Congregational Minister ed.  
John Markham  
(East Yorkshire LHS no.57 2008 ISBN 978 0 900349 57 7) from Paper 4U Ltd., Station  
Rise, York YO1 6HT

THE KIRKYARD OF NEW PITSLIGO (Parish of Tyrie)  
(ANESFHS 2008 ISBN 978 1 905004 08 9) £2.25+56p p&p from above address

THE KIRKYARDS OF KINNEFF AND CATTERLINE  
(ANESFHS 2008 ISBN 978 1 905004 10 2) £2.25+42p p&p from above address

Wales

CEFN REMEMBERED ed. Meurig Owen  
(Cefn Historical Society 2007) £7.50 inc. p&p from  
author, 10 Deans Walk, St Asaph, Denbighshire  
LL17 0NE

INDEX TO TESTATORS OF ENGLISH LATE MEDIEVAL AND EARLY TUDOR WILLS AND TESTAMENTS 1399-1500 published in serial publications, books and other printed matter between 1717-2000  
CD compiled by Richard III Society  
£9.99+£1.50 p&p (cheques to Richard III Society) from  
Sally Empson, Richard III Society, 42 Pewsey Vale, Forest Park, Bracknell RG12 9YA

Scotland

DOUNE KIRKYARD, MACDUFF (Parish of Gamrie)  

THE KIRKYARD OF PORTHILETHEN (Parish of Banchory-Devenick)  
(ANESFHS 2008 ISBN 978 1 905004 09 6) £2.25+56p p&p from above address

THE KIRKYARDS OF KINNEFF AND CATTERLINE  
(ANESFHS 2008 ISBN 978 1 905004 10 2) £2.25+42p p&p from above address

Wales

STOKE NEWINGTON: a DVD  
Bill Hull running time 2 hours £6.95+£1.50 p&p from  
Hackney Archives Department, 43 de Beauvoir Road,  
London N1 5SQ

INDEX TO TESTATORS OF ENGLISH LATE MEDIEVAL AND EARLY TUDOR WILLS AND TESTAMENTS 1399-1500 published in serial publications, books and other printed matter between 1717-2000  
CD compiled by Richard III Society  
£9.99+£1.50 p&p (cheques to Richard III Society) from  
Sally Empson, Richard III Society, 42 Pewsey Vale, Forest Park, Bracknell RG12 9YA

General

BURKE’S GREAT WAR PEERAGE  
Noble British and Irish families on the eve of the First World War  
(Burke’s Peerage and Gentry 76th edition 2008 ISBN 978 0 85011 060 9) £195 from Burke’s Peerage, PO Box 9 Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3DF

CHANTRY CHAPELS and the medieval strategies for the afterlife  
Simon Roffey  
(Tempus 2008 ISBN 978 0 7524 4571 7) £17.50

DEFENDED ENGLAND 1940  
South-West, Midlands and North  
William Foot  
(History Press 2009 ISBN 978 0 7524 4784 5) £25

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE HEARTH TAX  
Elizabeth Parkinson  

GEORGE WADE 1673-1748  
Denise Chantrey  
JOURNALS AND NEWSLETTERS RECEIVED

The more substantial articles in these journals are noted below, but we do not give a full contents list. Most journals are listed alphabetically by geographical location, not title of publication; general journals are at the end of the list.

Abbots Langley LHS Journal (no.29) Autumn/Winter (2008) 75p from Editor ALLHS, 32 St Peter’s Way, Spixworth, Norwich NR10 3NS
ashbyaudrey@yahoo.co.uk Gentry and villagers of Abbots Langley; Edward Tomlinson, sexton & gravedigger; Let’s go to the picture show; memories of WW2

Cake and Cockhorse: journal of the Banbury HS (vol.17 no.7 Autumn/Winter (2008)) £2.50 from Jeremy Gibson, Harts Cottage, Church Hanborough, Witney OX29 8RE:
The migration of plush weavers; the miracle of St Freomund

Barking & District HS Newsletter (Summer 2008: dedicated to Norman Gusby 1914-2008) from barkinghamstoric@hotmail.com, Charles James Dawson 1850-1933 distinguished Barking architect; St Margaret’s Church, Barking; local ginger beer jars

Bedfordshire & Luton Archives & Record Service Newsletter (no.79 Winter 2009) free from BLARS, County Hall, Bedford MK42 9AP: On the road—the first female motorists in Bedfordshire; the role of family and friends in the case of the mentally ill in 19th century: evidence from the Three Counties Asylum

Bedfordshire LHA Newsletter (no.11) free from Brian D. Lazelle, Springfield, 63 Ampthill Road, Maulden, Bedford MK45 2DH

Berkshire LHA Newsletter (no.93) January 2009 available from Dr M. Simons, 80 Reed Avenue, Earley, Reading RG6 5SR: H. & G. Simmonds Ltd; William Godfrey 1610-1696

The Bradford Antiquary: journal of the Bradford Historical and Antiquarian Society (3rd ser no.11, 2007) from editor, Bob Duckett, 22 Holden Lane, Baildon, Shipley BD17 6HZ: The 1722 Map of Bradford and Horton; Dr J.H. Bell and woodworkers’ disease; Wibsey Chapel; the Woodworkers’ Baths and Gardens; ‘Classic Cars’, Bradford; History of W.N. Sharpe Ltd; a remarkable family—the Cravens of Callington (no.12, 2008) a year in the life of an 18th century handloom weaver; Abraham Shackleton’s diary 1794-1795; Scar Hill Toll House and its keepers; the Bradford Subscription Concerts, 1865-1950; Ikley’s Carnegie Library 1907-2007; the DNB and Bradfordians; Bradford-Laureason collection; the Bradford Memory Bank; the Rooks portrait revisited

Bridport HS Newsletter (vol.14 no.1) £5 p.a. from G.R. Eveleigh, 12 Bramley Hill, Bridport DT6 3DP:
Wanderwell; Bridport map 1841; Bridport town centre 1952

Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society Newsletter (no.63 August 2008) Crime and punishment

Camden History Review: Camden HS (no.32) £5.95 from Dr P.F. Woodhead, 1 Akenside Road, London NW3 5BS: Des John Radcliffe, Hans Sloane and Richard Mead: natural sagacity and natural sciences in Bloomsbury 1700-1750; Henry Walter Bates (1825-1892): explorer, Darwinian, geographer and family man; Women’s Hospital Corps and Endell Street Military Hospital; Perkin & Co: steam and heat engineers in Camden; Howard Candler (1838-1916) schoolmaster, educationist and polymath; 100 years of the Kingsway tram subway

Cheltenham LHS Newsletter (no.62 November 2008) pdf copy available from kbooth@dircon.co.uk
More on the town clock

Journal of Christchurch LHS Articles and News (no.13 August 2008) £1 chlsociety@btYahoo.co.uk: Gilders at Christchurch; extracts from the diary of Mary Smith (nee Barrow); the bandstand on the quay; superstition in Dorsetshire; the manor of Winkton from Domesday to 1600

Cleveland and Teesside LHS Newsletter (no.90 February 2009) from CTLHS, 150 Oxford Road, Linthorpe, Middlesborough TS5 5EL: Out and about in 1764

CALH Journal: Cornwall Association of Local Historians (no.56 Autumn 2008) available from paulomax@aol.com: a millennium of Cornish markets; extracts from the life of a Cornishman in the RAF 1944-1945; war alarms in Mount’s Bay; the mystery of St Bellarmine

The Cranbrook Journal: Cranbrook & District LHS (no.19 2008), £3 from CDLHS, Cranbrook Museum, Carriers Road, Cranbrook TN17 3JX: Nonagenarian schoolmaster?” tobacco in the UK and Kent; bank failure, 1826; James Hall, naval surgeon; W.D. Caroe and St Dunstan’s; Colliers Green School, ‘Our Filthy Town’; Cranbrook’s Bevin Boy

Dorking History: journal of the Dorking Local History Group (no.10 2008) From DLHG, c/o Dorking Museum, The Old Foundry, 62 West Street, Dorking RH4 1BS: John Langdon Davies; making
Dorwich History & Archaeology Society Newsletter (no.48 November 2008) from Chris Bowes, 9
Laurelwood Close, Droitwich Spa WR9 7SF: Droitwich canal project; Droitwich Methodist churches; Italian experience in the Worcester Road; John Corbett—salt king; the kaiser’s plans for Droitwich

The Dunningite: newsletter of the Dunning Parish HS (Winter 2008/2009) £1.50 from DPHS, The Old Schoolhouse, Newton of Pitcairns, Dunning, Perth PH2 0SL: Building, banking, music and weaving; the Battle of Dunphlin Moor; Dunning’s latest archaeological finds; from Dunming to SW Victoria

Eastbourne Local Historian (no.150 Winter 2008) £8 p.a. from eastbournehistory@hotmail.com message to royalty; Eastbourne Model Village and Aquarium; Lewis Carroll in Eastbourne; the Technical Institute; the mysterious disappearance of John Osborn

EYLHS Newsletter: East Yorkshire LHS (no.19) from EYLHS Secretary, David Smith, 114 Telford Street, Hull HU9 3DY: the Minerva Hotel

Essex Archaeological and Historical Congress Newsletter (no.98 Spring 2009) from editor, Mrs W. Hibbitt, 2 Green Close, Writtle, Chelmsford CM1 3DX: local history course to make a comeback; Iron Age enclosure at Great Tey; origins of Maldon; geo-archaeology and reconstructing past landscape at Olympic Park; air-raid shelter at EKCO Works, Southend; archaeology of Canvey Island; Foulness

Farnham & District Museum Society Journal (vol.15 no.4 December 2008) £15 p.a. from Museum of Farnham, Willner House, 38 West Street, Farnham GU9 7DX: Wrecclesham and the manor of Farnham; the Civil Wars, the Commonwealth, the Restoration, and hop-growing; John Perry’s list of Hampshire churches

Fram: Journal of the Framlingham & District LH & Preservation Society (5th ser no.11 December 2008) from editor, 43 College Road, Framlingham, IP13 9ER: the three workhouses of Framlingham; mills of Framlingham; Framlingham Castle Pageant

Friern Barnet Newsletter: Friern Barnet & District LHS (no.35 December 2008) from friernbarnet@hotmail.co.uk: the Russell Eagles; Friern Barnet reminiscences; AA Pilots, Queen’s Parade reminiscences; memories of teaching (no.36 February 2009)

Hackney History: Friends of Hackney Archives (no.14 2008) £3 from FHA c/o Hackney Archives Department, 43 de Beauvoir Road, London N1 5SQ: Newcome’s School; the elusive Pennington; punning down a forgotten hero; Quakers in Stoke Newington the 19th and 20th centuries; the Dalston Turkish baths—and two that never happened; the mystery of the Homerton H-O-G; Lee Valley Regional Park: a historical perspective

Hampshire Studies: Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society (vol.63 2008) non-members £20 details from Dr Alison M. Deveron, 8 Lynch Hill Park, Whitchurch RG28 7NF: building craftsmen of William of Wykeham and the ‘patronage’ society; tomb of Prior Huston in St James Church, Huston; canons of Winchester in the long eighteenth century; Frances Wickham Swanton (1746-1823); diocese of Winchester: reform and reorganisation 1827-1927; from Age and Roman activity at Rectory Road, Oakley; Roman pottery kilns, kiln furniture etc from Alice Holt Forest; two Anglo-Saxon brooches from the central Man Valley; Late Saxon and early medieval occupation at 26-27 Staple Gardens, Winchester; the boundaries of Buckholt, a Hampshire royal forest; review of county council elections in Hampshire 1889-1974

Harpenden & District LHS Newsletter (no.105 August 2008) from Eric Brandreth, 10 The Close, Harpenden, AL5 3NB: the way we used to travel; August Bank Holiday 1919; waterway wonders; social conditions in Harpenden 1858; prisoners of war 1783-1815; St John’s Church centenary; the coach-horn tooder

Hedon History: joint newsletter of Hedon Museum Society and Hedon and District LHS (no.36 Autumn 2008) From the museum archives


Hertfordshire Local History News and Events: Hertfordshire Association for LH (Winter 2008) progress of the Deane-Radcliffe appeal; recent archive acquisitions


Ilkeston & District LHS Newsletter (vol.9 no.21 October 2008) from P. Stevenson, 16 Rigley Avenue, Ilkeston DE7 5LW: Poplar Inn deed of enfranchisement, RYS Narcissus on convoy duty in World War I

Proceedings of the Isle of Man Natural History and Antiquarian Society (vol.12 no.1 April 2005-March 2007) £15+£2 p&p from Mrs C.J. Bryan, Ballacrue Stream Cottage, Ballaugh, Isle of Man IM7 5LW: saltmarsh ecology in the IOM; Traflagar through Manx eyes; the farming landscape of Lonan and the Laxey valley; Manx houses of the seventeenth century; fish and aquatic invertebrates of Sulby Glen; Sir William Herdman’s legacy to the IOM: 114 years of marine biology; Bishop Wilson and the steps of St Paul’s; buildings in the IOM by Thomas Brine, Viking Age burials in the Manx landscape

Journal of Kent History: Kent History Federation (no.68 March 2009) £1.50 from Dr M. Raraty, 41 The Minerva Hotel, Canterbury CT4 5BA: Charles Darwin centenary; first for flight on Sheppey

Llanasamlet Times Past: magazine of the Llanasamlet HS (no.1 July 2008) from Dr D.H. Stokes, 3 Belgrave Close, Gorseinon, Swansea SA4 4BQ: Llwyndybraun and Lonlas remembered (no.2 October 2008) the beginning of the Ebenezer Chapel, Llwyndybraun; World War One; World War Two

The Record: London Colney LHS (no.20 Summer 2008) 50p from 23 Chester Gibbons Green, London
Colney AL2 1EA: property deeds; Collardswick Farm; a Broad Colney Childhood, 1936-1854 (no.21 Spring 2009) the Spot Cafe and Dance Hall; the Water Splash Hotel; Broad Colney childhood memories

Orford & District Local History Bulletin (no.11 Autumn 2008) £10 p.a. enquiries to Jane Allen, Bell House, Quay Street, Orford, Woodbridge IP12: 2NU: teenage years in war-time Orford; the evacuation of Sudbourne and Ben; feathered combatants and other wartime memories; a village goes to war; artists around the Battle Area; the Orford air raid; castle cuisine; what went on in the battle area? three tales of the Bailey Bridge; Hall, who goes there?

Rickmansworth HS Newsletter (no.82 December 2008) 60p from Geoff Saul, 20 West Way, Rickmansworth WD3 7EN: turnpikes; papermaking; Rickmansworth from the Watford Observer Autumn 1908; special trees and woods of the Chilterns

Rutland Record: journal of the Rutland LH & Record Society (no.28 2008) £4+£1 p&p from the editor, RLHRS, 5 Forth Close, Oakham, Rutland LE15 6JW: some kinship wills of the late 15th century from Stamford, Rutland and surrounding area; Lady Charlotte Finch (1725-1813); Thomas Hotckin of Tixover (1774-1843) In the Doghouse: Rutland benefactors of Lord Harborough’s Hospital at Stapleford

Scottish Local History (no.74 Winter 2008) £15 p.a. from Doris Williamson c/o Scottish History, School of History and Classics, 17 Buccleuch Place, Edinburgh EH8 9LN: 500th anniversary of printing in Scotland; Duncan Roy Campbell and ‘The Watch’ in the Highlands; Rest and be thankful – the historic highway to Argyll; Fair Isle families; the Glasgow mail tax riot

Send & Ripley History Society Journal (vol.6 no.203 Nov/Dec 2008) free from mailinglist@english-heritage.org.uk: Double-booked; New kid on the block; The Devil drives; Long time man; Saving Nell for posterity

Salopian Recorder: newsletter of the Friends of Shropshire Archives (no.60 Autumn 2008) £2 from Shropshire Archives, Castle Gates, Shrewsyrbury SY1 2AQ: eyewitness tales of an attempted coup in Oswestry; the follies of a Victorian athlete

South Gloucestershire Mines Research Group Newsletter (no.19 September 2008) from Steve Grudgings, 31 Laverstoke Lane, Laverstoke, Whitchurch RG28 7NY: emergency rescue archaeology; Crofton beam engine; artefacts and archaeology; Combe Martin silver mine; Yate No 2 colliery SGMRG investigations update; Malago Vale Colliery

Stapleford and District LHS Newsletter (no.25 Autumn 2008) £1 from Barbara Brooke 0115-939 4979 Ilkeston Pioneer extracts 1904, 1912, 1918, 1919

Suffolk Local History Council Newsletter (no.77 Autumn 2008) from Suffolk Community Research Centre, 2 Wharfedale Road, Ipswich IP1 4JP

Borough of Twickenham LHS Newsletter (no.149 December 2008) from johnshca@btinternet.com: letters from the Home Front pt.1; Hampton in 1978; a mystery underground structure

Wanstead HS Journal (no.66 Autumn 2008) £1 from Brian J. Page, Flat 82A, The Weavers’ House, New Wanstead, London E11 2SY: Colen Campbell’s Vitruvius Britannicus, local history watch; models of Wanstead village, 1735; what’s in a postcard?

Warwickshire History: journal of the Warwickshire LHS (vol.14 no.1 Summer 2008) from Christine Woodland, 28 Lillington Road, Leamington Spa CV32 5YY: Knowle Sanctuary; Gentleman Philanthropist: C.T. Warde of Clifton and Victorian morality, Warwick Borough Golf Club for Working Men, 1911

The Link: Wessex Newfoundland Society quarterly magazine (no.76 December 2008) £10 p.a. details from Bryankeeping@aol.com: Newfoundland observations; cod bones and commerce; celebrating the first flight in Canada; cemetery discovered south of 1610 Plantation at Cupids

West Sussex Archives Society Newsletter (no.66 Spring 2009)

Wiltshire Local History Forum Newsletter (no.72 January 2009) from Jane Howells, 7 St Marks Road, Salisbury SP1 3AY: English music and the local historian; West Gallery music and musicians in Wiltshire; musical life in late 18th century Salisbury; Wiltshire historic pipe organs: are their futures secure?

Woodsets LHS Magazine (no.55 Michaelmas 2008) from www.woodsets.com: the 'Great War' news; Oh, What a Lovely War?; trench warfare; Woodsets men in the services; Woman’s work; Woodsets School’s First World War effort; the Northern Base Hospital

Bookdealer (no.1797 October 2008) £27 p.a. see info@bookdealer.org.uk: Double-booked; New kid on the block; The Devil drives; Long time man; Saving Nell for posterity

Conservation Bulletin [English Heritage] (no.59 Autumn 2008) free from mailinglist@english-heritage.org.uk: continuity and innovation; new understanding; the curator’s story; shock of the new (and nearly new)

Local History Magazine (no.120 Sept/Oct 2008) £5.50 from Local History Magazine, Doric House, 56 Aylesbury Road, Studley B80 7LG: a treasured possession; Essex tales of witchcraft; the Neck—the pit they thought was safe; Changing Croome—restoration and recording; hospital conditions 1850-1900 (no.121 Nov/Dec 2008) as above: a look at Christmas past; Thomas Cook’s greatest rival: publishing your own local history book; hospital conditions 1850-1900

Open History: magazine of the Open University History Society (no.106 Winter 2008/09) £3 from OUHS, 77 Marford Crescent, Sale M33 4DN: 1945 general election; New Mills Torr Hydra; medieval tile pavement at Winchester Cathedral; Roman military identity on Hadrian’s Wall; Battle of Cambrai November 1917

PROphile: magazine of the Friends of the National Archives (vol.19 no.3 December 2008) £2.50 supporting a mentally deranged soldier; death of Sir Henry Gurney, Malay, October 1951; 1968 Year of Revolutions; Richthofen’s victims speak; the mayor’s and City of London Court


William Barnes Society Newsletter (no.57 November 2008) from Richard Burleigh, Alberta Cottage, Higher Sea Lane, Charmouth DT6 6BB