# KILHAM, NORTHUMBERLAND

## AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL STUDY OF A BORDER TOWNSHIP

Compiled by:
The Archaeological Practice Ltd.
Newcastle upon Tyne

Commissioned by: *The Northumberland National Park Authority*

# CONTENTS

# ILLUSTRATIONS

## FIGURES

# PART 1

# INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

# 1. BACKGROUND, AIMS & METHODS

The Northumberland National Park Historic Village Atlas Project is a collaborative project between the National Park Authority and local communities,[1] the main product of which is an atlas of Historic Villages in the Northumberland National Park (NNP) area.

Despite a considerable amount of historical and archaeological research within NNP, much of this work has been targeted on outlying sites and areas and there has been little targeted study of the historic villages themselves. Previous studies undertaken into the history of the villages, including those provided by the antiquarian, Hodgson (1820-1840), those contained in the County Histories, as well as the later work of Wrathmell (1975) and Dixon (1985), cover some of the same ground as the present studies, but are now in need of revision in the light of subsequent archaeological discoveries and historical findings, as well as changes to both the built fabric and community of the villages in the National Park area. Even John Grundy's impressive work on the buildings of the National Park completed as recently as 1988 has been rendered out of date by the conservation, renovation, adaptation and, in some cases, demolition of many buildings covered in his report.

The increased pace of modern development within the National Park has put pressure on its cultural heritage resource, specifically its historic buildings and villages. One of the aims of the Historic Village Atlas Project, therefore, is to provide additional information which NNPA can use to further inform its approach to the management of sites of cultural heritage importance.

Changes in the social fabric of the area, often linked to the development work outlined above, mean that traditional lifeways maintained over many generations are now becoming increasingly rare or extinct. In particular, many traditional farming practices and the skills, tools and buildings used to support them have been lost and are being lost, and along with these has gone a regional vocabulary of specific terms and expressions. However, within the same communities there is also a considerable interest in the history and archaeology of the villages. Part of the purpose of the Historic Village Atlas Project, therefore, is to provide information and advice to facilitate not only greater understanding, but also active participation by community members in investigating and preserving aspects of the past. Some of the ways in which this can be achieved is through the presentation of data, guided walks and oral history recordings, all of which have been built into the project brief.

The study presented here was commissioned in order to redress the lack of systematic research into the historic settlements of the Northumberland National Park area, with the intention not only to contribute to the Regional Research Agenda, but to inform the planning and heritage management process, and provide impetus and encouragement for local communities to carry out their own work.

The main aims of the project are as follows:

- To further the study, understanding and enjoyment of the historic villages, both by interested individuals and community-based groups.
- To reinforce and develop the existing sense of place and belonging of individuals within the communities of the region.
- To provide a springboard for future community-led initiatives by supplying information which community groups can use to develop their own proposals.

[1] See the Acknowledgments section of the Synthesis volume for a list of institutions and individuals that have provided assistance in various ways.

- To facilitate the management of the cultural heritage by the NNPA

Village settlements, traditionally recognisable as clustered assemblies of houses and farmsteads, are scarce within the Park, where most settlements are isolated farms and hamlets. However, on the basis of their current status and what was known about their historic importance, the NNPA identified seventeen historic villages for study:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Akeld | NT 957 296 | Glendale |
| Alnham | NT 996 108 | Alndale |
| Alwinton | NT 923 065 | Coquetdale |
| Byrness | NT 764 026 | Redesdale |
| Elsdon | NY 937 934 | Redesdale |
| Falstone | NY 724 875 | North Tynedale |
| Great Tosson | NU 027 006 | Coquetdale |
| Greenhaugh | NY 795 873 | North Tynedale |
| Harbottle | NT 935 046 | Coquetdale |
| Hethpool | NT 896 284 | College Burn |
| High Rochester | NY 832 982 | Redesdale |
| Holystone | NT 955 026 | Coquetdale |
| Ingram | NU 019 164 | Breamish Valley |
| Kilham | NT 884 325 | Glendale |
| Kirknewton | NT 915 303 | Glendale |
| Tarset | NY 788 855 | North Tynedale |
| Westnewton | NT 903 303 | Glendale |

Villages do not exist as self-contained units, but rather as focal points within the wider landscape. It is important, therefore, in attempting an understanding of the development of villages themselves, that the study villages are investigated in the context of their wider landscapes which may be definable by bounded areas, such as parishes and townships, or by topographic features such as river valleys.

Modern villages exist within clearly demarcated territories known as civil parishes, which are generally based on the boundaries of earlier territorial units labelled townships – units of settlement with pre-Norman origins which were regarded as discrete communities within each ecclesiatical parish. The ecclesiastical parish represented a unit of land paying tithes to a parish church, and in upland Northumberland, these parishes were often vast, incorporating entire dales and numerous townships. A township has its own settlement nucleus and field system and is thus an area of common agricultural unity and is often equivalent to the medieval *vill* – though the latter frequently refers to a taxation unit or administrative entity, whereas a territorial township refers to the physical fabric of the community (fields, buildings, woods & rivers). Township boundaries sometimes follow pre-Norman estate divisions and in some cases may even be earlier - it seems likely that a system of land organisation based around agricultural territories was in operation in Roman or pre-Roman times. Therefore, in some instances very ancient boundary lines may have been preserved by later land divisions. The various forms of parish and township and their development over time are discussed more extensively in the historical synthesis in Section 3.

In order to carry out a study focussing on the village core whilst attempting also to understand it within the local and regional context, a variety of approaches has been taken using information derived from a wide range of sources, including existing archaeological and historic buildings records, historic maps and documents, historic and aerial photographs and published information. In the present section (Section 1) the location of the village is discussed and an indication is given of the area covered by the present study. Section 2 provides a background to the sources of information used to compile the report, listing the archives consulted and some of the most significant maps, documents

and photographs used to compile a list of cultural heritage sites. Section 3 provides a listing of all the historic and archaeological monuments identified within the study area and synthesizes the collected data to provide a summary of the known history of the settlement. Section 4 contains suggestions for future work and sets out the report's conclusions regarding the village's historical development which in turn inform the judgements regarding the levels of archaeological sensitivity applied to different parts of the settlement and displayed graphically on the 'sensitivity maps'. The appendices contain catalogues of the various categories of collected data. A glossary of historical terms used and a full bibliography are also provided.

One final point cannot be over-emphasized. Too often the completion of a substantial work of this kind tends to create the impression that everything is now known regarding a particular subject and thereby discourages further investigation. In compiling this report, the consultants have on the contrary been all too conscious of barely scratching the surface and aware that many additional avenues of research could have been pursued. The Historic Village Atlas should be a starting point not a conclusion to the exploration of this broad and fascinating field.

# 2. LOCATION AND TOPOGRAPHY

## 2.1 Location and topography

The village of Kilham is situated in the Glendale in north Northumberland, on the northern edge of the Northumberland National Park (see figures 1 and 2). The village lies on the south side of the river valley about 8km south of the border with Scotland near Coldstream, and about 10km northwest of the market town of Wooler. Today Kilham comprises a small group of dwellings located to the southwest of the Bowmont Water, along a small track that joins the road running from Wooler (in the east) towards Kirk Yetholm (in the west). To the south the village is overlooked by the northern limits of the Cheviot Hills and Kilham Hill, while to the north lie the less formidable heights of Housedon, Homilton and Wester Hills.

## 2.2 Area of Study

The area of study adopted is represented by the 19th century township of Kilham, one of 15 townships incorporated in the huge, 38,000 acre ecclesiastical parish of Kirknewton (see figures 3-4). The parish embraced the bulk of the north Cheviot massif and a substantial proportion of what is now the Northumberland National Park. Kilham township itself contained 2871 acres and comprised two main components (NCH XI (1922), 158-69). The valley of the Kilham Burn occupies the south side of Glendale with Kilham at the mouth of the valley and the farm of Longknowe higher up. Opposite Kilham, on the north side of the dale, lies Thornington with adjacent hills on the north side of the dale. The modern civil parish covers a much wider area embracing the former townships of Howtel, Paston and Coldsmouth and Thompson's Walls. The development of parochial and township structures is discussed more fully in the next section and in the historical synthesis contained in Part 3.

# 3. TERRITORIAL UNITS AND SETTLEMENT TYPES

## 3.1 Parishes and Townships, Baronies and Manors

To understand the history of a particular village settlement, like Kilham, it is necessary to distinguish and define the various different territorial units within which the village was incorporated, and which provided the framework for the development of that community. Each of these units related to different aspects of the settlement's communal relations, both external and internal and their corresponding religious spheres – religious, economic and administrative, and estate management.

**The Parish** was the basic unit of ecclesiastical administration and essentially represented 'a community whose spiritual needs were served by a parish priest, who was supported by tithe and other dues paid by his parishioners' (Winchester 1987, 23). It was the payment of tithes - established as a legal principle since the reign of King Edgar 959-75 (Platt 1981, 47) - which gave the parish a territorial dimension so that the boundaries of the parish came to embrace all that community's landed resources. Only the most remote areas of upland waste or 'forest', such as Kidland and Cheviot Forest, remained 'extra-parochial'. Ecclesiastical parishes in the Northumbrian uplands typically covered extensive areas, sometimes very extensive areas, Simonburn in North Tynedale, Elsdon in Redesdale and Kirknewton in Glendale being amongst the largest parishes in the country. Others, such as Alnham or Ingram were not in the same class as Kirknewton or Simonburn, but, in common with almost all the upland parishes, it embraced several of the civil township communities or *vills*, including that centred on Alnham village itself. In all, six of the seventeen villages studied in this survey were parochial centres in the medieval period, namely Elsdon, Holystone, Alwinton, Alnham, Ingram and Kirknewton. Others, such as Kilham, Akeld, Falstone, Harbottle and perhaps Byrness were the site of dependent chapels of ease. The presence of early medieval carved stonework at Falstone suggests it had long been an ecclesiastical centre and may have had greater significance in the 8th and 9th centuries (as a small monastic site?) than it possessed later on. However several of our study villages contain no places of worship whatsoever, and it is clear that the traditional, almost unconscious, English equation of village and parish church does not apply in Northumberland, and certainly not in the Northumbrian uplands.

It is thus clear that these large medieval parishes embraced many distinct communities and the church was often too distant to conveniently serve all the spiritual needs of the parishioners in the outlying townships. However there are relatively few instances of new parishes being carved out of a well-established parish and practically none after 1150. The payment of tithes created a strong disincentive to do so since creating a new parochial territory would inevitably reduce the income of the priest in the existing parish. This relatively early fossilisation of parish territories was given added impetus once ownership of parish churches was largely transferred from the hereditary priests or local lay lords whose predecessors had founded the churches over to the monasteries in the 12th and 13th century, since these ecclesiastical corporations strenuously defended their legal and economic rights (Lomas 1996, 111, 116-7; Dixon 1985 I). Instead the needs of the more distant township communities were catered for by the construction of dependent chapels of ease, which were established either by the monastic institutional patrons or on the individual initiative of local lay lords. Even so many townships had neither a church nor chapel of their own (Lomas 1996, 111-4).

In the medieval era the parish was a purely ecclesiastical institution and was to remain so until the beginning of the 17th century when the Elizabethan Poor Law Act of 1601 made this territorial unit responsible for the maintenance of the poor through the appointment of overseers for the poor and the setting of a poor rate (*Statutes* 43 Eliz. I c.2; cf. Winchester 1978, 56; Charlton 1987, 98). This is in many respects typical of the history of English local government whereby 'new administrative units have generally been created by giving new functions to existing territorial divisions' (Winchester

1987, 27). Thereafter parochial administration of poor law was particularly prevalent in southern and midland England, where parishes were generally smaller and often coterminous with the civil townships. However in northern England even these additional functions tended to devolve down to the constituent townships which were a more convenient and manageable size than the extensive parishes. The modern civil parishes were established by the Local Government Act of 1889 and were substantially based on the earlier townships rather than the ecclesiastical parishes (*Statutes* 52/53 Vict. c.63).

**The Township or *Vill*** (derived from the medieval Latin '*villa*') was the basic territorial unit in Northumberland, instead of the ecclesiastical parish. The term *vill* can be defined in two ways, on the one hand as a territorial community, which may be labelled the *territorial vill*, and on the other as the basic unit of civil administration in medieval England, the *administrative vill*. The two units were related and they could indeed be cover identical territorial divisions, but this was not always the case and they must therefore be carefully distinguished.

**The territorial vill** is synonymous with the English words *town* or *township*, deriving from the Old English *tun*, the commonest element in English placenames, i.e. a settlement with a distinct, delimited territory, the latter representing the expanse of land in which that particular community of peasants lived and practised agriculture. A township/territorial vill was not the same as the village itself, which was simply the nucleated settlement which commonly lay at the heart (though not necessarily the geographical centre) of the township, and where the bulk of the individuals who made up the community might reside. A classic township, centred on a nucleated village settlement, was composed of three main elements, the village itself, the cultivated arable land and meadows, and the moorland waste or common. However a township community might live scattered about in dispersed farms instead of or as well as being grouped together in a nucleated village or hamlet. Any combination of these elements was possible, but some permanent settlement was required for there had to be a community for a township to exist. Writing between 1235 and 1259, the lawyer Henry de Bracton defined the township thus (*De Legibus et Consuetudinibus Angliae*, iii, 394-5; cited by Winchester 1978, 69; Dixon 1985, I):

> "If a person should build a single edifice in the fields, there will not be a *vill*, but when in the process of time several edifices have begun to be built adjoining to or neighbouring to one another, there begins to be a *vill*."

A township's consciousness of itself as a distinct community would have been reinforced by the communal agricultural labour required to work the land. This is particularly obvious in the cases where the township was centred on a nucleated village, its members living and working alongside one another, but even in townships composed of scattered hamlets or farmsteads it was just as vital to regulate access to the use of communal resources such as the upland waste or commons. Such activities would have generated a sense of communal cohesion however fragmented the framework of manorial lordship and estate management in the township might have become over time (see below).

The boundaries of such township communities would have become fixed when the land appropriated by one community extended up to that belonging to neighbouring settlements (Winchester 1987, 29). In the lowlands intensive cultivation had been practised for millennia prior to the medieval period, when townships are first documented. Consequently it has been argued that many of these boundaries were of considerable antiquity, particularly where obvious natural features such as rivers and streams and watersheds were followed, although such antiquity is difficult to prove conclusively. In the uplands, settlement is thought to have experienced successive cycles of expansion and contraction in response to a variety of stimuli, including environmental factors such as climatic change, but doubtless also political and economic issues. This may have resulted in periodic obscuring of the boundaries when communities were not fully exploiting the available resources and hence had less need to precisely define their limits. In all areas the definitive boundary network recorded by the first

Ordnance Survey maps is obviously a composite pattern, in which precise delineation occurred in a piecemeal fashion over the centuries.

**The administrative vill:** The term vill also designated the basic unit of civil administration in medieval England, representing a village or grouping of hamlets or farmsteads which were obliged to perform a range of communal administrative duties. The latter included the delivery of evidence at inquests, the upkeep of roads and bridges, the apprehension of criminals within its bounds and the assessment and collection of taxes (Vinogradoff 1908, 475; Winchester 1978, 61; 1987, 32; Dixon 1985 I). The most comprehensive listing of these administrative vills is provided by the occasional tax returns known as Lay Subsidy Rolls. The assessment units recorded therein essentially correspond to the vills and, although clearly incomplete, sufficient survives of the 1296 and 1336 Northumberland rolls to provide a good impression of the number and distribution of the administrative units in many parts of the county (*cf*. Fraser (ed.) 1968, xv-xvi).[2] In many areas these administrative vills correspond very closely to the territorial vills and with the later poor law townships (see below). Dixon has shown this to be the largely case in north Northumberland (north of the Coquet), for example (1985 I). This was by no means the case everywhere in the border counties, however. In the district of Copeland in West Cumbria, where a predominantly dispersed settlement pattern of scattered 'single farmsteads, small hamlets and looser groupings of farms' prevails, Winchester has demonstrated that the administrative vills had a composite structure, frequently embracing several 'members' or 'hamlets' which correspond to the basic territorial townships (1978, 61-5). In many instances administrative vills were significantly larger than the later poor law townships. These relatively large, composite administrative vills correspond to what were termed *villae integrae* ('entire vills') elsewhere in England. It is possible that a similar pattern of composite administrative vills might be have been introduced in areas of the Northumbrian uplands such as Redesdale and North Tynedale, where hamlets and farmsteads were more common than nucleated villages. However these areas were liberties or franchises, like the lands of the Bishops of Durham, i.e. the normal apparatus of royal government was absent and their administration was entrusted instead to the baronial or ecclesiastical lord. This may have resulted in administration and justice being exercised through the structures of manorial lordship rather than a separate tier of specifically administrative land units. Finally, Winchester also suggests that the term vill gradually acquired a more specific administrative connotation as the organisation of local government became more standardised after the Statute of Winchester in 1285, with the result that in his study area, from the end of the 13th century, the term was restricted to the administrative units and no longer applied to the basic territorial townships (1978, 66-7).

**The Poor Law Township**, to use Winchester's term (1978), is the form of township community most familiar today through in the works such as the Northumberland County History and Hodgson's *History of Northumberland*, where, along with the parish, it provides the framework for the historical narrative of individual localities. The boundaries of these territorial communities were mapped by the 1st edition Ordnance Survey in the mid-19th century and they have generally been presumed to have had a long and largely uninterrupted history stretching back in most cases to the townships of the medieval period. They are conveniently depicted on the maps which front of each volume of the *Northumberland County History*, from which figure * in each of the individual village reports is derived. A more detailed record of each township territory is provided by their respective tithe and enclosure maps and other historic maps catalogued and reproduced in the village reports.

The assumption that the medieval administrative vill was the direct ancestor of these post-medieval poor law township, and hence of the modern civil parish, was a reasonable one since functionally they

[2] The 1296 roll omits Alnham, as well as Fawdon and Farnham (two of the 'ten towns of Coquetdale'), Caistron, Wreighill, Prendwick and Unthank and probably Branton, Hedgeley, Glanton, Little Ryle and Shawdon (Fraser (ed.) 1968, xv-xvi), but this is most likely simply to reflect the loss of parts of the original roll rather than the absorption of these vills in a larger'*villa integra*'.
On the other hand the regalian liberties of Redesdale, upper Tynedale and the Northumbrian holdings of the Prince Bishops of Durham were never included in the roll (ibid., xiii).

are somewhat similar, representing the most basic level of civil administration. However the actual line of descent is much more complex.

The administration of poor relief was originally established at parochial rather than township level, with the requirement of the Elizabethan Poor Law Act of 1601 that overseers for the poor be appointed in every ecclesiastical parish in England (*Statutes* 43 Eliz. I c.2; *cf*. Winchester 1978, 56). Following pressure in parliament to permit the subdivision of the huge ecclesiastical parishes in the northern counties into smaller, more convenient units, the 1662 Poor Law Act allowed 'every Township or Village' in northern England to become a unit for poor-rate assessment and collection with their own overseers (*Statutes* 14 Charles II c.12, s.21; (*cf*. Winchester 1987, 27). Winchester has argued, on the basis of the arrangements he documented in the Copeland district of west Cumbria, that it was the territorial townships rather than the administrative vills which were most frequently adopted to serve as the new poor law townships. However in Northumberland north of the Coquet there was in any case relatively little difference between the medieval territorial and administrative units, as noted above, and about three quarters of the townships identifiable in the 13th century may be equated with the poor law townships recorded by the Ordnance Survey. The disappearance or radical alteration of the remaining 25 percent was the result of settlement abandonment or colonisation during the late medieval period and estate reorganisation in the post-medieval period (Dixon 1985, I)[3]. The upland dales south of the Coquet were a very different matter. Redesdale and North Tynedale fell within the vast parishes of Elsdon and Simonburn respectively, the latter with a dependent chapelry at Bellingham which itself embraced all of upper North Tynedale. In Redesdale, six large 'wards' or townships are found, namely Elsdon, Otterburn, Woodside, Rochester, Troughen and Monkridge, plus the small extra-parochial township of Ramshope (Hodgson 1827, 82-3). The wards were almost certainly created in response to the 1662 act and presumably represent subdivision of the parish to facilitate the administration of poor relief. There is no indication that they existed at an earlier date. They are not recorded in the 1604 border survey, which instead lists a great number of 'places' or 'parts of the manor' within the constituent parishes of the Manor of Harbottle. These places were in most cases more than hamlets, groups of farms or individual farmsteads, the kind of small early territorial township found in upland areas. The twelve townships of upper North Tynedale, described in the County History (NCH XV, 234-80), were established in 1729 by Thomas Sharp, Archdeacon of Northumberland, specifically to administer poor relief, each township being responsible for the maintenance of its own poor and setting a separate poor rate (Charlton 1987, 98-9).[4] Some of these townships may have been based on earlier territorial units, but others have rather artificial names – West Tarset or Plashetts and Tynehead- indicative of institutions established by bureaucratic fiat.

It is from these 'poor law townships', however ancient or recent their origins, rather than the medieval administrative vill, that the modern civil parish is directly derived in northern England. The Local Government Act of 1889, which established the civil parish, specifically stated it was to be 'a place for which a separate poor rate is or can be made' (Statutes 52/53 Vict. c.63 sec. 5). Today's civil parishes, however, are generally somewhat larger than the preceding townships, in part as a result of more recent amalgamations.

**The Manor** was a territorial unit of lordship and the basic unit of seigneurial estate administration. Jurisdiction was exercised by the manorial lord over the estate, its assets, economic activities and customary and legal rights, through his manor court sometimes termed the *court baron*.

Manorial lordship thus represented only one link in the chain of feudal and tenurial relationships which extended from the lowly peasant through to the baronial superior lord and ultimately right up to the king himself. In its simplest form a township would be encapsulated within a single manor and would therefore have the same territorial limits. However such 'classic' manors were much rarer than

3 Dixon (1985, I) provides a comprehensive summary of these changes for north Northumberland, including lists of abandoned early townships, new townships and identifiable boundary shifts or rationalisations.

4 Prior to 1729, the Chapelry of Bellingham had been subdivided into four wards for more convenient collection of the poor rate, but these wards had not set a separate rate.

primary school history lessons might have us believe. Then as now, the processes of succession and inheritance and the inevitable variability in human fortunes resulted in the amalgamation or, more often, fragmentation of estates. Most townships therefore were divided between a number of manorial landholders.

Thus a parish, township and manor could all be coterminous, with a small parish serving the spiritual needs of a single township community whose landed resources formed a single manorial estate and whose members were bound by a variety of personal and tenurial relationships to a single lord. However this simple arrangement was highly unusual in Northumberland, and particularly so in the upland areas of the county, where, as we have seen, the parishes were often very large (e.g. Simonburn, Elsdon, Alwinton-Holystone, and Kirknewton). Thus there were only 63 parishes in the county in 1295, whilst the total number of townships at the same time, although not precisely quantifiable, was probably not far short of 450 (Lomas 1996, 71, 108-10). The number of manors would have been greater still.

## 3.2 Villages, Hamlets and Farmsteads

The territorial labels discussed above can all be defined with relative ease, despite the complexity caused by their changing role over time (which is especially marked in the case of the township), since they describe specific entities which figure in legislation and other formal records from the medieval period onwards. However it is a very different matter when it comes to precisely defining the terms used to describe different types of settlement, such as 'village' or 'hamlet'. As the foremost scholars of landscape and settlement studies have admitted (e.g. Roberts 1996, 14) it is extraordinarily difficult to define these terms with precision in such a way as to impose any absolute consistency of usage upon them.

For the purposes of this study the following definitions of settlement were used, all drawn from Brian Roberts' extensive work, in particular the succinct discussion provided in *Landscapes of Settlement* (1996, 15-19):

VILLAGE: A clustered assembly of dwellings and farmsteads, larger than a hamlet, but smaller than a town

and

A rural settlement with sufficient dwellings to possess a recognisable form (Roberts 1976, 256).

HAMLET: A small cluster of farmsteads

FARMSTEAD: 'An assemblage of agricultural buildings from which the land is worked'

TOWN: A relatively large concentration of people possessing rights and skills which separate them from direct food production.

The most substantial body of work on village morphology is that undertaken by Brian Roberts (e.g. 1972;, 1976; 1977; 1990). Roberts has identified a complex series of village types based on two main forms, termed 'rows' and 'agglomerations', multiplied by a series of variable factors:

- Regular or irregular
- The presence or absence of greens
- Complexity – e.g. multiple row villages
- Building density – infilling of toft areas
- Fragmentation – 'exploded' versions of row villages and village agglomerations

This provides a useful schema for classifying villages, but it is difficult to determine what these different morphological characteristics actually signify. Dixon (1985, I,) is sceptical of regularity or irregularity as a significant factor, noting that irregularity does not necessarily mean that a village was not laid out in a particular order at a particular time; that the regularity of a layout is a subjective judgement; and that an irregular row may simply be a consequence of local terrain or topography. He also points out that however irregular it might appear, by its very existence the row constitutes an element of regularity. He is especially dismissive of the presence or absence of a green as a significant factor in village morphology, arguing that a green is simply an intrusion of the common waste into the settlement; if such a space is broad it is called a green, if narrow it is a street or gate.

In the case of the Historic Village Atlas Project a still more substantial problem is posed by the lack of detailed mapping earlier than c. 1800 for many of the 17 villages considered. In other words, there is no reliable cartographic evidence which predates the late 18th-19th century transformation of populous village communities of the medieval and early modern era into 'farm hamlets', i.e. settlements focussed on one or two large integrated farm complexes. In Northumberland, particularly in the northern half of the county, the 1st edition Ordnance Survey – so often the first resort in analysing settlement morphology – and even the relevant tithe map do not provide a reliable guide to the early modern or medieval form of any given village. Moreover the documentary evidence assembled by Wrathmell and Dixon suggests there was often a marked reduction in the size of the village population in the later 17th and early 18th centuries, accompanying a gradual reduction in the number of tenancies. Thus, even where 18th –century mapping does survive for a particular village, it may actually under-represent the extent of the earlier, medieval and 16th-17th century phases of that settlement.

If Brian Roberts, using the methods of historical geography, has perhaps done more to shape current thinking on the overall pattern of medieval village settlement than any other scholar, at the micro level of the individual village and its components the seminal investigation in Northumberland has been Michael Jarrett's archaeological excavation of West Whelpington village. Conducted over a period of fifteen years from 1966 onwards this revealed a substantial proportion of a medieval village (Jarrett et al. 1987; 1988). Lomas (1996, 71-86) has recently emphasised the fundamental degree to which our understanding of life in a medieval Northumbrian village rests on the programme of research at West Whelpington.

Two major studies (both regrettably unpublished), which to some degree were able to draw on the work of Roberts and Jarrett, comprise Stuart Wrathmell's PhD thesis on medieval village settlement in south Northumberland (Wrathmell 1975) and Piers Dixon's equivalent doctoral research on the medieval villages of north Northumberland (Dixon 1985). Dixon's work, in particular is of fundamental importance for the Historic Village Atlas, as the citations in the text of the individual reports and the synthesis makes clear, since it covered many of the settlements in the northern half of the Northumberland National Park included in the Project. The villages in the central band of the county between the River Coquet and the North Tyne catchment remain as yet uncovered by any equivalent study, however.

This lacuna particularly unfortunate because a similar level of coverage of the south side of the Coquet and Redesdale would have served to emphasise how similar the settlement pattern in these areas was to that prevailing in upper North Tynedale and how different from that encountered in north Northumberland, even in the Cheviot uplands and Glendale. Lomas (1996, 86), has characterised the long Pennine dales in the eastern half of the county as areas of 'commons with settlements' rather than 'settlements with commons'. These areas – North Tynedale, Redesdale, and the south side of Coquetdale, along with South Tynedale, and East and West Allendale largely outside the National Park – were distinguished by a prevailing settlement pattern of dispersed farmsteads and hamlets. In marked contrast, a more nucleated pattern predominated in the upland Cheviot valleys of north Northumberland, although the density of such settlements was inevitably reduced by comparison with the lowland districts in the northern part of the county. The excellent fertility of the Cheviot soils permitted intensive agricultural cultivation during optimal climatic phases, but only at locations

within the massif where there was sufficient level ground – such as Hethpool – and even there substantial terracing of the adjacent hillsides was required to create enough ploughland to make the settlement viable.

To some extent the gap left by Wrathmell and Dixon in Redesdale and southern Coquetdale has been filled by the programme of investigation conducted by Beryl Charlton, John Day and others on behalf of the Ministry of Defence, which resulted in a series of synthetic discussions of various aspects of settlement in the two valleys (Charlton & Day 1978; 1979; 1982; Day & Charlton 1981; all summarised in Charlton & Day 1976 and Charlton 1996 and 2004). These may be compared with the summary of the development of medieval and early modern settlement in upper North Tynedale provided by Harbottle and Newman (1973). However the former was restricted in scope by its emphasis for the most part on the Otterburn Training Area (although the authors did extend their scope beyond the confines of the military range where this obviously provided a more coherent analysis[5]), whilst the principal focus of Harbottle and Newman's work was the rescue excavation of a series of early modern and later farmsteads threatened by the construction of Kielder Water, to which the settlement overview provided an invaluable but all too brief introduction. Hence all three valleys still merit comprehensive syntheses of their medieval/early modern settlement patterns, combining analysis of the historic maps and documents – including what is known regarding the pattern of seigneurial and ecclesiastical landholding – with the evidence of the surviving physical remains and site layouts.

[5] In particular the initial overview provided by Charlton & Day 1976, plus Charlton & Day 1978, covering the late prehistoric and Romano-British settlements, and Charlton & Day 1982, dealing with the corn mills and drying kilns, extend their treatment well beyond the Otterburn Training Area.

# PART 2

# SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

# 4. LOCATION OF EVIDENCE

Accessible regional and national archives, libraries and record offices consulted for documentary, cartographic and pictorial material relevant to the present study include the following:

- Northumberland Record Office, Melton Park, Gosforth (NRO-MP)
- Northumberland Record Office, The Kylins, Morpeth (NRO-TK)
- Northumberland County Council Sites & Monuments Record, County Hall, Morpeth (NCC-SMR)
- Morpeth County Library, Local Studies Section (ML)
- Museum of Antiquities Records Room, University of Newcastle upon Tyne (MA)
- Newcastle Central Library, Local Studies Section (NCL)
- The Robinson Library, Newcastle University (NUL)
- Palace Green Library, University of Durham (DUL)
- The Public Record Office, Kew (PRO)
- National Monuments Record (NMR)

## 4.1 Compiling the project database

Assembly of the research material required to produce the Atlas has been achieved by the following methods:

### 4.1.1 Air Photographic coverage

All locally accessible air photographic coverage of the listed villages was inspected and catalogued, including photographs held by Northumberland National Park, the Northumberland County Sites and Monuments Record (SMR), Newcastle Central Library and the Museum of Antiquities at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne. In addition, a considerable body of new oblique aerial photography, specifically commissioned for the project and covering all the designated villages was analysed in order to provide pointers for further research both within and outside the scope of the present study.

### 4.1.2 Documentary survey

A wide range of medieval and early modern documentation, including inquisitions post mortem (IPMs), ecclesiastical chartularies, royal charters and judicial proceedings, Border Surveys and other official correspondence, has been used to illuminate the history and development of the village and its setting. In addition several categories of more recent archival material - maps, sketches, photographs - and local historical descriptions, have proved informative.

Documentary sources provide most of our information on certain aspects of the village's past, notably its medieval origins and development, and its tenurial and ecclesiastical framework. A targeted approach to the analysis of data from such sources was adopted in order to maximise the amount of information gained in the available timescale. Accordingly, data gathering focussed on cartographic, pictorial and photographic evidence, whilst the County History volumes and other historical syntheses covering sub-regional geographic units or settlements were used to identify particularly important documentary source material worthy of further scrutiny.

***Historic Maps***

All available historic maps and plans were examined and, where possible, copied. These include the successive county maps - Saxton 1576, Speed 1611, Armstrong 1769, Smith 1808, Fryer 1820,

Greenwood 1828, etc. (figures 10, 11, 17 & 18) - but more importantly the tithe (c. 1840) (figs. 22 & 23) and enclosure maps and Ordnance Survey editions (figs. 24-28), as well as other detailed mapping, privately commissioned during the 17th-19th centuries. The tithe and enclosure maps for the relevant townships, provide evidence for the layout of field patterns to assist in interpreting the extant earthwork systems. The 1st edition Ordnance Survey in many instances constitutes the earliest reliable and comprehensive evidence for the settlement pattern in each village. The relationship of this baseline record to surviving earthworks is key to understanding the dynamic processes involved in the development of the settlement.

***Pictorial representations***

Pictorial representations - prints, sketches and paintings - and early photographs, were examined and, where possible, copied. The principal source of such representations was the NRO Photographic archive. Such photographs show the appearance of buildings shown in plan on historic maps, as well as features not included on such plans. In some cases they also provide useful information on the function of such buildings. The participation of local individuals who have made available their collections of earlier photographs, postcards or paintings, has been particularly useful and may provide a source of additional material in the future.

***Published Syntheses and published collections of sources***

Existing published research covering the historic village has been summarised for inclusion in the historical synthesis, including information from the Volume XI of the Northumberland County History (NCH XI (1922)) and from P.J. Dixon's unpublished PhD thesis on medieval settlement in north Northumberland (Dixon 1985). The County History volume, in particular, summarises the important evidence provided by the unpublished Cartulary of Kirkham Priory (*Kirkham Cartulary*), reproducing some of the texts. This contains very detailed information regarding monastic landholding and wider settlement patterns in the township.

Other published sources include: Inquisitions Post Mortem (IPMs), the Lay Subsidy Roll for 1296 (Fraser 1968), Bowes and Ellerker' Border survey of 1541 (reproduced in Bates 1891), the latter providing a clear understanding of the role of well-populated townships in securing Border defence and importance of conveniently located fortifications in maintaining that population by providing a refuge for the tenantry in times of trouble.

### 4.1.3 Archaeological Survey

The Northumberland County Sites and Monuments Record was consulted in order to prepare a summary gazetteer of all archaeological sites recorded in each township, including industrial archaeological monuments, find spots and communications routes. Sites newly identified during the course of the study have also been added to the gazetteer.

Listed Building Records were consulted through the NMR along with Grundy's survey of the historic buildings in the National Park (1988) in order to compile a gazetteer of historic buildings in the township. Photographs of the exterior of each building have been incorporated in the archive gazetteer. A small number of structures, which by virtue of their importance and complexity of fabric are considered by the project team to merit stone-by-stone recording, have also been identified.

### 4.1.4 Survey of Village environs

The wider setting of the villages have been assessed, using the territorial framework of the historic township where relevant, through a combination of aerial photographs, historic maps, documents, previous historical syntheses and site visits. Where possible the various components - infield arable and meadow, outfield pasture, woodland – have been identified and different phases of activity evidence of change over time have been noted in the historical synthesis. Information regarding the extent of outlying settlement has also been summarised in the synthesis, and particular attention has been paid to essential components as watermills which could often be located some distance from the main settlement.

More detailed recording of the surrounding field systems could form the basis of future community-led studies. These might involve recording the wavelength of ridge-and-furrow, examining field boundary walls to detect different structural phases present (sometimes evident in longstanding walls such as the head-dyke separating enclosed infields from the rough pasture (outfield) beyond, for example) or noting where a wall or sod-cast hedge has been replaced by more recent fencing and identifying ancient hedgelines by the variety of flora present. The data gathered could then be interpreted using the assembled resource of historic maps, aerial photographs and documented history provided by this report.

### 4.1.5 Site inspections

Site visits were undertaken to examine the village and wider township area, their principal monuments, built environment and field systems. Rather than being a comprehensive field survey, this was carried out to enable the project team to characterise the built fabric, archaeological landscape features and wider landscape setting of the village and to examine features which other data collection methods (air photography/documentary survey etc.) identified as being of particular importance. Photographs were taken of all the historic buildings and other sites or features of especial significance.

### 4.1.6 Public information and involvement

The NNPA Archaeologist organised presentations or guided walks at six of the largest villages under study. At least one member of the project team participated in these presentations/walks. It was anticipated that this would help to identify knowledgeable local informants who could be interviewed further during the site visits. This proved to be the case. A more informal process of gathering such local information was undertaken during the site visits at the smaller communities under study. This process in turn assisted in selection of suitable individuals for an associated oral history project, focussed on the communities of upper North Tynedale, Redesdale and upper Coquetdale, which was established as an important adjunct to the material Atlas research.[6]

It was also anticipated that these methods would also identify questions concerning the historical past of the villages which were of particular interest to members of the local community and which the project might address in its report, or alternatively might form the basis for follow-on community based projects. It was clear from the meetings and presentations that there was a significant degree of interest amongst several communities in the past of their settlements. It is hoped that this engagement with the past can be supported through future community-led projects, aimed at facilitating more detailed, long term studies of these villages and their landscape settings. The meetings and presentations were particularly successful in prompting local participation in data collection, inspiring the villagers to assemble and bring in for copying numerous privately-held photographs, historic maps, photographs, deeds and other documents. These have all been scanned and incorporated in the project archive and many have been included in the individual Historic Atlas Village Reports. Northumberland Record Office have also made digital copies of the maps and documents to ensure the preservation of this valuable record. Although much new material has been come to light by this means, it is doubtful that the potential has been exhausted.

6 See *A Report on the Oral History Recording made for the Historic Village Atlas Project 2004*. The Archaeological Practice Ltd & Northumberland National Park Authority; 2004.

# PART 3

# SYNTHESIS & ANALYSIS

# 5. GAZETTEER OF CULTURAL HERITAGE SITES

A summary site gazetteer is set out below. Fuller descriptions are provided in Appendix 4 and complete entries for those sites listed in the Northumberland Sites and Monuments Record (NSMR) may be consulted by contacting the Conservation Team at County Hall, Morpeth. The gazetteer sites are all located on figure 4 and, in the case of those in the immediate vicinity of the village and in the village core, on figures 5 and 6 respectively. For convenience figures 4 and 5 are reproduced in this section as figures 56 and 57, whilst the village core sites are marked on the archaeological sensitivity plan in Part 4 (fig. 58). For further ease of identifiability the site catalogue numbers are placed between square brackets when cited in the report text. Thus catalogue number 5, Kilham tower or bastle house, would normally appear as [5], although in some cases a site may be more fully identified.

***Table 1***: *Known sites of cultural heritage importance within the wider study area.*

| Catalogue | SMR No. | Period | Site Name | Grid Ref. | Status |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 849 | ROMAN | Roman period native farmstead 320m north east of Longknowe | NT 387160 631030 | SAM |
| 2 | 853 | UNKNOWN | Surface quarrying | NT 389070 632220 | |
| 3 | 859 | MEDIEVAL | North Coldside, shield | NT 388000 634800 | |
| 4 | 859 | MEDIEVAL | North Coldside, shield | NT 388000 634800 | |
| 5 | 860 | POST MEDIEVAL | Kilham peel tower | NT 388550 632580 | |
| 6 | 861 | POST MEDIEVAL | Chapel Field, possible site of a chapel | NT 388600 632330 | |
| 7 | 862 | UNKNOWN | Possible site of a camp | NT 388860 632030 | |
| 8 | 863 | BRONZE AGE | Kilham Hill, cairn | NT 388520 631160 | |
| 9 | 864 | UNKNOWN | Han Hill, possible camp but probably natural feature | NT 388620 632500 | |
| 10 | 869 | UNKNOWN | Hare Law, oval enclosure | NT 385640 630770 | |
| 11 | 875 | BRONZE AGE | Rapier blade found in 19th century | NT 388000 632000 | |
| 12 | 876 | IRON AGE | Cropmarks of settlement | NT 388750 634220 | |
| 13 | 878 | LATER PREHISTORIC | Cropmarks of pit alignments, palisade slots and enclosure | NT 388800 634500 | |
| 14 | 880 | UNKNOWN | Cropmarks of defended settlement | NT 387400 632300 | |
| 15 | 881 | UNKNOWN | Cropmarks of ring ditch, palisade and rectilinear enclosure | NT 387000 633000 | |
| 16 | 881 | UNKNOWN | Cropmarks of ring ditch, palisade and rectilinear enclosure | NT 387000 633000 | |
| 17 | 882 | UNKNOWN | Cropmarks of rectangular enclosure and pit alignment | NT 387800 634700 | |
| 18 | 883 | MEDIEVAL | Thornington deserted medieval village | NT 388400 633500 | |
| 19 | 884 | MEDIEVAL | Reedsford deserted medieval village | NT 389400 632400 | |
| 20 | 887 | MEDIEVAL | Killum, deserted medieval village | NT 388400 632500 | |
| 21 | 890 | UNKNOWN | Monylaws Covert 2 - ?enclosure-cropmarks | NT 387700 634500 | |
| 22 | 891 | UNKNOWN | Kilham Hill - fort | NT 388660 631190 | |
| 23 | 897 | MESOLITHIC | Pawston Hill, mesolithic artifacts | NT 386200 631800 | |
| 24 | 899 | POST MEDIEVAL | Dovecote at Reedsford Farm | NT 389340 632460 | Grade II |
| 25 | 900 | POST MEDIEVAL | Langham Bridge | NT 387410 633310 | Grade II |
| 26 | 906 | UNKNOWN | Cropmark of pit alignment | NT 387950 634500 | |
| 27 | 909 | UNKNOWN | Cropmark enclosure | NT 387500 632300 | |
| 28 | 911 | POST MEDIEVAL | Kilham Crossing Keeper's House | NT 388420 632750 | |
| 29 | 912 | POST MEDIEVAL | Langham Bridge Crossing Keeper's House | NT 387430 633140 | |
| 30 | 917 | UNKNOWN | Water Mill, Thornington | NT 388400 633500 | |
| 31 | | POST MEDIEVAL | Kilham Farm | NT 388420 632530 | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 32 | | POST MEDIEVAL | Farmbuildings at Kilham Farm | NT 388420 632530 | |
| 33 | | POST MEDIEVAL | Blacksmith's forge at Kilham Farm | NT 388420 632530 | |
| 34 | | POST MEDIEVAL | Thompson's Walls | NT 38865 63245 | |
| 35 | | POST MEDIEVAL | Farm mill | NT 38865 63245 | |
| 36 | | MEDIEVAL | Site of Medieval mill | NT 38865 63275 | |
| 37 | | POST MEDIEVAL | Complex of terraces and channels possibly feeding Kilham mill pond | NT 38775 63175 | |
| 38 | | POST MEDIEVAL | Ruins of possible 2nd black smiths and joiners shop | NT 38840 63240 | |
| 39 | | POST MEDIEVAL | Cottages at Kilham | NT 38850 63260 | |
| 40 | | POST MEDIEVAL | Old bakery, Kilham | NT 38840 63245 | |
| 41 | | POST MEDIEVAL | Ford crossing the burn to the south of Kilham | NT 38865 63240 | |
| 42 | | | Bank and ditch and other poorly defined earthworks | NT 38940 63180 | |
| 43 | | (POST) MEDIEVAL | Agricultural terraceing | NT 38925 63185 | |
| 44 | | (POST) MEDIEVAL | Stone rubble rectilinear structure/enclosure (ruin) possibly related to 43 | NT 38905 63190 | |
| 45 | | POST MEDIEVAL | Farmstead, incl. remains of structure and enclosure | NT 38920 63180 | |
| 46 | | POST MEDIEVAL | Enclosure bank, possibly related to 45 | NT 38885 63195 | |

# 6. HISTORICAL SYNTHESIS

## 6.1 Introduction

### 6.1.1 Standard works
NCH XI (1922), 158-69; Dixon 1985 II, 370-1.

### 6.1.2 The Placename
Kilham is first attested in documentary sources in 1177 in the form, 'Killum', which is usually thought to derive from the Old English '*cylnum'* and signify the presence of kilns (Beckinsall 1992, 35). It retains this form throughout the medieval period and as late as the 18th century.

## 6.2 Prehistory

### 6.2.1 Palaeolithic and Mesolithic (500,000 BC – 5000 BC)
Research in the vicinity of Milfield village to the north did not produce diagnostic Late Upper Palaeolithic finds, and it seems likely that this area was not densely settled until the Late Mesolithic (Waddington 1999, 180-1). Around Kilham, artefacts of Mesolithic type are recorded by the Northumberland Sites and Monuments Record (NSMR) from Pawston Hill (Site Gazetteer catalogue no. [23],[7] NT 862318). Pawston Hill, in common with other upland areas in the Cheviots, would have been wooded throughout this period (*op. cit.*, 104 -6). Cheviot slopes such as this were probably occupied only seasonally, and these artefacts may have been discarded or lost by a hunting or foraging party. As the gravel terraces adjacent to the alluvial floodplain of the rivers Till and Glen are thought to have supported year round Mesolithic occupation, the scarcity of recorded Mesolithic finds in the Kilham area probably reflects the lack of detailed research, rather than genuine absence of occupation.

### 6.2.2 Neolithic (c. 5000 BC – 2000 BC)
There are no recorded Neolithic sites within the Kilham study area, though the pit alignments at NT 888345 [Site 13] and NT 879345 [26] if correctly identified, may be of Neolithic date (cf Ewart Park; Higham 1986, 73). On the basis of work-undertaken close by, it seems likely that the area was at least semi-permanently settled by the end of the Neolithic (Waddington 1999).

### 6.2.3 Bronze Age (2000 BC – 700 BC)
It is unfortunate that the rapier blade [11] found near to Bowmont Water, Kilham during the 19th century, and now in the Edinburgh Museum, is not better provenanced (NT 880320 is approximate). Bronze weapons such as this are extremely rare, and are likely to have been very valuable, perhaps the exclusive preserve of an elite social class. Rapiers such as this one were in use approximately 1500-1000 BC, and are likely to have been suited only to combat between individuals (Higham 1986, 101). It is possible that this was accidentally lost, although bronze weapons are known to occur in rivers, lakes and bogs as votive deposits, and this may be one such example. However, without a precise location for this discovery, it is impossible to be certain.

The cairn on Kilham Hill [8, NT 885311] excavated in 1905 and concealing a cist (slab lined burial chamber) containing burnt bones is likely to be of Bronze Age date. Two other burial cairns are known from Coldsmouth hill, just to the north of the current study area. All three cairns are positioned prominently so as to overlook, or be seen from, many parts of the landscape, something that was

[7] The gazetteer sites referred to in the text are all located on figures 4 and 59. Those in the immediate vicinity of the village and in the village core are also shown on figures 5 & 60 and 6 & 61, respectively. For ease of identifiability the site catalogue numbers are placed between square brackets in the report text; thus catalogue number 23 would normally appear as [23].

considered particularly important to Neolithic and Bronze Age societies. Several well-preserved settlements are known to exist in this area, mostly identified from aerial photographs, though these are very difficult to date, as all are unexcavated, and none are visible above ground. It is possible that the ring ditch, palisade and rectilinear enclosure at NT 870330 may have Bronze Age origins, though without excavation this cannot be confirmed.

### 6.2.4 Iron Age (700 BC–AD 70)

The boundaries of the current study exclude the prominent local hillforts of Bowmont Hill and Pawston Camp, though the defended settlement at White Hill [14, NT 874323] may be Iron Age in date. A fort is also recorded at Kilham Hill (NT 886311), though there are unfortunately no further details available for this record, and further examination is clearly needed. At Wester Hill, NT 879339, an enclosure is visible on a vertical aerial photograph (106G/UK.765 - 3/09/45, Frame 4019) held by the SMR, for which a first millennium BC date might be suggested. The great density of hillforts and hilltop enclosures is not unusual in this part of the Cheviots. Many of these so-called hill forts were not necessarily defensible or defended, and the small interior area of the majority of Cheviot hillforts suggests that they were not permanent settlements. Some hillforts may have served as defended farmsteads established by autonomous small groups (Oswald and McOmish 2002, 30). In fact, there is probably no single explanation for all so-called hillforts in the Cheviots. They are likely to have served as animal enclosures, market places, trading stations, defensive enclosures, community centres and places of worship.

It is clear that by the mid-first millennium, that a substantial, permanently settled population was well-established in the Cheviots and the Bowmont valley, as the construction of numerous hillforts would have required significant manpower. Iron Age peoples continued to live in much the same way as in the Bronze Age, on small farmsteads, in roundhouses with adjacent stockyards, perhaps enclosed by a substantial bank or ditch. The enclosure identified from cropmarks at Barley Hill [12, NT 887342] may be an Iron Age settlement of this type, though the site cannot be securely dated without excavation.

### 6.2.5 Romano-British period and after

Towards the end of the first millennium BC, pollen evidence suggests that all remaining upland forest had been cleared, and small-enclosed settlements or "homesteads" were established in increasing numbers on slopes and high moorland. Some of these new settlements seem to have been established within the ramparts of earlier hillforts, or overlying the defences, which in some cases were seen to have been abandoned for some time (Welfare 2002, 75). There are, unfortunately, very few well-dated first millennium BC settlement sites, and it is often not possible to determine without excavation whether an individual settlement belongs to the Bronze Age, Iron Age, or Roman period. It some cases, such as at Hetha Burn Head in the College valley, settlements seem to have continued in use throughout all of these periods. The well-preserved settlement 320m northeast of Longknowe (No. 1, NT 871310) is thought to be Romano-British in date, though a late pre-Roman Iron Age date is also possible.

This part of Northumberland lay beyond the Roman frontier for much of the period of occupation, and the influence of Roman culture is likely to have been slight and very indirect (Higham 1986, 224-6). Small enclosed homesteads such as these are likely to have continued to be used for several centuries and were perhaps only eventually abandoned in favour of lower-lying hamlets and villages, many of which are in existence today, during the Early Medieval period, following a political takeover by new warrior elites originally deriving from Northern Europe and Scandinavia.

## 6.3 Early Medieval Glendale

The significance of Glendale in the early medieval period needs little emphasis. Less than 5km downstream of Kilham, in the township of Yeavering, lies the renowned site of *Ad Gefrin*, the Anglian palace complex. This '*villa regia*' figures in Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* as the centre of Bishop Paulinus' mission to the Bernician kingdom, where the saint is said to have baptized the surrounding populace`in the River Glen over 36 days in AD 627 (*HE* II, xiv). The site was the subject of magisterial excavation by Brian Hope-Taylor between 1952-1962 (Hope-Taylor 1977). Whilst archaeologists still debate the results of Hope-Taylor's excavations and the conclusions he drew from them, the basic outline seems clear. The complex was a major royal centre in the Anglian kingdom of Bernicia, and later Northumbria, with administrative and ceremonial functions which involved the collection the renders provided by the surrounding peasant communities and redistributing them to key royal supporters and valued warriors. The complex contained a great defended or enclosed meeting place with adjacent halls and a timber-built 'theatre' or political arena.

Sitting right at the mouth of Glendale, *Ad Gefrin* was well-positioned to control population and resources over a wide area, not only Glendale itself - embracing the hills and valleys of the Cheviots to the south and west - but also a large tract of the Till flood plain to the east. The complex must have lain at the centre of a substantial royal estate embracing these areas, which O'Brien has recently labelled 'Gefrinshire' (O'Brien 2002).

The suggestion that this site may have originated in the 5$^{th}$ century and was associated with the British polities, which preceded the Anglian kingdoms of Bernicia and Northumbria, is more controversial (Hope-Taylor 1977, 209; Higham 1986, 247). However, on a more basic level, it is difficult to believe that it is a mere coincidence that this major complex sits at the foot of Yeavering Bell, the site of the largest hillfort in Northumberland and where evidence for continued occupation in the Romano-British period has been identified. In other words, some continuity of political and territorial focus seems likely in north Northumberland, from the Iron Age through the Roman period and into the early medieval era, even as the social and political structures of those territorial communities were perhaps evolving from kinship-based clans or tribes into chiefdoms and ultimately small states. Yeavering would thus represent an inland counterpart to the coastal stronghold of Bamburgh, where occupation spanning the same period is attested. Bamburgh remained a principal political centre for kings, ealdermen and earls in Northumbria throughout the early medieval period and continued to function as a royal castle thereafter. In contrast, as Bede tells us, under King Edwin's successors *Ad Gefrin* was eventually replaced by a new, more enclosed site, *Maelmin*, situated 4km further north beside the Till near Milfield, and the archaeological evidence suggests that by *c*. AD 685 *Ad Gefrin* was completely abandoned.

The abandonment of Ad Gefrin might be connected with the grant by King Oswine to St Cuthbert of a large tract of land beside the River Bowmont, including 12 named vills, in *c*. AD 651, which is recorded by the *Historia de Sancto Cuthberto*, or 'History of St Cuthbert', a work probably compiled in the mid tenth century (*HSC*, par. 3 (Roll Series edn. i, 197); Craster 1954, 180; Barrow 1973, 32-5; Hart 1975, doc. 139; Morris 1977, 91; Higham 1986, 288-9; O'Brien 2002). Craster followed by Barrow and Morris suggested that this was one of the twelve estates which King Oswiu is said by Bede to have granted to the church in 655 (*HE* III, xxiv). Hart was more sceptical regarding the precise historical context, but agreed that the account was probably based some early record of the endowment of Melrose, the daughter house of Lindisfarne. The most readily identifiable of the 12 vills – Yetholm, Clifton, Shotton, Halterburn and Mindrum – all lie along the west flank of the Cheviots, but Barrow (1973, 34, n.133) has suggested that *Colwela* may represent 'Colewell', a lost township situated somewhere near Westnewton recorded in several documents between 1319 and *c*.1330 (NCH XI (1922), 152 Macdonald 1950, 112-5, nos. 12,18, 21); and that *Waquirtun* might be associated with 'Wakerich' which is encountered in 1631 in one of the Laing Charters (*Laing Charters*, no. 2090, 499 ) and evidently lay somewhere in Kirknewton parish. Wakeridge Cairn, which marks the boundary between Kirknewton, Yeavering and Akeld townships on the eastern slope of Newton Tors (NT 92702767), figures on maps from the 1st edition Ordnance Survey onwards.

Similarly, one could further speculate that *Thornburnum* might represent Thornington, the hamlet just north of Kilham. Although the very tentative nature of these identifications must be acknowledged, if correct they would extend the limits of the land grant right along the Bowmont Water to its confluence with the College Burn. The alienation of so much adjacent territory to St Cuthbert's monasteries, either Melrose, or perhaps the mother house, Lindisfarne, would have meant that a royal estate centre at *Ad Gefrin* was no longer so well-situated and may have prompted a shift further north to *Maelmin*, which was better placed to control the remaining royal estates in the Milfield basin and the eastern Cheviot fringe[8].

### 6.3.1 Shires and concept of the 'Multiple Estate'

Thus we can recognise the major royal estate centre in Glendale and make some attempt to plot the extent of subsequent land grants to the church. These 'multiple estates' or 'shires', as they are generally termed, are considered typical of this period, representing large administrative districts cum landholdings composed of many separate communities which all rendered the larger proportion of their surplus produce and labour to a single, central lord's hall or *caput*, instead of to their local manorial lord, as in the high medieval period from the 11th/12th centuries onwards.

Although there is much regarding the history and workings of such shires that remains contentious (*cf.* Kapelle 1979, 50-85), the individual rural communities, which must have made up such estates, are still more shadowy, particularly in the uplands. Little is known for certain of settlement patterns in the north Northumbrian uplands in the centuries following the collapse of Roman imperial authority. Nevertheless, is likely that the enclosed farmsteads which were such a feature of rural settlement in the preceding Romano-British period, continued to be occupied well into the early medieval era, but diagnostic dating evidence is lacking and at present it is impossible to say when they were replaced by a different type of settlement or what form that settlement took and in what way it was distributed.

By the 12th-13th centuries, when abundant documentary evidence becomes available again and archaeologically dateable pottery is found in significant quantities, communities were focussed in nucleated village settlements like Kilham. However the formation of these nucleated settlements may be relatively late. Brian Roberts (1972, 33-56; *cf.* Taylor 1983, 133-47) has argued that the regular row plans of many villages in County Durham and North Yorkshire were part of a reorganisation of rural settlement and landscape instituted by the Anglo-Norman lords in the late 11th and 12th centuries, following the devastation wrought by the conquest of those areas. Dixon (1985, I) was more cautious with regard to the evidence for widespread replanning of the villages of north Northumberland and it is clear that the implantation of Anglo-Norman lordship occurred later there (not till the early 12th century) and in different, less violent, circumstances. Nevertheless such evidence as we possess does suggest that settlement in the northern part of the county from the 12th century onward was predominantly focussed on nucleated village communities with defined territories.

What form rural settlement took prior to that time, i.e. what constituted a ---*tun* before 1100, remains unresolved. There may conceivably have been something of a retreat from the uplands from the later 7th or 8th-century onwards, perhaps affected by climatic deterioration, outbreaks of plague, widespread warfare and political upheaval following the Viking invasions – the same kind of factors which led to a similar retreat in the 14th century – with exploitation henceforth achieved by seasonal transhumant migration up to the highland pastures, as was pursued in parts of Northumberland in the medieval and early modern eras. In these circumstances permanent settlement may have moved off the Cheviot hilltops and slopes and become focussed on lower-lying sites to form township communities, designated *villa* in Latin documents.

8 O'Brien has discussed in detail the evidence for these two multiple estates, which he labels 'Yetholmshire' and 'Gefrinshire' (2002, 53-6, 61-6). For the reasons outlined above 'Maelminshire' would seem to be a better title than Gefrinshire for the territorial unit analysed by O'Brien, since that territory would appear to represent the residual area left after Yetholmshire had been carved out of the original royal estate (which *could* perhaps be properly labelled Gefrinshire) and alienated to St Cuthbert's community at Lindisfarne or to one of the latter's daughter houses. More generally, this serves to emphasise that the history of these multiple estates was perhaps more fluid and linked to the context of specific events than has hitherto been acknowledged.

It is noteworthy that the Romano-British settlements scattered along Glendale or the Breamish Valley, tend to occupy elevated sites overlooking the valley bottom, often indeed overlying the ramparts of the earlier hillforts, whereas the medieval villages sit at the foot of the hillsides on valley terraces just above the land likely to be periodically flooded. In this the villages parallel the location of the Anglian palace complexes. Both types of community – settlement and village - were probably exploiting the same mixture of resources, but they doing so in different ways. The new township communities, whatever factors were responsible for their emergence, could have been based on village settlements, hamlets or groups of dispersed farmsteads. However aerial photography of Glendale or the Milfield Basin has not revealed substantial numbers of sites which might, even tentatively, be proposed as candidates for 8th-11th century township settlements – aside from the major estate centres of *Ad Gefrin* and *Maelmin*, only the smaller complex at Thirlings (O'Brien & Miket 1991) and some sunken floored buildings (*grubenhäuser*) at New Bewick have been identified (Gates & O'Brien 1988), all of which could be slotted with the 5th-8th century timeframe rather than later. In part, the problem is related to the difficulty in actually identifying these classes of site from the air. Even grubenhäuser are relatively hard to spot and rectangular halls constructed with posts set in individual postholes, rather than continuous construction slots, are almost invisible. More grubenhäuser sites may be in the process of identification as a result of the re-examination of existing coverage in the quest for other types of monument (T.G. Gates *pers. comm.*) and this in turn may lead to the identification of timber halls which are often associated with grubenhäuser, either on the same site or very close by.[9]

Nevertheless, it is tempting to assume that the most successful settlements of the early medieval era, which may have formed the original township centres, lay on the same sites as the later villages and are as a result masked by the modern settlements or by the remains of the medieval period (*cf.* Dixon 1985 I). If this was the case, such proto-village, township settlements would have been nucleated, forming either hamlets or villages, but then many of the Romano-British settlements on the hilltops contain numerous round houses and represent sizeable communities, corresponding to villages or hamlets in scale, so there may actually may have been relatively little change in that regard. Indeed, the very act of bounding the Romano-British settlements by an enclosure wall would have created a strong impetus to restrict the area occupied by such settlements, giving a misleading impression of their population size relative to the later villages. The suggested proto-villages might then, in turn, have been reorganised and formalised into regular village settlements by Anglo-Norman lords of the 12th century.

## 6.4 Township and Parish, Barony and Manor

Before examining the medieval village community of Kilham in detail, it is necessary to outline the various different territorial units within which it was incorporated, and which provided the framework for the development of the village. Each of these units related to a different aspect of the settlement's communal relations, both internal and external. More extensive definition and discussion of the different types of territorial unit and their development over time is contained in Section 1, above.

### 6.4.1 Kilham Township and Kirknewton Parish

The 19th century township of Kilham, formed the basic framework for the historical summary set out in volume XI of the Northumberland County History, edited by K. H. Vickers (NCH XI (1922), 158-69). It was one of 15 townships incorporated in the huge, 38,000 acre parish of Kirknewton, which embraced the bulk of the north Cheviot massif. Kilham township itself contained 2871 acres and comprised two main components. The valley of the Kilham Burn occupies the south side of Glendale with Kilham at the mouth of the valley and the farm of Longknowe higher up. Opposite Kilham, on the north side of the dale, lies Thornington with adjacent hills on the north side of the dale. The

9 The authors are grateful to Mr Tim Gates for discussing with them the problems currently faced in identifying early medieval sites through aerial photography.

modern civil parish covers a much wider area embracing the former townships of Howtel, Paston and Coldsmouth and Thompson's Walls.

### 6.4.2 The Barony of Wark and Manor of Kilham

Kilham formed one of the constituent manors of the barony of Wark-on-Tweed which was held by the Ros (or Roos) lineage in the 13th century (*Liber Feodorum* II, 1120, see below, *Selected Sources and Surveys* no. 1). The lordship was established by Henry I (1100-35), who was responsible for setting up the great majority of Anglo-Norman baronies in Northumberland, and granted to Walter l'Espec, one of his principal agents of government in the North (Kapelle 1979, 198-9, 207, 287).

In 1242, much of the barony was held by Robert de Ros, brother of William de Ros, the baron of Wark. The manor of 'Killum' was in turn subinfeudated to a local family, the lord of the manor being one Michael of Kilham in the mid-late 13th century. However even at its zenith this family did not possess the entire township. A number of other landholders, both lay and ecclesiastical, as well as free tenants, are documented legal documents and monastic cartularies, Kirkham Priory being a particularly substantial landholder from the 13th century onwards.

The manorial lordship passed through various hands eventually coming into the possession of the Greys of Chillingham by the 15th century. In 1541 there were twenty-six husbandlands "well plenyshed", but no tower or barmkin, a deficiency which the border commissioners, Sir Robert Bowes and Sir Ralph Ellerker, urged strongly should be remedied (Bates 1891, 31; see below, *Selected Sources and Surveys* no. 3). The Grays eventually consolidated ownership of the entire township through additional purchases, acquiring the former Kirkham Priory holdings from John Strother in the early 17th century, for example.

## 6.5 The components of the medieval settlement

The clearest evidence for the form of the village in the medieval period is provided by the map of 'Kilham and Longknow' dated 1712 contained in the survey of the Estate of Charles Bennet, Lord Ossulton, who was created Earl of Tankerville in 1714 (NRO .4206). Although there are obviously problems in using an early 18th century map to elucidate details of settlement three or four hundred years previously, when used in conjunction with other source material, it can yield interesting results and at least allows us to strip away the more recent accretions.

### 6.5.1 The village layout

The 1712 map shows a village of two rows of dwellings and toft enclosures following the same NE-SW alignment as the present village. A total of 19 buildings are depicted, plus a watermill on a separate site to the north, beside the Bowmont Water and three buildings at Longknowe Farm to the southwest. The street appears to widen gradually as it approaches the junction with the Kirknewton-Paston road, to create a broader open area, if not a green, at the northern end of the village and giving the settlement a wedge-shaped plan. The east row probably followed much the same line as the present cottages on that side of the village, but the west row was set back from the present street frontage, and was perhaps on the same line as the present Kilham House [31]. A thick-walled building that stood adjacent to the farmhouse and was demolished a few years ago (M Goodson, pers. comm.), may have represented the last surviving structure of the early 18th century village depicted in the Tankerville estate map. At the north end of the village, the layout of the village appears less regular, with three of the tenements belonging the west row, one of which lacked a building, having apparently encroached forward onto the broad street or green. Some complexity in the layout of the tenements is also evident at the north end of the east row. The present farmyard is probably represented by an open area, which forms a break in the east row. This open area or yard broadens out towards the south as it approaches the burn just like the oldest part of the farmyard. None of the current farm buildings are visible however, not even the building adjacent and parallel to the burn, which appears to be oldest structure in the present farm complex. There is no indication of the chapel or the bastle house, which are recorded by the antiquarian sources. The bastle house (see below) was

perhaps the final incarnation of the manorial complex, or 'capital messuage', which Micheal of Kilham and his various successors must surely have possessed. One would expect this to have been located in or adjacent to the village and it may be represent by one of the building tenements shown on the map, but not otherwise distinguished.

The village appears to stretch slightly further along the road to Longknowe than the current farm hamlet, and this is confirmed by the earthworks of former garths and cottages on the east side of the road, in the field just to the south of the farm complex and associated cottages. Dixon noted that these did not appear to be of great antiquity since some of the ruined walls are mortared (1985, II, 371), but they could represent the final phase in a long succession of village tenements in that location. Indeed it is possible that some shrinkage might already have taken place before the 1712 map was surveyed. The border commissioners, Bowes and Ellerker, noted that Kilham township contained 26 'well plenyshed' husbandlands 1541 (Bates 1891, 31), whereas the 1580 survey of Border Service recorded only twenty tenants of Mr Gray there (*CBP* I, 14-19). Even the 1541 figure might represent something of a decline on the late 13th century extent, given the prolonged insecurity, climatic deterioration, disease and economic recession of the late medieval period (see below *Population*).

### 6.5.2 Mills

A watermill is shown to the north of the village, located beside the Bowmont Water and fed by a parallel leet [36]. This is certainly the mill documented in the hands of Lord Grey in mid-late 17th century documentary sources (*cf.* Hodgson 1820, 278; NCH XI (1922), 163). It had apparently originally belonged to Kirkham Priory and after the dissolution was eventually sold by the crown, along with all the priory's holdings in Kilham, to William Strother of Kirknewton in 1553. It was subsequently purchased, with the rest of these lands, by Sir Ralph Grey in the early 17th century (NCH XI (1922), 166).

At least two mills are mentioned in the medieval sources. One was alienated to Nicholas of Kilham by his father Michael lord of the manor in the mid-late 13th century, along with the lands called Newhalow, Elfordhalow, the Floros etc. in Kilham. The Northumberland County History suggests this was the same mill as the one later held by Kirkham Priory (NCH XI (1922), 160, 166 n.7). However another possible mill site can be identified on the 1712 map, providing an alternative candidate for location of Nicholas' mill. The map shows a small field or paddock labelled 'Mill Close' at the south end of the village on the opposite side of the burn. No buildings are depicted within the close, but the name could preserve the location of a long abandoned medieval mill. The position is certainly appropriate for a watermill, right beside the burn, which was later used to power the farm mill a little to the north.[10]

In addition 'a mill in Kilham and Paston' is recorded in the 14th century (NCH XI (1922), 161, 168). Possession of the mill was shared, and various transactions relating to the buying, selling or lease for a specific term of years of quarter shares in the mill are documented. The tenant at this time was William Heron (NCH XI (1922), 168). This mill presumably served both townships and may have lain on or near the boundary between the two, at Langhamhaugh or thereabouts. A mill 'in Kilham and Shotton', of which Robert de Roos of Wark held a third in 1290 (see below) is also documented (NCH XI (1922), 160), although it is more difficult to determine where this might have been located since these two townships were not contiguous along the Bowmont, as Paston and Kilham were, and only bounded one another at all on their upland margins and there only to a limited extent.

### 6.5.3 The Chapel

There is clear evidence for the existence of a chapel at Kilham during the medieval period [6]. Michael of Kilham is mentioned in the cartulary of Kirkham Priory as having a private chapel with an endowment of its own (*Kirkham Cartulary*, fo. 86; *cf.* NCH XI (1922), 160) and in 1379 Sir William

[10] Mill Ground, a field shown on the 1712 map, located on the south side of the Kilham-Paston road to the west of the watermill and NW of the village, was presumably simply a parcel of ground set aside for miller's use as there are no watercourses there and it does not appear sufficiently elevated or exposed for a windmill.

de Daltoun is listed as chaplain of 'Killum' in one of the Laing Charters (*Laing Charters*, no. 63; Macdonald 1950, 123 no. 42). The Kilham glebe land, with a yearly value of £10, listed among the property of Lord Grey in 1682, might represent Michael's original endowment. The chapel itself had probably fallen out of use by that stage. The antiquary John Warburton noted the existence of a ruined chapel at Kilham in 1715. The chapel is traditionally located in Chapel Field [9] on the hillside south east of the village. Nothing is shown in that area on the 1712 map and neither a ruined monument nor a distinct chapel are marked on Armstrong's map (fig. 17). As a derelict ruin the chapel's remains might not have been considered worth depicting on the estate map, although Warburton's comments would suggest something was still visible at that time. However identification of the chapel site with Chapel Field' was already established by the mid 19th century. While surveying ancient monuments for the Duke of Northumberland in the 1850s, Henry MacLauchlan noted 'the faint traces of the foundation of a chapel' in this area, where 'some bones were lately disinterred', and records the field was called Chapel Field (MacLauchlan 1867, 35).

### 6.5.4 Dispersed settlement

The Tankerville estate map reveals there was already a farmstead higher up the valley at Longknowes, where it marks by three buildings, at the beginning of the 18th century. There is no evidence for the existence of this farmstead during the medieval period, but does serve to does emphasise that the nucleated village did not constitute the only settlement in the township. There were also a number of farmsteads or small hamlets. The clearest evidence is provided by the grant, recorded in the Kirkham Cartulary, of two tofts and twelve bovates of land by Henry Manners and his wife to Kirkham Priory in the early 13th century (Bod. Lib. MS Fairfax 7 fo. 85; NCH XI (1922), 163-4; Dixon 1985, II, 371). One of these tofts was said to lie on the south side of the Bowmont Water at the western end of the vill between the river and the road to Scotland, which would place it at Langhamhaugh. No settlement is shown there on the 18th-century maps. The second toft lay hard by the road from Kirknewton to Carham and was very likely situated at the modern hamlet of Thornington [18], beside the current B6352, as suggested in the County History (NCH XI (1922), 163). Identifying the 'road from Kirknewton to Carham' with the course of the B6352 on the north side of the Bowmont, makes sense as that road must be different from 'the road to Scotland', which evidently lay on the south side of the river and can only be represented by the present Kilham-Langham-Paston road.

### 6.5.5 Extent of settlement and cultivation

The pattern of settlement depicted in the 1712 the map can be amplified with the aid of certain medieval documents. Particularly enlightening is a dispute over the dower due to Idonea, widow of Michael of Killum the former lord of the manor, which provides a detailed breakdown of the major property holders in the vill in 1290 (cited in NCH XI (1922), 160). Idonea sued as many as eleven defendents, eight of whom held property in the township, property which her husband presumably alienated to them.

| Holder | Messuages | Land & rents |
|---|---|---|
| John of Killum<br>(eldest son of Michael of Killum) | 37 messuages | 3 carucates & 48 bovates<br>30 acres meadow<br>100 acres wood |
| Nicholas son of Michael of K. | 1 messuage<br>1 toft | 57 acres land<br>4 acres pasture |
| William son of Michael of K. | 4 messuages | 6 bovates & 8 acres land<br>3 acres pasture<br>2s 6d rent in Kilham & Paston |
| Robert son of Michael of K. | - | 6 marks of rent in Kilham |
| Prior of Kirkham | - | 9.5 acres land<br>4 acres pasture<br>20s rent |
| Thomas Baxter | 1 messuage | 2 bovates land<br>0.5 acre meadow |
| Thomas Archer | 1 messuage<br>1 toft | 3 acres land |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Robert Roos of Wark | 3 messuages | 66 acres land<br>third part of a mill in Kilham & Shotton |
| **Total** | 47 messuages<br>2 tofts | |

It follows that the landholdings and building plots (messuages) listed below represent a substantial proportion of the township's cultivable land and dwellings, since Michael of Killum was clearly lord of the manor and the largest single landholder in the vill in the late 13th century. However they were by no means the only proprietors and some of those listed here may have held other land in the township which they had not acquired from Michael and was not therefore liable for inclusion that third of her husband's holdings which Idonea could expect to be granted for her lifetime, as her widows entitlement. This last point is particularly clear in the case of the Kirkham Priory which is known have held substantial holdings and grazing rights in the township (*cf*. NCH XI (1922), 163-6). Even so the figures recorded are sizeable. A total of 47 messuages (building plots) and c??????. The ploughland amounts to 3 carucates, 56 bovates[11] and 143.5 acres. A bovate is usually 12-15 acres, two bovates representing a fairly standard allotment for an unfree bondage tenant on Northumbrian manors, whilst a carucate was generally c. 100-120 acres (equivalent to 8 bovates). On the basis of the lower end of these figures we can conservatively calculate the arable land on Michaels manor at 1115.5 acres. The totals for meadow, pasture and wood were much lower at 30.5 acres, 8 acres and 100 acres respectively. There were also rents, presumably from various free tenants.

### 6.5.6 Population

The evidence for the population levels and tenurial development of the township has been collated by the County History and by Dixon (1985, II, 370-1). Some impression of the scale of the settlement and population has already been provided by the 1290 law suit which listed a total of 47 messuages, or building plots, in the vill, though this certainly underestimates the full total. A few years later, in 1296, when the vill was assessed for the Lay Subsidy (a tax of one eleventh of the value of all non-essential moveable goods, levied to finance the campaigns of Edward I in Scotland), there were eleven taxpayers with sufficient wealth to be eligible (Fraser 1968, no. 290). In 1377, however, 109 adults were accounted for in the Poll Tax return (PRO E179/158/31) and this probably gives us a clearer picture of the adult population. This may be compared with the twenty-six "well plenyshed" husbandlands, recorded by the border commissioners, Sir Robert Bowes and Sir Ralph Ellerker, in 1541 (Bates 1891, 31), and the twenty tenants of Mr Gray reported by the 1580 survey of Border Service (*CBP* I, 14-19). Together these figures suggest that there may have been a decline in population during 16th century, as might be expected given the chronic insecurity experienced by the border communities during that period. However, the 1712 estate map, which shows 19 buildings in the village plus the mill and Longknowes Farm, and which excludes Thornington from its view though part of the township, implies that population levels had subsequently stabilised at around their late 16th-century levels with relatively little change in the intervening period.

### 6.5.7 Kirkham Priory's lands

The canons of Kirkham Priory, in the Vale of Pickering, received substantial grants of land from Michael of Kilham, and other landowners in the township during the 13th century, in addition to the two tofts already noted, all of which meticulously recorded in the priory's cartulary (charter book). The separate grants are set out in detail in the Northumberland County History (NCH XI (1922), 163-6, citing *Kirkham Cartulary* (Bod. Lib. MS Fairfax 7), fols. 85-8). The parcels were generally relatively small – 10 acres here, 8 acres there - but often included substantial grazing rights attached. Thus Michael of Kilham gave 10 acres of land in the place called Coteside (Coldside (?), east of Moneylaws Hill) with permission to build a sheepfold there, and pasture for 300 sheep. The grant of two tofts and 12 bovates discussed previously also came with sufficient pasturage for 1000 sheep and

[11] The figure of 48 bovates of ploughland attributed to John of Killum, along with a further 3 carucates, is problematic since it represents several additional carucates. One would expect the full number of carucates to have been given with only the residual acreage calculated in terms of bovates. Could the figure of 48 (xlviii or iil) represent an error, either in the original document or in the NCH transcription?

their lambs from their birth till midsummer, and in a legal dispute over pasturage rights in 1269, it was stated that the priory had 1000 sheep feeding on the 'great moor' of Kilham (*Northumb. Assize R.* 176). Other religious corporations, namely Melrose Abbey and the leper hospital of St Thomas the Martyr at Bolton in Whittingham Vale, also acquired land in Kilham, but on nothing like the same scale as Kirkham Priory, which evidently benefited early on from the patronage of the barons of Wark, the latter being the original founders of the priory which lay close to their Yorkshire estates.

The Kirkham Cartulary contains a great deal of detailed information, not only about the extent and location of the priory's holdings, but also regarding the way the institution was managing its land and, in particular, the livestock it maintained there. This detail includes the construction of sheepfolds and ponds, the enclosure of its various holdings by walls or ditches and the grazing of stock on different pastures at different times of the year. Unfortunately, for the most part the locations named in the cartulary are not immediately identifiable with any current place names, however more prolonged and systematic study, involving detailed scrutiny of all the available estate maps and their attached schedules might begin to yield positive and highly significant results which could then be validated by field examination.

## 6.6 Border warfare

As a result of its proximity to the border, the township suffered repeatedly from Scottish incursions during the late medieval period and right up to the end of the 16th century. These are summarised in volume XI of the Northumberland County History (NCH XI (1922), 168-9). Thus, as the County History notes, no valuation of Kilham's lands in the 15th century failed to reveal a state of waste and destruction. One such raid, in April 1597, evolved into virtually a full-scale pitched battle, as Sir Robert Carey, Warden of the March, related in a report to the Privy Council (*CBP* ii, 441):

> On the 14th instant, at night, four Scotsmen broke up a poor man's door at Kilham on this march, taking his cattle. The town followed, rescued the goods, sore hurt three of the Scots, and brought them back prisoners. The fourth Scot raised his country meanwhile, and at daybreak 40 horse and foot attacked Kilham, but being resisted by the town, who behaved themselves very honestly, they were driven off and two more were taken prisoners. Whereon the Scots raised Tyvidale (Teviotdale), being near at hand, and to the number of 160 horse and foot came back by seven in the morning, and not only rescued all the prisoners but slew a man, left seven for dead and hurt very sore a great many others.

The need to fortify Kilham to alleviate such chronic insecurity was explicitly stated to in the survey of the Northumberland's border defences, conducted by Sir Robert Bowes and Sir Ralph Ellerker in the autumn of 1541 (see below *Selected Sources and Surveys* no.3; *cf.* Bates 1891, 31; Hodgson 1828, 183). It was expressly reiterated later in their report in an important passage which explains in clear terms why the fortified border townships and villages were so strategically significant (Cotton MS. Calig., B vii, fo. 636; cf. Bates 1891, 35-6; Hodgson 1828, 187-8):

> This part of Glendale lying upon the west side of the river of Till is a very good, plenteous and fertile country and will bear and sustain a great number of men with living able to maintain horse and harness (a full set of military equipment) for the defence of the borders there. Every husband land a man if they be not too highly rented.
>
> Albeit because there is not in this said part of Glendale towers and fortresses sufficient to relieve all the inhabitants thereof with their horses in time of war nor yet barmkins for the safeguard of their cattle, so (as) soon as there is any appearance or suspicion of war the most part of the inhabitants thereof do withdraw themselves with their goods inwards to other fortresses for their defence and leaves the said border by west the said river of Till almost desolate and waste and if war continues long those tenants provide them(selves) of other

> farms. And so it is a long season after the end of every such war before that frontier and border can again be peopled and replenished.
>
> For the remedy whereof we think is most necessary, first, that the king's majesty's said castle of Wark (on Tweed) be repaired . . . .
>
> Also that a new tower and barmkin be made at Kilham and that the townships be so assigned unto such fortresses and barmkins as they with their goods may be relieved in time of necessity and to be so apportioned and rated that at least forty persons or more be assigned to every fortress, for, as we think, the more men that be together in any fortress, so that it may conveniently contain them with their goods, the more stronger shall be the defence thereof.

Critical to border defence was the maintenance of a numerous and well-armed population along the frontier, its value demonstrated by the stout, though ultimately fruitless, communal defence mounted by the villagers of Kilham in 1596 (see above). The construction of towers, barmkins and other fortifications was primarily a means to achieve that by enabling the tenant farmers to remain in place and withstand assault during periodic Scottish incursions.

### 6.6.1 Kilham stronghouse [5]

Towards the end of the 19th century, Bates (1891, 53-4) reported that a 'strong house' had recently been destroyed at Kilham. Bates' comments imply that he himself had not seen the structure, but it was reported to closely resemble, on a smaller scale, the bastle house at Doddington. This probably represents the same structure which the surveyor Henry MacLauchlan refers to as 'a Pele tower'. The ruins of this structure had been taken down a few years before MacLauchlan wrote, although the foundation stones still remained at that stage (MacLauchlan 1867, 35). His description suggests the building stood on the towards the north end of the village. The Doddington bastle house has itself suffered partial collapse since Bates wrote, but was sufficiently well-recorded to preserve a clear understanding of its original appearance (Knowles 1899; cf. NCH XIV (1935) 155-9; Cathcart King 1983, 358). Doddington was a substantial three-storey building, oblong in plan with a stair-turret projecting midway along one of the long sides, which were also furnished with crenelated parapets. Strong houses of this kind perhaps first emerged in the early 16th century and were beginning to replace the tower as the gentry's fortified dwelling of choice towards the end of the century (cf. Pevsner *et al*. 2002, 63-4).

It has been suggested that the construction of this fortified dwelling was a response to Bowes and Ellerker's recommendation (Bates 1891, 53), although the evidence is not altogether conclusive. The common assumption that the stronghouse was built prior to 1584, rests on the fact that 'Kellum' figures, along with neighbouring townships such as Westnewton, Kirknewton, and Akeld, on the 'plat or carte' produced in that year by Christopher Dacre to show the line of his proposed defensive ditch along 'the plenished ring of the borders' (Bates 1891, 53; NCH XI (1922), 169; Long 1967, 128). However Dacre's plan does not actually depict or identify any fortification at Kilham. The explanatory document which Dacre attached to the 'plat or carte' indicates that the map was intended to show the particular castles and towers which the Border Commissioners had recommended be repaired, the general areas where four new fortresses should be established and, thirdly, 'by what *towns and places* the new devised dike or defence is to go, which is to pass through the said East and Middle Marches along the plenished ring of the borders . . .' Dacre uses two distinct symbols on the plat. One clearly represents a crenelated tower (expanded and elaborated in the case of the larger castles) whilst the other, composed of one or two rows of houses, is probably intended to signify a well-populated ('plenished') village settlement. Kilham falls in the latter category. There is no indication either in his accompanying letter, the explanatory document or the captions on the actual plan that all the sites shown were meant to represent fortifications. Indeed it is explicitly stated that some represented 'towns and places' (i.e. village townships). In all but a couple of cases (Carham and Ingram) the tower sites are specifically labelled as such, e.g. 'Wooler towre', 'Bittelsden towre' or whatever. Conversely none of the settlement symbols is labelled a tower (although settlements are sometimes shown alongside the towers). Instead the name of the township is simply given. This does

not necessarily imply that there were no fortifications in these 'towns' in 1584 - we know that there were in the cases of Alnham, Kirknewton and Akeld for instance - but it does mean that the appearance of one of these settlements on the plat cannot be used as evidence for the existence of such a fortification.

Thus the stronghouse at Kilham could have been built late in the 16th century, or even in the early 17th century, rather than the years following the 1541 survey, as might have been assumed. The example at Doddington, which the Kilham stronghouse was said to resemble, is shown by a datestone to have been built as late as 1584. The Kilham stronghouse could quite conceivably be roughly contemporary and form part of a continual process of residential fortification along the border, rather than a specific response to an official directive.

## 6.7 Later history

The later history of the Kilham village and township, covering its transformation from the regular two-row village of the late-medieval/early modern era into its present form is traceable in maps, trade directories and photographs. The documentary evidence relating to the 18th century is summarised Dixon (1985, II, 370-1).

The rate book of 1663 shows the whole township of Thornton (Thornington) and Kilham including Kilham mill was held by Lord Grey with a rental of £396 (Hodgson 1820, 278). In 1682 the property is described as (NCH XI (1922), 163):

- Kilham worth yearly £101
- Kilham glebe - £10
- Kilham tenements - £13
- Kilham mill - £20
- Lands and tenements called Kilham Hill - £22
- Tithes of corn in Kilham - £25

In 1701 all this passed to Charles Bennet, Baron Ossulton who had married Mary, the daughter and heiress of Ford, Lord Grey of Wark, in 1695, and was later created Earl of Tankerville in 1714. Kilham remained in Tankerville hands until 1913 when the farm of Kilham, comprising 2009 acres, was sold to Sir Alfred Goodson of Manchester. The mansion at Thornington was also sold off at the same time.

The form of the village at the beginning of the 18th century was depicted in detail by the Tankerville estate map of 1712 (NRO.4206 fo.13), discussed above, and was described by the herald and antiquary, John Warburton, as 'a large village" with 'a chapel in ruins' at roughly the same time (Hodgson 1916, 11). In 1718, a court Roll of Wark Manor listed a single tenant at Thornington and four at 'Killum', plus five cottagers (NCRO ZBM 3). Armstrong's map (fig. 17) was inevitably less detailed, but suggests little change. The village is shown on a north-south axis on the south side of the Wooler-Yetholm road, and a hamlet at Thornington across the river Bowmont to the north. The mill is still located beside the Glen but slightly downstream of the position shown on the 1712 map, opposite the confluence with the Howtell Burn. However the difference is relatively slight and may simply reflect a degree of imprecision of Armstrong's cartography rather than an actual shift in the mill's position. The 1762 militia list records David Henderson as the miller. No later map marks this corn mill. Longknowe Farm, which had also figured on the 1712 Tankerville estate map, is marked to the south west of the village with another farm, 'Thomsons Walls' located a little further south, in the neighbouring township of the same name. The nearest gentry residence depicted was that of the Selbys, to the west, at Paston Hall.

By the time the tithe map (fig. 22) was drawn up in 1840 the farm complex on the east side of the street was beginning to take shape, although the farmhouse itself had not yet been built. The street

had been narrowed to its present width with a row of cottages lining the west side. The 1st edition of the Ordnance Survey shows the farmhouse set back on the west side. A small dam upstream of the village is shown on the tithe map and presumably fed the mill attached to the farm, which had replaced the old mill next to the Bowmont Water by this stage. Increasingly from the 18th century, and certainly by the early 19th century, Kilham's social and economic centre of gravity was provided by a single integrated farm complex. By the latter half of the 19th century Kilham essentially comprised a large farm with farmhouse, and rows of cottages for the farm's workforce (*cf.* Barnwell & Giles 1997, 89-90, 93). A few other structures such as a smithy and a post office only marginally impinge on this unified picture.

The development of neighbouring Thompson's Walls farm and township can traced in maps and documents held in the Goodson family archives. The township was derived from the medieval vill of Antechester (*cf.* Dixon 1985). The earliest map in the Goodson archive, dated to 1800, covers the entire Thompson's Walls estate and shows a coherent farm complex laid out around a square courtyard. The map provides a full record of the field names at that time, one of which ('Hemp Holes') provides evidence hemp and flax cultivation, which is corroborated by oral testimony regarding more recent activity on that farm.

### 6.7.1 19th-century population

The census figures suggest that the population of Kilham was already beginning to decline from the mid 19th century onwards. A total of 206 inhabitants were recorded in the township of Kilham in 1801. This fluctuated over the next 40 years reaching a maximum of 279 in 1841. Thereafter numbers began to decline and had dropped to 113 by the beginning of the 20th century.

***Bondagers***

A significant, if transient element in the population of the Border villages during the 18th and 19th centuries were the females outworkers, or 'bondagers', who were employed to labour in the fields of the region's agricultural estates. The use of such female bondagers as agricultural labourers was especially prevalent in south-east Scotland and extended into north Northumberland. The system is recorded in the Scottish Borders as early as 1656, when it is documented that a hind was bound to provide a women whose labour at harvest paid the rent of his house, and to be on call as a day labourer whenever required (Fenton 1976). In the mid 19th century the rate for such labour was about 10d a day. The bondager's work was regarded as paying the rent of the cottage in which the hind's family lived and it was the hind's responsibility to supply this labour, either in the shape of female relatives able to do the work or, if necessary, by engaging one or two women or girls to 'live in'. As well as making a major contribution to the local agricultural economy these women were noteworthy for their distinctive costume, which has been the subject of detailed study (Thompson 1977). By the turn of the 19th century the Bondage System had finally fallen into disuse, although the term bondager persisted till the end of the First World War.

**Farm mills**

(including information supplied by the North East Mills Group)

Site Name: *Kilham Mill*
Grid Reference: NT885325
First recorded C13
Last recorded 1900

There had been at least one corn mill at Kilham from the 13th century onwards. Indeed there is evidence for three or four distinct structures though they were not all necessarily working at the same time (see above). However the later farm mill at Kilham probably did not occupy the same site as any of these. The farm mill is thought to have had a waterwheel of about 20ft diameter, made of iron. This is said to have been in use until about 1900 and was broken up for scrap in the 1970s (Griffith 1974).

Site Name: *Thompson's Walls*
Grid Reference: NT867304

First recorded 1860
Last recorded 1950?
A small dam fed by a long race is clearly shown behind the farm building on Ordnance Survey maps from the 1860s through to the 1950s. This is assumed to have been a small farm mill.

### 6.7.2 Transport and Communications

In addition to the adoption of new agricultural techniques facilitated by the construction of coherently planned farm complexes, steady improvements to the area's transport infrastructure also contributed to the prosperity of farming in Glendale's estates during the late 18th and 19th centuries. The main routes from Wooler northward to Coldstream and westward through Kirknewton and Kilham towards the Scottish border had been converted into turnpikes by the early 19th century. The branch route from the Coldstream road, just north of Milfield, to the border via Flodden, Howtell, Kilham, Langham and Shotton was added to the network as part of the Ford and Lowick Turnpike in 1812 (NRO QRUp 7), with the deviation via Thornington and Langham Bridge being included in 1834 (NRO QRUp 30). The turnpike trusts were gradually wound up in the face of competition from the railways during the mid-late 19th century. However it was not until 1887 that a branch line serving the small communities of Glendale, operated by the North Eastern Railway (NER), was finally opened, although a number of other schemes intended to serve north and central Northumberland had been put forward previously, all of which were designed to traverse either Glendale or the Milfield Plain. Indeed the origins of the railway owed more to the commercial rivalry of Victorian railway companies than it did to the needs of this sparsely populated, rural part of Northumberland.

**The Alnwick and Cornhill Railway**

Various schemes were promoted in the mid-late 19th century for a railway line through either Glendale or the Milfield Plain and thence through central Northumberland, to enable the Edinburgh-based North British Railway (NBR) to gain direct access to the lucrative traffic of industrial Tyneside. Thus in 1860s the Northumberland Central Railway (NCR) was proposed to run between a junction with NBR's Wansbeck Railway at Scots Gap, via Rothbury and Wooler culminating in a junction with the North Eastern Railway's Tweedmouth-Kelso branch at Cornhill. North of Wooler the railway was projected to cross the Milfield Plain, following the course of the River Till rather than the Glen and the Bowmont like the later Alnwick-Cornhill branch. In the final event, however, only the section between Rothbury and Scots Gap was constructed (Warn 1975, 29-31; Jenkins 1991, 9-26; Sewell 1992, 82-5; Mackichan 1998, 39ff). Another scheme, labelled, with only a modicum of originality, the Central Northumberland Railway, was promoted in 1881, perhaps with tacit NBR support. This was projected to run from Newcastle to Scotsgap via Ponteland, thence over the NCR to Rothbury continuing to Wooler and on to a junction with the Kelso line at Sprouston (QRU p152; Warn 1975, 41, 43; Jenkins 1991, 45-6; Mackichan 1998, 129-54). The threat posed by the Central Northumberland Railway finally spurred the powerful North Eastern Railway (NER), somewhat reluctantly, to promote a branch line of its own between Alnwick, Wooler and Cornhill to block this particular line of commercial attack. In this the company was strongly supported by the tradespeople of Alnwick who were concerned at the potential loss of business if the farmers of Wooler and north Northumberland had a direct raillink to the rival market and shops in Rothbury. Both schemes were presented to Parliament in 1881 and it was the NER route which gained approval with the Alnwick and Cornhill Act passed on 19th May 1882.

The new single-track line finally opened on 5th September 1887, having cost £272,266 15s 3d to construct. North of Wooler, it ran alongside the Glen and then the Bowmont, turning north as it emerged from the narrow valley to reach a junction with the Tweedmouth-Kelso branch at Cornhill station (later renamed Coldstream). Between Wooler and Cornhill there were stations at Akeld, Kirknewton and Mindrum.[12] There was no station at Kilham itself, but sidings were provided to handle goods traffic next to the level crossing and these can be seen on the 2nd and subsequent editions of the Ordnance Survey.

[12] Mindrum station was actually situated closer to the hamlets of Downham and Pawston than to Mindrum itself, a common phenomenon in respect to the stations on this line. Akeld and Kirknewton were actually unusual in being located right beside the villages they served.

The quality of all the station buildings, and indeed all the structures along the line, was remarkable. The stations have been acclaimed as '*probably the best ever built by the North Eastern Railway in its sixty eight years of existence'* (Hoole 1984) and '*unsurpassed on any other minor rural line in Britain'* (Young 2003, 28). This has resulted in virtually complete survival of these buildings with most converted to residential use.[13] The crossing keepers houses at Kilham [28] and Langham Bridge [29] were equally substantial and likewise have both survived to the present day. The stations were all constructed to the same basic design, but varying in size according to the anticipated scale of traffic. The northeast railway historian Ken Hoole has classified them into five categories (1984):

A: Single storey station, separate stationmaster's house (Kirknewton, Edlingham)
B: Island platform, separate house (Whittingham)
C: Two-storey station including house (Mindrum, Ilderton, Wooperton, Hedgeley, Glanton)
D: Larger two storey station including house (Akeld)
E: Still larger two-storey station including house (Wooler)

The buildings were constructed of buff-coloured rock-faced sandstone with half-hipped slate roofs, tall chimneystacks and iron finials. Passengers were sheltered by herringbone patterned wood-and-glass lean-to structures that extended along the platform frontage. All stations handled freight as well as passengers and substantial goods sheds were provided.

It is somewhat puzzling, however, why the NER should choose to lavish such splendid facilities on such a minor and relatively unremunerative line, especially as the NER was in many respects the most profitable and professionally managed of Britain's Victorian railway companies with financial controls far ahead of its time (cf. Mackichan 1998, 157-8). Perhaps it was felt that the strategic importance of this line in safeguarding NER territory from possible penetration by a competing NBR main line justified the expenditure as a clear demonstration of the NER's commitment to provide the area with a proper service. Nevertheless, the passenger service was always meagre with three trains each way on weekdays stopping at all stations, four on Saturdays and, before the First World War, on Mondays. There was no Sunday service. Goods traffic was predominantly agricultural, largely consisting of grain and livestock, including horses, outward and feed, machinery, coal and oil inward.

The passenger trains were withdrawn after only 43 years on 22nd September 1930, just as the Great Depression began to bite, making it at the time the longest British route to have closed. Several stations on the line were adjacent to the A697 and therefore particularly vulnerable to bus competition. Many were some distance from the villages they purported to serve. An internal LNER memo of June 1930 noted that passenger traffic had suffered a large decline 'due for the most part to road competition' (Young 2003, 28). However the goods and parcels services continued to run and special passenger trains occasionally to visited the line after 1930. Whenever necessary a coach was attached to the daily parcels train to enable holidaymakers to travel to the camping coaches, which the LNER still maintained in the sidings at several stations along the line. The establishment of Milfield airfield by the RAF during World War II generated additional traffic, including troop trains, with Akeld station, four miles to the south, serving as the railhead for the airfield.

Ending the passenger service brought only a limited financial respite, however. There was little reduction in the line's overheads, which now fell entirely on the goods and parcels service. Full signalling was maintained throughout until the end of the LNER period, stations were still staffed, and a daily parcels train had to be introduced which must have cost as much to run as one of the passenger trains! Nevertheless the line continued without major incident until the torrential storms of 12 August 1948, which caused severe flooding right across the Borders and severed the Alnwick to Coldstream line in several places. Most of the damage was repaired by the following year, with the exception of a bridge between Mindrum and Kirknewton stations, which were then operated as the termini of two separate branch lines until further flooding in October 1949 cut the line between Ilderton and Wooler. This damage was not repaired. Instead the bridge near Kirknewton was restored, and services were now restored north of Wooler and south of Ilderton.[14] Operations on the southern half of the line did not prove economically viable for long under this arrangement and closed completely in March 1953. Goods services were withdrawn from Kilham sidings and Kirknewton in the same month. However the

[13] Only Whittingham station stands empty and derelict because, uniquely, it was built on an island platform, but the nearby stationmaster's house and railway cottages remain in residential use.

[14] As there was no loop at Ilderton, goods and parcels trains had to be pushed slowly back to Whittingham before the locomotive could run round to the front of the train.

remaining freight services on the northern half of the line to Wooler lasted for a further twelve years, finally closing on 29th March 1965 along with the Tweedmouth-Kelso branch.

## 6.8 Kilham in the 20th century

The development of the village in the twentieth century can be traced in the photographs and maps reproduced in this study. Kilham Farm was bought by the Goodson family in 1913. The family added a substantial 3-storey extension to Kilham House (Grundy 1988: KIL 1) in 1926, probably designed by the architect George Reavell of Alnwick, transforming the building from a farmhouse into a small but attractive country house. The use of 12-pane windows throughout lends the house a pleasing unity despite the building having at least three phases (Frodsham 2004, 136).

Farming at Kilham throughout much of the 20th century concentrated on the rearing of pedigree Aberdeen Angus cattle of the highest quality. This activity has been recorded in detail through photographs, newspaper clippings etc. held in the Goodson family archives, which provide a rich record of rural life and agricultural activities in the district. However mechanisation and the decline in farming incomes mean that agriculture no longer employs the bulk of the village's population. The farm no longer functions as an independent unit being leased out to the neighbouring farmer at Thornington, whilst a few of its buildings have found alternative uses as workshops. The inevitable result has been a gradually declining population in the village and radical alteration to its demographic profile. Nevertheless it would be wrong to paint a wholly negative picture of the changes which have occurred over the last century. Living standards have vastly improved and the life of resident of Kilham today is immeasurably more comfortable and secure than that of a farm labourer at the beginning of the 20th century.

# 7. SELECTED SOURCES AND SURVEYS

**1. *Liber Feodorum* (*The Book of Fees*) II, 1120; Northumberland, 1242**

***Baronia de Ros***

*Willelmus de Ros tenet in capite de domine rege Werke, Leuermuwe, Mindrum, Karham, Prestfen, Manilawe, Dunum, Palwiston, Schotton,* ***Killum****, Holthal, Neuton et alteram Neuton, Langeton, Lilleburn, Hildirton, Weperden, Russeden, Schauden, Titlington, Bowilton, Alburwye, Butlisdon, Grangiam de Stratton et medietatem de Glatendon per duo feoda et dimidium feodum de veteri feoffamento.*
*Robertus de Ros tenet predictas villas de predicto Willelmo per duo feoda et dimidium feodum de novo feoffamento exceptis Bowilton, Karham, Titlington et Grangiam de Stratton..*

Translation:

**Barony of Ros**
William de Ros holds in chief from the lord king Wark (on-Tweed), Learmouth, Mindrum, Carham, Pressen, Moneylaws, Downham, Pawston, Shotton, **Kilham**, Howtel, (Kirk)newton and the other (West)Newton, Lanton, (West) Lilburn, Ilderton, Wooperton, Roseden, Shawden, Titlington, Bolton, Abberwick, (Low) Buston, the Grange of Sturton and half of Glanton for two and a half (knights') fees by ancient feoffment.
Robert de Ros holds the aforesaid townships from the aforesaid William for two and a half (knights') fees by new feoffment, with the exception of Bolton, Carham, Titlington and the Grange of Sturton.

***2. The Lay Subsidy 1296*** (Fraser (ed.) 1968, 122-3 no.290)

Kilham (*Kylum*) in the Ward of Glendale

| **Taxpayer** | **Tax Assessment** | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Robert Herbert | £1 | 2 | 6 |
| Hugh son of the reeve | £1 | 18 | 0 |
| William *de* Molle | £2 | 1 | 4 |
| William son of Peter | £1 | 1 | 6 |
| Adam Tempilman | £1 | 9 | 6 |
| The lady of Kilham | £2 | 1 | 8 |
| Robert of Kilham | £1 | 11 | 0 |
| Alan the smith | £2 | 1 | 4 |
| Thomas the servant of Robert | £3 | 4 | 4 |
| Robert the Reeve | £2 | 2 | 8 |
| Thomas the servant *(servientis)* of the canons | £1 | 14 | 0 |
| **Total Assessment of Kilham** | £20 | 7 | 10 |
| **Tax Due** | £1 | 17 | 1 |

**3. *A View and Survey . . . of the borders or frontier of the East and Middle Marches of England, Sir Robert Bowes and Sir Ralph Ellerker'1541*** (Cotton MS. Calig., B vii, fo. 636, reproduced in Bates 1891, 31 and Hodgson 1828, 183)

| *Margin* | *Description* |
|---|---|
| Kylhame | The towneshippe of Kylham conteyneth xxvi husband lands nowe |

most part Gray of Chillingham's inheritance

No fortresse, desolate therefore by warre Pytye, being a good plot.

well penyshed and hathe in yt nether tower, barmekyn nor other fortresse whiche ys great petye for yt woulde susteyne many able men for defence of those borders yf yt had a tower and barmekyn buylded in yt where nowe yt lyeth waste in ev'ry warre and then yt is a great tyme after (before) yt can be replenished againe and the most parte thereof ys the inherytaunce of the said Mr Graye of Chyllingham.

**4. Warburton's description - 1715**

John Warburton's notes contain the following description of the village in 1715 (Hodgson 1916, 11):

> Kilham: a large village . . . . . a chapell in ruins.

**5. Description of Kilham bastle house *The Border Holds of Northumberland*** (Bates 1891, 53-4):

> It appears that, in accordance with the views of the Commissioners of 1541, a strong house was built at Kilham. This has been unfortunately recently destroyed, but it is said to have closely resembled, on a smaller scale, the bastle-house at Doddington, one of the most charming remains of Border architecture, only finished, as the inscription on it informs us, in 1584.

# PART 4:

# SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS:

# 8. POTENTIAL FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

1. The outstanding significance of the extant **late prehistoric and Romano-British monuments** in Glendale and the Cheviots needs no emphasis. Several recent surveys undertaken by English Heritage as part of the Discovering our Hillfort Heritage Project have revealed just how many elements of the more extensive landscape can be traced around these sites and demonstrated the progress which can be made in phasing the various different components through detailed survey. However major questions of chronology, site hierarchy, settlement transition remain unresolved and when set against the outstanding survival international quality of these historic landscapes it is extraordinary how little has been carried out in recent decades.

2. **The late antique/early medieval period** is still especially poorly understood. Significant progress has been made in understanding the overall pattern of estates known as 'shires' or 'multiple estates' and something of their historical development. Some of the major estate centres have been investigated or are known from aerial photography (e.g. *Ad Gefrin*, *Maelmin*, Sprouston) and a few lesser sites have been excavated, notably Thirlings. However the processes by which shift was accomplished from the numerous hilltop or hillside settlements of the Romano-British period to the nucleated villages - like Kilham - located in the valley bottom, which are apparent in the 12$^{th}$and 13$^{th}$ centuries, remain very unclear. This shift undeniably represents a substantial reordering of settlement and society over time.

3. **The Kirkham Cartulary** contains a great deal of detailed information, not only about the extent and location of the priory's holdings in Glendale, but also regarding the way the institution was managing its land and, in particular, the livestock it maintained there. In most cases the locations named in the cartulary are not immediately identifiable with any current placenames, however more prolonged and systematic study, involving detailed scrutiny of all the available estate maps and their attached schedules might begin to yield positive and highly significant results which could then be validated by field examination.

# 9. ARCHAEOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY ISSUES

The grades of sensitivity shown on the accompanying archaeological sensitivity map (fig. 53) are based on the following conclusions drawn from the available archaeological, documentary and cartographic evidence. The following guidelines have been adopted as the basis of classifying the sensitivity areas. Sites or areas where the survival archaeological remains can be demonstrated are accorded high sensitivity. Areas where the former existence of historic settlement is known or suspected, but the degree of survival of any associated archaeological deposits is uncertain, are accorded medium sensitivity.

The clearest evidence for the form of the village in the medieval and early modern periods is provided by the map of 'Kilham and Longknow', dated 1712, contained in the Tankerville estate survey (NRO 4206 ).

1. The medieval and early-modern village probably occupied broadly the same location as the present settlement and comprised two rows of dwellings and toft enclosures following the same NE-SW alignment. A total of 19 buildings are depicted on the 1712 map. However the street appears to widen gradually as it approaches the junction with the Kirknewton-Paston road, to create a broader open area, if not a green, at the northern end of the village and giving the settlement a wedge-shaped plan. The east row probably followed much the same line as the present cottages on that side of the village, but the west row was set back from the present street frontage, and was perhaps on the same line as the present Kilham House [31].

2. The field known as Chapel Field [9], on the opposite side of the burn from the village, is the traditional location for the chapel, which is referred to, in medieval charters. No remains are visible there today. It is therefore ascribed medium significance.

3. A 16$^{th}$- or early 17$^{th}$-century stronghouse probably lay towards the north end of the village, on the basis of MacLauchlan's comments.

4. A watermill is shown to the north of the village, located beside the Bowmont Water and fed by a parallel leet [36]. This is certainly the mill documented in the hands of Lord Grey in mid-late 17$^{th}$ century documentary sources and had apparently originally belonged to Kirkham Priory in the medieval period.

5. However another possible mill site can be identified on the 1712 map in the shape of a small field or paddock labelled 'Mill Close' at the south end of the village on the opposite side of the burn. No buildings are depicted there, but the fieldname could preserve the location of a long abandoned medieval mill.

6. The later components of the village – the farm complex, the cottages and Kilham House - have significant cultural historic value in their own right.

# PART 5:

# APPENDICES
# &
# BIBLIOGRAPHY

# 10. GLOSSARY

| | |
|---|---|
| **Advowson** | the legal right to appoint a priest to a parish church**.** |
| **Agistment** | the grazing of livestock on pasture belonging to someone else. |
| **Alienate** | to grant land to someone else or to an institution. |
| **Assart** | land cleared for cultivation. |
| **Assize** | a legal procedure |
| **Barony** | the estate of a major feudal lord, normally held of the Crown by military tenure. |
| **Borough** | a town characterised by the presence of burgage tenure and some trading privileges for certain tenants. |
| **Bovate** | measure of arable land, normally equivalent to approx. 12-15 acres. This measurement especially popular in eastern and northern counties of England. |
| **Burgage** | A form of property within a **borough** |
| **Capital Messuage** | A **messuage** containing a high status dwelling house, often the manor house itself. |
| **Cartulary** | a book containing copies of deeds, charters, and other legal records. |
| **Carucate** | a unit of taxation in northern and eastern counties of England, equivalent to eight **bovate**s or one **hide** (120 acres). |
| **Charter** | a legal document recording the grant of land or privileges. |
| **Chattels** | movable personal property. |
| **Common land** | land over which tenants and perhaps villagers possessed certain rights, for example to graze animals, collect fuel etc. |
| **Common law** | a body of laws that overrode local custom. |
| **Copyhold** | a tenure in which land was held by copy of an entry recording admittance made in the record of the manor court. |
| **Cotland** | a smallholding held on **customary tenure**. |
| **Cottar** | an **unfree** smallholder. |
| **Croft** | an enclosed plot of land, often adjacent to a dwelling house. |
| **Custom** | a framework of local practices, rules and/or expectations pertaining to various economic or social activities. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Customary tenure** | an unfree tenure in which land was held "at the will of the lord, according to the custom of the manor'. In practice usually a copyhold of inheritance in Cumbria by the sixteenth century. |
| **Deanery** | unit of ecclesiastical administration consisting of a group of parishes under the oversight of a rural dean. |
| **Demesne** | land within a manor allocated to the lord for his own use. |
| **Domain** | all the land pertaining to a manor. |
| **Dower** | widow's right to hold a proportion (normally one-third) of her deceased husband's lad for the rest of her life. |
| **Dowry** | land or money handed over with the bride at marriage. |
| **Enfeoff** | to grant land as a **fief.** |
| **Engross** | to amalgamate holdings or farms. |
| **Farm** | in medieval usage, a fixed sum paid for leasing land, a **farmer** therefore being the lessee. |
| **Fealty** | an oath of fidelity sworn by a new tenant to the lord in recognition of his obligations. |
| **Fee/Fief** | hereditary land held from a superior lord in return for **homage** and often, military service. |
| **Fine** | money payment to the lord to obtain a specific concession |
| **Forest** | a Crown or Palatinate hunting preserve consisting of land subject to Forest Law, which aimed to preserve game. |
| **Free chase** | a forest belonging to a private landholder. |
| **Freehold** | a tenure by which property is held "for ever", in that it is free to descend to the tenant's heirs or assigns without being subject to the will of the lord or the customs of the manor. |
| **Free tenure** | tenure or status that denoted greater freedom of time and action than, say, customary tenure or status, a **freeman** was entitled to use the royal courts, and the title to free tenure was defensible there. |
| **Free warren** | a royal franchise granted to a manorial lord allowing the holder to hunt small game, especially rabbit, hare, pheasant and partridge, within a designated **vill.** |
| **Furlong** | a subdivision of open arable fields. |
| **Glebe** | the landed endowment of a parish church. |
| **Headland** | a ridge of unploughed land at the head of arable strips in open fields providing access to each strip and a turning place for the plough. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Heriot** | a death duty, normally the best beast, levied by the manorial lord on the estate of the deceased tenant. |
| **Hide, hideage** | Angl-Saxon land measurement, notionally 120 acres, used for calculating liability for geld. *See* **carucate**. |
| **Homage** | act by which a **vassal** acknowledges a superior lord. |
| **Knight's fee** | land held from a superior lord for the service of a knight. |
| **Labour services** | the duty to work for the lord, often on the demesne land, as part of the tenant's rent package. |
| **Leet** | the court of a vill whose view of frankpledge had been franchised to a local lord by the Crown. |
| **Manor** | estate over which the owner ("lord") had jurisdiction, excercised through a manor court. |
| **Mark** | sum of money equivalent to two-thirds of a pound, i.e., 13s. 4d. |
| **Merchet** | a fine paid by **villein** tenants. |
| **Messuage** | a plot of land containing a dwelling house and outbuildings. |
| **Moot** | a meeting. |
| **Multure** | a fee for grinding corn, normally paid in kind: multure can also refer to the corn thus rendered. |
| **Neif** | a hereditary serf by blood. |
| **Pannage** | payment for the fattening of domestic pigs on acorns etc. in woodland. |
| **Perch** | a linear measure of 16½ feet and a square measure equivalent to one fortieth of a **rood**. |
| **Quitclaim** | a charter formally renouncing a claim to land. |
| **Relief** | payment made by a free tenant on entering a holding. |
| **Rood** | measure of land equivalent to one quarter of an acre; and forty perches. |
| **Serf** | an unfree peasant characterised by onerous personal servility. |
| **Severalty** | land in separate ownership, that is not subject to common rights, divided into hedged etc., fields. |
| **Sheriff** | official responsible for the administration of a county by the Crown. |
| **Shieling** | temporary hut on summer pasture at a distance from farmstead. |
| **Socage** | a form of tenure of peasant land, normally free. |
| **Stint** | limited right, especially on pasture. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Subinfeudate** | the grant of land by on a lord to another to hold as a **knight's fee** or **fief**. |
| **Subinfeudation** | the process of granting land in a lordship to be held as **fiefs** |
| **Suit of court** | the right and obligation to attend a court; the individual so attending is a **suitor**. |
| **Tenant in chief** | a tenant holding land directly from the king, normally termed a baron. |
| **Tenement** | a land holding. |
| **Tenementum** | a land holding (Latin). |
| **Tithe** | a tenth of all issue and profit, mainly grain, fruit, livestock and game, owed by parishioners to their church. |
| **Toft** | an enclosure for a homestead. |
| **Unfree tenure** | see **customary tenure.** |
| **Vaccary** | a dairy farm. |
| **Vassal** | a tenant, often of lordly status. |
| **Vill** | the local unit of civil administration, also used to designate a territorial township community (prior to the 14th century) |
| **Villein** | peasant whose freedom of time and action is constrained by his lord; a villein was not able to use the royal courts. |
| **Villeinage** | see **customary tenure** and **unfree tenure**. |
| **Virgate** | a quarter of a **hide**; a standardised **villein** holding of around 30 acres. Also known as a **yardland**. |
| **Ward** | administrative division; the word implies a guarded or defended unit. The term most commonly relates to large administrative subdivisions of the county (usually 5 or 6) from the 13th century.<br>Equivalent to a Poor Law township in Redesdale from 1662 onwards and in upper North Tynedale (Bellingham Chapelry) between 1662-1729. |

# 11. BIBLIOGRAPHY

## 11.1 Manuscript Sources

*Kirkham Cartulary* The Cartulary of Kirkham Priory, Bod. Lib. MS Fairfax 7 (extensively used in NCH XI (1922)).

## 11.2 Published Documentary Sources

### Medieval

Benedict *Gesta regis Henrici Secundi Benedicti Abbatis. The Chronicle of the Reigns of Henry II and Richard I (1169-1192) known commonly under the name of Benedict of Peterborough*, (ed.) W Stubbs, Rolls Series **49**, 2 vols (London, 1867).

*Cal Charter R.* *Calender of the Charter Rolls*, preserved in the Public Record Office, covering the period 1226-1516 (London, 1903-27).

*Cal Close R.* *Calender of the Close Rolls*, preserved in the Public Record Office, covering the period 1272-1509 (London, 1900-63).

*CalDocScot* *Calendar of Documents relating to Scotland preserved in Her Majesty's Public Record Office, London, I: AD 1108-1272*, (ed.) J A Bain, (Edinburgh, 1881).

*Cal Fine R.* *Calender of the Fine Rolls*, preserved in the Public Record Office, covering the period 1272-1509 (London, 1911-63).

*Cal IPM* *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem and other analogous Documents preserved in the Public Record Office*. Multiple vols, covering the reigns of Henry III-Henry VII (London, 1898--).

*CalMisc* *Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous (Chancery)*, preserved in the Public Record Office, 7 vols., covering the reigns of Henry III-Henry V (London, 1916-69).

*Cal Pat R* *Calender of Patent Rolls*, preserved in the Public Record Office, covering the period 1232-1578 (London, 1891--).

*Chron. de Lanercost* *Chronicon de Lanercost, 1201-1346*, ed. J Stevenson (Edinburgh, 1839).

*Chron. de Melsa* *Chronica Monasterii de Melsa* [Meaux] *a fundatione usque ad annum 1396, auctore Thoma de Burton, Abbate*, (ed.) E A Bond, Rolls Series **43**, 3 vols (London, 1866-68).

*Curia Regis R.* *Curia Regis Rolls*, preserved in the Public Record Office, 16 vols, covering the reigns of Richard I-Henry III (London, 1923-79).

*De Legibus et Consuetudinibus Angliae* Henricus de Bracton, *De Legibus et Consuetudinibus Angliae*, (ed.) T Twiss (HMSO London,1883).

*ESC* *Early Scottish Charters prior to 1153*. (ed.) A C Lawrie; (Glasgow, 1905).

Fortescue Fortescue, Sir John, *De Laudibus Legum Angliae*, (ed.) S B Chrimes (Cambridge, 1942).

FRASER, C M, 1968, *The Northumberland Lay Subsidy Roll of 1296*. (ed. in trans.) C M Fraser, The Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle upon Tyne, Record Series **1** (Newcastle upon Tyne, 1968).

GALBRAITH, V H, 1928, Extracts from the *Historia Aurea* and a French *Brut*, *The English Historical Review* **43**, 208-15.

*Gough Map* *Map of Great Britain c. 1360 (Gough Map). Facsimile in full colour*. Bodleian Library (Oxford, 1958).

*HE* Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, printed and translated in *Bedes Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, (ed.) B Colgrave and R A B Mynors (Oxford, 1969).

Hemingburgh *The Chronicle of Walter of Guisborough, previously edited as the chronicle of Walter of Hemingford or Hemingburgh*, (ed.) H Rothwell, Camden Society, 3rd series, **89** (London, 1879).

HODGSON, J, 1820, 1828, 1835, *History of Northumberland, Part 3, vols. I, II & III: Containing Ancient Records and Historical Papers.* (Newcastle upon Tyne).

Holinshed *Chron.* Holinshed, R, *The . . . chronicles of England, Scotlande and Irelande*, (ed.) H Ellis, 6 vols (London, 1807-8).

*HSC* *Historia de Sancto Cuthberto*, published in two editions:
*Symeonis Dunelmensis Opera et Collectanea* (ed.) J Hodgson Hinde, Surtees Society **41**, I, 138-52 (Durham, 1868).
*Symeonis Monachi Opera Omnia* (ed.) T Arnold, Rolls Series **75**, I, 196-214 (London, 1882).

*Illustrations* *Illustrations of Scottish History from the Twelfth to the Sixteenth Century, selected from unpublished MSS in the British Museum and the Tower of London,* (ed.) J Stevenson, Maitland Club (1834).

*Iter of Wark* *Iter of Wark*, 1279, (ed.) C H Hartshorne, *Memoirs illustrative of the history and antiquities of Northumberland* - Proceedings of the Archaeological Institute at Newcastle, 1852. *Vol. II, Feudal and Military Antiquities of Northumberland and the Scottish Borders*. (London, 1858), Appendix III, ix-lxviii.

Jordan Fantosme *Chronicle of the War between the English and the Scots in 1173 and 1174 by Jordan Fantosme*, (ed.) F Michel, Surtees Society **11** (Durham, 1840).

*Laing Charters* *Calendar of the Laing Charters*, (ed.) J Anderson (Edinburgh, 1889).

*Leges Marchiarum* *Leges Marchiarum*, ed. W Nicolson (London, 1747).

*Liber de Calchou* *Liber de S. Marie de Calchou*. (ed.) Cosmo Innes, Bannatyne Club, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1846).

*Liber Feodorum* *Liber Feodorum. The Book of Fees commonly called the Testa de Nevill.* 2 vols - *Part I: AD 1198-1242; Part II: AD 1242-1293 and Appendix,* (ed.) H C Maxwell Lyte, 2 vols., Public Record Office (London, 1920, 1923).

*Liber Niger Scaccarii* *Liber Niger Scaccarii*, (ed.) T Hearne (London, 1774).

MACDONALD, A, 1950, Calendar of Deeds in the Laing Charters relating to Northumberland, *AA*$^4$, **28**, 105-31.

Matthew Paris *Matthaei Parisiensis, monachi sancti Albani, Chronica Majora*, (ed.) H R Luard, Rolls Series, 7 vols (London, 1872-74).

*NC* *Chartularium Abbathiae de Novo Monasterio, Ordinis Cisterciensis, fundatae anno mcxxxvii*. (ed.) J. T. Fowler, Surtees Society **66**, 1876 (Durham, London & Edinburgh, 1878)

*Northumb. Assize R.* *Three Early Assize Rolls for the County of Northumberland, saec. xiii*. (ed.) W. Page, Surtees Society **88**, 1890 (Durham, London & Edinburgh, 1891).

*Northumb. & Durham Deeds* *Northumberland and Durham Deeds from the Dodsworth MSS. in Bodley's Library, Oxford*. Newcastle upon Tyne Records Series **7**, 1927 (Newcastle upon Tyne, 1929).

*Northumb. Petitions* *Ancient Petitions relating to Northumberland*. (ed.) C.M. Fraser, Surtees Society **176**, 1961 (Durham & London, 1966).

*Northumb. Pleas* *Northumberland Pleas from the Curia Regis and Assize Rolls 1198-1272*. Newcastle upon Tyne Records Series **2**, 1921 (1922, Newcastle upon Tyne).

*Percy Bailiff's Rolls* *Percy Bailiff's Rolls of the Fifteenth Century*, (ed.) J C Hodgson, Surtees Society **134**, 1921 (Durham & London).

*Pipe Roll* *The Great Roll of the Pipe of the Reigns of Henry II, Richard and John*. Multiple volumes, Pipe Roll Society (London, 1884-1955).

*Placita de Quo Warranto* *Placita de Quo Warranto temporibus Edw. I, II & III in curia receptae scaccarii Westm. asservata*, Record Commission (London, 1818).

*Red Book* *Red Book of the Exchequer*, (ed.) H Hall, Rolls Series **99** (London, 1896).

*Rot. Cart* *Rotuli Chartarum in Turri Londiniensi asservati.*

*Rot. Hundred.* *Rotuli Hundredorum temp. Hen III et Edw. I*, ed. W Illingworth and J Caley; 2 vols, Record Commission (London, 1812-18).

*Rot. Lit. Claus.* *Rotuli Litterarum Clausarum in Turri Londinensi asservati*, (ed.) T D Hardy, 2 vols., covering the period 1204-27, Record Commission (London, 1833-34).

*Royal Letters Hen III* *Royal and other historical letters illustrative of the reign of Henry III, from originals in the P.R.O.*, (ed.) W W Shirley, Rolls Series **27**, 2 vols (London, 1899).

*RRS i* *Regesta Regum Scottorum I: The Acts of Malcolm IV King of Scots 1153-65, together with Scottish Royal Acts prior to 1153 not included in Sir Archibald Lawrie's 'Early Scottish Charters'*, (ed.) G W S Barrow (Edinburgh, 1960).

*RRS ii* *Regesta Regum Scottorum II: The Acts of William I King of Scots 1165-1214*, (ed.) G W S Barrow (Edinburgh, 1971).

*RRS v* *Regesta Regum Scottorum V: The Acts of Robert I King of Scots 1306-1329*, (ed.) A A M Duncan (Edinburgh, 1988).

*Scalachronica* *Scalachronica, the reigns of Edward I-III as recorded by Sir Thomas Gray*, trans. Sir H Maxwell (Glasgow, 1907).

Symeon *Symeonis Dunelmensis Opera et Collectanea*, (ed.) H Hinde, Surtees Society **41** (Durham, 1868).

*Vita Oswini* *Vita Oswini Regis*, in *Miscellanea Biographica*, (ed.) J Raine, Surtees Society **8**, 1-59 (London & Edinburgh, 1838).

**Early-modern**

*1604 Survey* *Survey of the Debateable and Border Lands adjoining the Realm of Scotland and belonging to the Crown of England taken A.D. 1604*, (ed.) R P Sanderson (Alnwick, 1891).

*1618 Rental* 'A rental of the ancient principality of Redesdale 1618, copied from an original roll in the possession of William John Charleton, of Hesleyside, esq.', (ed.) R W Hodgson and J Hodgson, *AA*[1], **2** (1832), 326-338.

*1826 Poll Book* *The Poll Book of the Contested Election for the County of Northumberland from June 20th to July 6th, 1826*. Alnwick, 1827.

*1841 Poll Book* *The Poll Book of the Contested Election for Northern Division of the County of Northumberland taken on the 9th and 10th days of July, 1841, to which is added an Appendix with Copies of the Poll Books for1722 & 1734*. Newcastle upon Tyne, 1841.

*1852 Poll Book* *The Poll Book of the Contested Election for Northern Division of the County of Northumberland taken on the 22nd and 23rd days of July, 1852*. Newcastle upon Tyne, 1852.

*CBP* *Calendar of Letters and Papers relating to the affairs of the Borders of England and Scotland preserved in Her Majesty's Public Record Office, London*; (ed.) J Bain, 2 vols. (HM General Register House, Edinburgh, 1894, & 1896).

*Cal SP* *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, preserved in the Public Record Office*, multiple volumes, with addenda, covering the reigns of Edward VI-George III (London, 1856--).

*Compounding Records* *Records of the Committees for Compounding, etc. with Delinquent Royalists in Durham and Northumberland during the Civil war, etc. 1643-1660*. (ed.) R. Welford, Surtees Society 111, (Durham, London & Edinburgh, 1905).

*EPR* *The Register of Baptisms, Marriages and Burials solemnized in the Ancient Parish Church of Elsdon in the County of Northumberland from AD 1672 to AD 1812*. (ed.) T. Stephens, Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, (Newcastle upon Tyne, 1912).

HODGSON, J, 1822, Calenders of prisoners confined in the High Castle in Newcastle upon Tyne, at the Assises for Northumberland in the years 1628 and 1629 (drawn from Sir Thomas Swinburne's Sherrif's Book), *AA*[1], 1, 149-163.

Leland *Itin* *The Itinerary of John Leland the Antiquary, in or about the years 1535-45*, (ed.) L T Smith, 5 vols (London, 1907-10).

*LP Hen VIII* *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the reign of Henry VIII*, preserved in the Public Record Office, 21 vols (London, 1862-1932).

Pococke 'Northern Journeys of Bishop Richard Pococke' in *North Country Diaries II*, (ed.) J. C. Hodgson, Surtees Society 124: 199-252 (Durham, London and Edinburgh, 1915 for 1914).

*PSAN*$^{2}$, **9** (1899-1900): 196-197 (An 'Award on Umpirage' of 1703 relating to Petty Knowes).

*PSAN*$^{3}$, **3** (1907): 23-29 'Buryness register of Baptisms and burials' (covers the period 1797-1813).

*PSAN*$^{3}$, **9** (1919-1920): 57ff 'The Coleman Deeds' (p. 58 for 18th-century deeds etc. relating to Petty Knowes and Rochester).

*Statutes* *The Statutes of the Realm: Printed by Command of His Majesty King George III, from original Records and authentic Manuscripts.* Vol II. (London, 1816; repr.1963).

## 11.3 Secondary Bibliography

### Journal and Corpora Abbreviations

| | |
|---|---|
| *AA*[1] | *Archaeologia Aeliana*, First Series etc. |
| *Corpus* | *Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture. Volume I: County Durham and Northumberland*. R Cramp, (1984), Oxford University Press for the British Academy; Oxford. |
| *CW*[2] | *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmoreland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society*, Second Series etc. |
| *PSAN*[4] | *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle upon Tyne*, Fourth Series etc. |
| *PSAS* | *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*. |

### References


ALLASON-JONES, L, and McKAY, B, 1985, *Coventina's Well. A Shrine on Hadrian's Wall*. Trustees of the Clayton Collection, Chesters Museum.

ANON., 1864, A History of Harbottle and its Neighbourhood; in *The Alnwick Journal*, 15 Dec. 1864, 478-9.

ARKLE, T, 1841, *A statistical account of the landed estates in the Parish of Elsdon, in the County of Northumberland: Explanatory of a new and correct map of the parish shewing each estate, its quantity, value, tithe rent charge, land tax, etc*. Newcastle upon Tyne.

ARKLE, T, 1879-81, Elsdon Mote Hills, *History of the Berwickshire Naturalists Club* **9**, 538-542.

ASUD, 2002, The Breamish Valley Archaeology Project: Annual Report 2001. Archaeological Services, University of Durham, Unpublished report.

BAILEY, J, and CULLEY, G, 1805, *General View of the Agriculture of the County of Northumberland*. 3rd edition, London.

BAILEY, M, 2002, *The English Manor c. 1200-c. 1500. Selected Sources translated and annotated*. Manchester University Press; Manchester.

BARNWELL, P S, and GILES, C, 1997, *English Farmsteads, 1750-1914*. Swindon: Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England.

BARROW, G W S, 1966, The Anglo-Scottish Border, *Northern History* 1, .21-42.

BARROW, G W S, 1969, Northern English society in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, *Northern History* **4**, .1-28.

BARROW, G W S, 1973, Pre-feudal Scotland: shires and thanes, in *The Kingdom of the Scots: Government, Church and Society from the 11th Century to the 14th Century*. London, 1-68.

BARROW, G W S, 1974, A note on Falstone, *AA*[5], **2**, 149-52

BARROW, G W S, 1998, The uses of placenames and Scottish history - pointers and pitfalls, in S. Taylor (ed.) *The Uses of Place-names*. Edinburgh, 54-74.

BATES, C J, 1889, The dedications of the ancient churches and chapels in the Diocese of Newcastle, *AA*[2] **13**, 317-45.

BATES, C J, 1891, *The Border Holds of Northumberland*, *AA*[2] **14**.

BATES, C J, 1895, *The History of Northumberland*. London.

BEAN, J M W, 1954, The Percies' acquisition of Alnwick, *AA*[4] **32**, 309-19.

BEAN, J M W, 1958, *The Estates of the Percy Family, 1416-1537*. Oxford.

BECKENSALL, S, 1992, *Northumberland Place Names*. Rothbury.

BIRLEY, E, 1961, *Research on Hadrian's Wall*. Kendal.

BONSER, K J, 1970, *The Drovers.*

BOSANQUET, R C, 1933-1934, The Roman tombs near High Rochester, *PSAN*[4], 6, 246-251.

BOWDEN, M, 1990 (unpub.), *Harbottle Castle - Archaeological Survey Report*. Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England (Newcastle).

BRUCE, J C, 1857, An account of the excavations made at the Roman station of Bremenium during the summer of 1855, *AA*[2], 1, 69-85.

BRUCE, J C, 1858, An account of the excavations of 1852, in *Memoirs illustrative of the History and Antiquities of Northumberland: Proceedings of the Archaeogical Institute, Newcastle Meeting, 1852*, Vol 1, 135-149.

BRUCE, J C, 1867, *The Roman Wall*, 3rd edition; London & Newcastle upon Tyne.

BRUCE, J C, 1875, *Lapidarium Septentrionale, or a Description of the Monuments of Roman Rule in the North of England*. London & Newcastle upon Tyne.

BRUCE, J C, (ed.) 1880, *A descriptive Catalogue of Antiquities, chiefly British, at Alnwick Castle*. Newcastle upon Tyne.

BULMER, T F, (ed.), 1887, *History, Topography and Directory of Northumberland*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

BUTLIN, R A, (ed.) and STALEY N, (cartography), 2003, *Historical Atlas of North Yorkshire*. Westbury Publishing; Otley, West Yorkshire.

CAMDEN, W, 1722, *Britannia*. (ed. E. Gibson), London.

CASEY, P J, and SAVAGE, M, 1980, The coins from the excavations at High Rochester in 1852 and 1855, *AA*$^5$, **8**, 75-87.

CATHCART KING, D J, and ALCOCK, L, 1969, Ringworks of England and Wales, *Chateau Gaillard* **3**, 90-127.

CATHCART KING, D J, 1983, *Castellarium Anglicanum*; 2 Vols. New York.

CHARLTON, D B, 1986, *The Story of Redesdale*. Northumberland County Council; Hexham.

CHARLTON, D B, 1987, *Upper North Tynedale: A Northumbrian Valley and its People*. Northumbrian Water, Newcastle upon Tyne.

CHARLTON, D B, 1996, *Fifty Centuries of Peace and War. An Archaeological Survey of the Otterburn Training Area*. The Ministry of Defence Otterburn Training Area.

CHARLTON, D B, 2004, The Archaeology of the Otterburn Training Area, in P Frodsham (ed.) *Archaeology in Northumberland National Park*. Council for British Archaeology Research Report 136; York, 324-37.

CHARLTON, D B, and DAY, J C, 1976, Upper Redesdale, Northumberland: an archaeological survey, in P A G Clack and P F Gosling (eds) *Archaeology in the North*, 228-242.

CHARLTON, D B, and DAY, J C, 1978, Excavation and Field Survey in Upper Redesdale, *AA*$^5$ **6**, 61-86.

CHARLTON, D B, and DAY, J C, 1979, Excavation and Field Survey in Upper Redesdale: Part II, *AA*$^5$ **7**, 207-233.

CHARLTON, D B, and DAY, J C, 1982, Excavation and Field Survey in Upper Redesdale: Part IV, *AA*$^5$ **10**, 149-170.

CHARLTON, D B, and MITCHESON, M M, 1983, Yardhope. A shrine to Cocidius? *Britannia* 14, 143-53.

CHARLTON, D B, and MITCHESON, M M, 1984, The Roman cemetery at Petty Knowes, Rochester, Northumberland, *AA*$^5$, **12**, 1-31.

CHARLTON, E, 1859a, Notes on North Tynedale in 1279, *AA*$^2$ **3**, 147-157.

CHARLTON, E, 1859b, The inquisition after the death of Adam de Charlton of Tyndale, *AA*$^2$ **3**, 261-262.

CLACK, P A G, and GOSLING, P F, 1976, *Archaeology in the North. Report of the Northern Archaeological Survey*. Northern Archaeological Survey with HMSO.

*Corpus* *Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture. Volume I: County Durham and Northumberland.* R Cramp (1984), Oxford University Press for the British Academy; Oxford.

COLLINGWOOD, W G, 1927, *Northumbrian Crosses of the Pre-Norman Age*. London.

CONZEN, M R G, 1969, Elsdon, in J Philipson (ed.) *Northumberland National Park*, HMSO, London, 71-82.

COWEN, J D, 1935, Prehistoric section, in *A History of Northumberland. XIV: The Parishes of Alnham, Chatton, Chillingham, Eglingham, Ilderton, Ingram and Whittingham. The Chapelries of Lowick and Doddington*, (ed.) M Hope Dodds, Newcastle upon Tyne, 21-67.

COWPER R A S, 1970-71, Northumbrian drove roads, *Journal of the University of Newcastle upon Tyne Agricultural Society* **24**, 30-33.

CRAMP, R, and MIKET, R, 1982, *Catalogue of the Anglo-Saxon and Viking Antiquities in the Museum of Antiquities, Newcastle upon Tyne*. University of Newcastle upon Tyne; Newcastle upon Tyne.

CRASTER, E, 1954, The Patrimony of St Cuthbert, *The English Historical Review* **69**, 177-99.

CRONE, G R, 1961, *Early Maps of the British Isles AD 1000-1579*. 2 parts; London.

CROW J, 1993, Survey and excavation at High Rochester, Northumberland 1992, *Universities of Durham and Newcastle upon Tyne Archaeological Reports 1992*, 16, 30-34.

CROW J, 1994, High Rochester, survey and excavation 1993, *Universities of Durham and Newcastle upon Tyne Archaeological Reports 1993*, 17, 29-37.

CROW J, 1995a, *Housesteads*. Batsford, London.

CROW J, 1995b, *High Rochester 1994: Third Interim Report*. Dept of Archaeology, University of Newcastle upon Tyne

CROW J, 1998, *Harbottle Castle, Survey and Excavations 1997*. (unpublished report prepared for The Northumberland National Park Authority). University of Newcastle upon Tyne, Department of Archaeology.

CROW J, 2004a, Survey and excavation at Bremenium Roman fort, High Rochester 1992-98, in P Frodsham (ed.) *Archaeology in Northumberland National Park*. Council for British Archaeology Research Report 136; York, 213-23.

CROW J, 2004b, Harbottle Castle. Survey and Excavations 1997-99, in P Frodsham (ed.) *Archaeology in Northumberland National Park*. Council for British Archaeology Research Report 136; York, 246-61.

DANIELS, R, 2002, Medieval boroughs of northern England, in C. Brooks, R Daniels and A Harding (eds.) *Past, Present and Future: The Archaeology of Northern England*. Durham; Architectural and Archaeological Society of Durham and Northumberland Research Report **5**, 185-196.

DAY, J C, and CHARLTON, D B, 1981, Excavation and field survey in upper Redesdale: Part III, *AA*$^5$, **9**, 267-298.

DIXON, D D,1895, *Whittingham Vale, Northumberland: Its History, Traditions, and Folk Lore*. Newcastle upon Tyne.

DIXON, D D, 1903, *Upper Coquetdale, Northumberland: Its History, Traditions, and Folk Lore*. Newcastle upon Tyne.

DIXON, P, and MARSHALL, P, 1993, The Great Tower in the Twelfth Century: The Case of Norham Castle, *Archaeological Journal* **150**, 410-32.

DIXON, P J, 1985, *Deserted Medieval Villages of North Northumberland: A Settlement History from the Twelth to the Twentieth Century*, (2 Vols) Unpub. PhD thesis, University of Wales

ELLIS S G, 1995a, *Tudor Frontiers and Noble Power: the Making of the British State*, Oxford.

ELLIS S G, 1995b, Frontiers and Power in the early Tudor State, *History Today* **45**, 35-42.

FAIRCLOUGH, G, 1983, Fortified Houses and Castles, in P A G Clack and J Ivy (eds.) *The Borders*; Durham; 81-99.

FAULL, M, and WOODHOUSE, S A,1981, *West Yorkshire: an Archaaeological Survey to AD 1500*. Wakefield.

FENTON, A, 1976, *Scottish Country Life*. Edinburgh.

FRODSHAM, P, (ed.) 2004, *Archaeology in Northumberland National Park*. Council for British Archaeology Research Report 136; York.

FRODSHAM, P, and WADDINGTON, C, 2004, The Breamish Valley Archaeology Project 1994-2002, in P Frodsham (ed.) *Archaeology in Northumberland National Park*. Council for British Archaeology Research Report 136; York, 171-89.

GATES, T G, and O'BRIEN C, 1988, Cropmarks at Milfield and New Bewick and the recognition of Grubenhauser in Northumberland, *AA*$^5$ **16**, 1-9.

GRIFFITH, E, 1974, *A History of Northumberland Water Mills*. Unpublished.

GRUNDY, J, 1988, *Historic Buildings of the Northumberland National Park:* A Report to the National Park Authorities. Napper Collerton Partnership.

HALL, G R, 1889, Notes on a pre-Conquest memorial stone from Birtley, and fragments of crosses from Falstone, North Tynedale, *AA*$^{2}$ **13**, 252-77.

HALLAS, C, 1999, *Rural responses to Industrialisation – The North Yorkshire Pennines 1790–1914*. Peter Lang; Bern.

HALSDANE, A R B, 1968, *The Drove Roads of Scotland* (2nd edition), Edinburgh.

HARBOTTLE, B, 1974, Note on excavation at The Belling, *Archaeological Newsbulletin CBE Group 3*, May, 9-10.

HARBOTTLE, B, 1977, Note on excavation at The Belling, *Archaeological Newsbulletin CBE Group 3*, 13.

HARBOTTLE, B, and NEWMAN, T G, 1973, Excavation and Survey on the Starsley Burn, North Tynedale, 1972, *AA*$^{5}$, **1**, 137-75.

HARRISON, 1577, *Description of Britain*.

HART, C R, 1975, *The Early Charters of Northern England and the North Midlands*. Leicester University Press; London.

HARTSHORNE, C H, 1858, *Memoirs illustrative of the history and antiquities of Northumberland - Proceedings of the Archaeological Institute at Newcastle, 1852. Vol. II, Feudal and Military Antiquities of Northumberland and the Scottish Borders*. London.

HARVEY, P D A, 1993, *Maps in Tudor England*. The Public Records Office/The British Library; London.

HEDLEY, I, 2004, Metal hills and kelties: Signposts to an industrial past, in P Frodsham (ed.) *Archaeology in Northumberland National Park*. Council for British Archaeology Research Report 136; York, 306-23.

HEDLEY, W P, 1968, 1970, *Northumberland Families*. 2 vols., Newcastle upon Tyne.

HIGHAM, N, 1986, *The Northern Counties to AD 1000*. London.

HIGHAM, N, 1993, *The Kingdom of Northumbria AD 350-1100*. Alan Sutton; Stroud.

HIGHAM, R and BARKER, P, 1992, *Timber Castles*. London.

HODGSON, J, n.d., (post 1810) *A Topographical and Historical Description of the County of Northumberland*. (in 'The Beauties of England and Wales' series).

HODGSON, J, 1822, Observations on the Roman station of Housesteads, *AA*$^{1}$, **1**, 263-320 (271 - 'urns of native type' found by 18$^{th}$ century ironstone prospectors at Petty Knowes).

HODGSON, J, 1827, *History of Northumberland, part 2, vol. I: Containing the History of the franchise of Redesdale, and of the Umfreville Family; Also, of the Parishes of Elsden ....* Newcastle upon Tyne.

HODGSON, J, 1840, *History of Northumberland, part 2, vol. III:* Newcastle upon Tyne.

HODGSON, J C, 1907, Holystone, *AA*$^{3}$ **4**, 107-46.

HODGSON, J C, 1908, An attempt to elucidate the descents of the family of Alder of Prendwick, *AA*$^{3}$ **5**, 16-39.

HODGSON, J C, 1916, Notices of ruined towers, chapels, etc., *AA*$^{3}$, **13**, 1-16.

HODGSON HINDE, J, 1869, *Inedited Contributions to the History of Northumberland*. (Privately published, Newcastle upon Tyne).

HONEYMAN, H L, 1927, The Golden Pots, *AA*$^{4}$, **4**, 90-103.

HOOLE, K, 1984, *North-Eastern Branch Lines Past and Present*. Oxford Publishing Co.; Poole.

HOPE TAYLOR B, 1977, *Yeavering: An Anglo-British Centre of early Northumbria*. London: HMSO.

HORSLEY, J, 1732, *Britannia Romana*. London.

HUGILL, R, 1939, *Borderland Castles and Peles*. London.

HUNTER BLAIR C H, 1932-34, Harbottle Castle; *History of the Berwickshire Naturalist's Club* **28**, iii, 215-231.

HUNTER BLAIR C H, 1944, The early castles of Northumberland. *AA*$^{4}$, **22**, 116-70.

HUNTER BLAIR C H, 1947-49, Elsden; *History of the Berwickshire Naturalist's Club* **31**, 40-47.

HUNTER BLAIR C H, 1957, Herbert Lewis Honeyman, *AA*$^{4}$, **35**, 252-59.

HUTCHINSON W, 1778, *A View of Northumberland, 1776*. Vol. 1, Newcastle upon Tyne

JARRETT, M G, 1987, The Deserted medieval village of West Whelpington, Northumberland, *AA*$^5$, **16**,

JARRETT, M G, 1988, The Deserted medieval village of West Whelpington, Northumberland, *AA*$^5$, **17**,

JENKINS, S C, 1991, *The Rothbury Branch*. The Oakwood Press; Headington, Oxford.

JOBEY, G, 1960, Some rectilinear farmsteads of the Roman period in Northumberland, *AA*$^4$, **38**, 1-38.

JOBEY, G, 1962, A note on scooped enclosures in Northumberland, *AA*$^4$, **40**, 47-58.

JOBEY, G, 1964, Enclosed stone-built settlements in north Northumberland, *AA*$^4$, **42**, 41-64.

JOBEY, G, 1965, Hill-forts and settlements in Northumberland, *AA*$^4$, **43**, 21-64.

JOBEY, G, 1973, A Romano-British settlement at Tower Knowe, Wellhaugh, Northumberland, *AA*$^5$, **1**, 55-79.

JOBEY, G, 1974, *A Field-Guide to Prehistoric Northumberland, Part 2*. Frank Graham; Newcastle upon Tyne.

JOBEY, G, 1977, Iron Age and later farmsteads on Belling Law, Northumberland, *AA*$^5$, **5**, 1-38.

JOBEY, G, 1978, Iron Age and Romano-British settlements on Kennel Hall Knowe, North Tynedale, Northumberland (1976), *AA*$^5$, **6**, 1-28.

JOBEY, G, 1982, The settlement at Doubstead and Romano-British settlement on the coastal plain between Tyne and Forth, *AA*$^5$, **10**, 1-23.

JOBEY, G, 1983a, A note on some northern palisaded sites, in A Connor & D V Clarke (eds.) *From the Stone Age to the Forty Five. Donald*; Edinburgh, 197-205.

JOBEY, G, 1983b, Excavation of an unenclosed settlement on Standrop Rigg, Northumberland, and some problems related to similar settlements between Tyne and Forth, *AA*$^5$, **11**, 1-21.

JOBEY, G, 1984, A settlement on Boggle Hill, Thorneyburn (NY 783862), *AA*$^5$, **12**, 241-242.

JOBEY, G, and TAIT, J, 1966, Excavations on palisaded settlements and cairnfields at Alnham, Northumberland, *AA*$^4$, **44**, 5-48.

JOLLIFFE, J E A, 1926, Northumbrian institutions, *The English Historical Review* **41**, 1-42.

JONES, G. R. J. 1976 Multiple estates and early settlement, in Sawyer P. H. (ed.) *Medieval Settlement, Continuity and Change*. London, 15-40.

KAPELLE, W E, 1979, *The Norman Conquest of the North: The Region and its Transformation, 1000-1135*. London

KEEN, L, 1982, The Umfravilles, the castle and barony of Prudhoe, Northumberland, *Anglo-Norman Studies* **5**, 165-84.

KELLY, 1910, *Kelly's Directory of Durham and Northumberland.*

KNOWLES, W H, 1899, The bastle house at Doddington, Northumberland, *AA*$^2$, **21**, 293-301.

LAWSON, W, 1971, The Newcastle to Carter Bar Road (A696 and A68), *AA*$^4$, **49**, 187-209

LAX, A, 1999, Border troubles and Border farmers: A study of bastle houses in the upper Tarset Valley, Northumberland, in '*We were always chasing time.' Papers presented to Keith Blood*, (*Northern Archaeology* **17/18**, Special edition), 165-172.

LOMAS R, 1996, *County of Conflict: Northumberland from Conquest to Civil War*. East Linton.

LONG, B, 1967, *Castles of Northumberland. The Medieval Fortifications of the County*. Harold Hill; Newcastle upon Tyne.

McCORD, N, 1982, *An Introduction to the History of Upper North Tynedale*, (Northumbrian Water)

McCORD, N and THOMPSON, R, 1998, *The Northern Counties from AD 1000*, Longman; Harlow, Essex.

McDONNELL, J, 1988, The role of transhumance in northern England, *Northern History* **11**, 1-16.

McNAMEE, C, 1997, *The Wars of the Bruces: Scotland, England and Ireland, 1306-1328*. Tuckwell Press, East Linton.

McOMISH D, 1999, Wether Hill and Cheviot Hillforts, in '*We were always chasing time.' Papers presented to Keith Blood*, (*Northern Archaeology* **17/18**, Special edition), 113-121.

MACDONALD, S, 1979, The role of the individual in agricultural change: the example of George Culley of Fenton, Northumberland, in H S A Fox and R A Butlin (eds.) *Change in the Countryside: Essays on Rural England, 1500-1900*. London: Institute of British Geographers Special Publication, no. 10.

MACKENZIE, E, 1825, *An Historical, Topographical and Descriptive View of the County of Northumberland and Parts of County Durham situated North of the River Tyne with Berwick upon Tweed*. 2nd edition; Newcastle upon Tyne.

MACKICHAN, N D, 1998, *The Northumberland Central Railway, its Concept and Context*. Whittingham, Northumberland.

MACLAUCHLAN, H, 1852a, *Memoir written during a Survey of the Watling Street, from the Tees to the Scotch Border, in the years 1850 and 1851*. London.

MACLAUCHLAN, H, 1852b, *The Watling Street. The chief line of Roman Communication leading across the Counties of Durham and Northumberland, from the River Swale to the Scotch Border*. London

MACLAUCHLAN, H, 1864a, *Memoir written during a Survey of the eastern branch of the Watling Street, in the county of Northumberland, in the years 1857, 1858 and 1859*. London.

MACLAUCHLAN, H, 1864b, *Eastern branch of the Watling Street, in the County of Northumberland, together with a branch extending from High Rochester to Whittingham*. London.

MACLAUCHLAN, H, 1867, *Notes not included in the Memoirs already published on Roman Roads in Northumberland*. London.

MAWER A, 1920, *The Place Names of Northumberland and Durham*. Cambridge.

MEIKLE, M M, 2004, *A British Frontier? Lairds and Gentlemen in the Eastern Borders, 1540-1603*. Tuckwell Press; East Linton.

MIKET, R, 1976, The evidence for Neolithic activity in the Milfield basin, Northumberland, in C Burgess and R Miket (eds.) *Settlement and Economy in the Third and Second Millennia BC*, Oxford; British Archaeological Reports, British Series **33**, 113-146.

MILLER, E, 1976 for 1975, Farming in northern England during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, *Northern History* **11**, 1-16.

MILLER, H, 1887, *Geology of the Country around Otterburn and Elsdon. Memoirs of the Geological Survey*.

MITFORD, E B, 1939, *Life of Lord Redesdale*.

MITFORD, R, 1989, *From Bremenium to High Rochester*. (unpub. BA diss., Dept of Archaeology, University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne).

MOORE, M, 1915, *The Lands of the Scottish King in England: The Honour of Huntingdon, the Liberty of of Tyndale and the Honour of Penrith*. George Allen & Unwin Ltd; London.

MORRIS, C D, 1977, Northumbria and the Viking settlement: the evidence for land-holding, *AA*$^5$, **5**, 81-103.

NCH XI (1922), *A History of Northumberland. XI: The Parishes of Carham, Branxton, Kirknewton, Wooler and Ford*. K H Vickers (ed.), Newcastle upon Tyne & London.

NCH XIV (1935), *A History of Northumberland. XIV: The Parishes of Alnham, Chatton, Chillingham, Eglingham, Ilderton, Ingram and Whittingham. The Chapelries of Lowick and Doddington*. M Hope Dodds (ed.) Newcastle upon Tyne & London.

NCH XV (1940), *A History of Northumberland. XV: The Parishes of Simonburn, Rothbury and Alwinton, with the Chapelry of Holystone and the Lordship of Kidland*. M Hope Dodds (ed.), Newcastle upon Tyne & London.

O'BRIEN C, 2002, The early medieval shires of Yeavering, Breamish and Bamburgh, *AA*$^5$ **30**, 53-73.

O'BRIEN C, and MIKET R, 1991, The early medieval settlement of Thirlings, Northumberland, *Durham Archaeological Journal* **7**, 57-91.

O'NEIL B, 1960, *Castles and Cannon*. Oxford, 42-45.

OSWALD A, JECOCK M, and AINSWORTH S, 2000, *An Iron Age hillfort and its environs on West Hill, Northumberland*. English Heritage Survey Report.

OSWALD A, and McOMISH D, 2002, *An Iron Age hillfort and its environs on St Gregory's Hill, Northumberland*. English Heritage Archaeological Investigation Report Series AI/1/2002.

OSWALD A, 2004, An Iron Age hillfort in an evolving landscape. Analytical field survey on West Hill, Kirknewton, in P F Frodsham (ed.) *Archaeology in Northumberland National Park.* Council for British Archaeology Research Report 136; York, 202-12.

OWEN, S F, 2003, *Redewater Views 1912 – 1937*. The Heritage Centre, Bellingham.

PARSON and WHITE, 1828, *History, Directory and Gazetteer of the County of Northumberland*.

PEASE, H, 1924, Otterburn. The Tower, Hall and Dene and the Lordship, or Manor, of Redesdale, *AA*$^3$ **21**, 121-31.

PETER McGOWAN ASSOCIATES with CROW, J, and RUSHWORTH, A, 2002, *Housesteads Roman Fort, Conservation Plan*. 2 vols. English Heritage.

PEVSNER, N, GRUNDY, J, McCOMBIE G, RYDER, P, WELFARE, H, and LINSLEY S, 2001, *The Buildings of England: Northumberland*. Reprinted 2nd edition; Yale University Press, London.

PLACKETT, R L, 1996/97, Roads and Tracks in the English Middle March. Part one from Roman Road to the New Line, *Tyne and Tweed*, **51**.

PLATT C, 1981, *The Parish Churches of Medieval England*. London: Secker & Warburg.

PLATT, C, 1982, *The Castle in Medieval England and Wales*. London.

*PSAN*$^2$ iv, (1889), 10,: Falstone.

*PSAN*$^2$ ix, (1900), 229-47, Harbottle, Alwinton and Hepple Woodhouses.

QUINEY, A, 1976, Elsdon, *Archaeological Journal* **133**, 173-178.

RAINE, J, 1852, *The History and Antiquities of North Durham*.

RAMM, H G, McDOWELL, R W, and MERCER, E, 1970, *Shielings and Bastles.* Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England); London.

RENNISON, R W, 1979, *Water to Tyneside*. Gateshead.

RICHMOND, I A, 1936, Excavations at High Rochester and Risingham, 1935, *AA*$^4$, **13**, 170-198.

RICHMOND, I A, 1940, The Romans in Redesdale, in M Hope Dodds (ed.), *A History of Northumberland* XV, Northumberland County History Committee; Newcastle upon Tyne, 63-154.

RIDPATH, G, 1848, *The Border History of England and Scotland* (1979 facsimile reprint of the 1848 edition). Edinburgh.

RITCHIE, R L G, 1954, *The Normans in Scotland*. Edinburgh.

RIVET, A L F, and SMITH, C, 1979, *The Place-names of Roman Britain*. 2nd edition; London.

ROBERTS, B K, 1972, Village plans in County Durham: a preliminary statement, *Medieval Archaeology* **16**, 33-56.

ROBERTS, B K, 1976, The northern village: an archaeological perspective, in P A G Clack and P F Gosling (eds) *Archaeology in the North*, 255-265.

ROBERTS, B K, 1977, *Rural Settlement in Britain*. Longman; Folkstone.

ROBERTS, B K, 1987, *The Making of the English Village. A Study in Historical Geography*. Longman; Harlow, Essex.

ROBERTS, B K, 1990, Back lanes and tofts, distribution maps and time: Medieval nucleated settlement in the North of England, in B E Vyner (ed.) *Medieval Rural Settlement in North East England*, Durham, 107-125.

ROBERTS, B K, 1996, *Landscapes of Settlement. Prehistory to the Present*. Routledge, London and New York.

ROBERTS, I D, 1992, *Upland Farming in Northumberland* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

ROBERTS, I D, and WEST, M, 1998, *Bellingham North Tynedale and Redesdale.* Tempus.

ROBSON, R, 1989, *The Rise and Fall of the English Highland Clans: Tudor Responses to a Medieval Problem*. Edinburgh

ROUND, J H, 1910, *Peerage and Pedigree: Studies in Peerage Law and Family History.* 2 vols; London.

RUSHWORTH, A, 1996, *High Rochester Fort: A Documentary Assessment of Post-Roman Occupation* (unpublished report; commissioned by The Northumberland National Park Authority). The Archaeological Practice, University of Newcastle upon Tyne.

RUSHWORTH, A, and CARLTON, R J, 1998, *Harbottle Castle: A Documentary Study.* (unpublished report; prepared for The Northumberland National Park Authority). The Archaeological Practice, University of Newcastle upon Tyne

RYDER, P, 1990, *Bastles and Towers in the Northumberland National Park.* Unpublished report for Northumberland National Park Authority.

RYDER, P, 2004, Towers and bastles in Northumberland National Park, in P Frodsham (ed.) *Archaeology in Northumberland National Park.* Council for British Archaeology Research Report 136; York, 262-71.

St. JOSEPH, J K, 1950, Castles of Northumberland from the air. *AA*$^4$, **28**, 7-17.

SALWAY, P, 1965, *The Frontier People of Roman Britain*. Cambridge.

SEWELL, G W M, 1992, *The North British Railway in Northumberland*. Merlin Books; Braunton, Devon.

SMITH, D J, 1962, The shrine of the nymphs and the *genius loci* at Carrawburgh, *AA*$^4$, **40**, 59-81.

SPRING, D, 1963, *The English Landed Estate in the Nineteenth Century: its Administration*. Johns Hopkins; Baltimore.

STOBBS, A W, 1986, *Memories of the LNER: Rural Northumberland*. Penrith

TATE G, 1866, 1868-9, *The History of the Borough, Castle and Barony of Alnwick.* 2 vols; H H Blair, Alnwick.

TATE G, 1868, Harbottle Castle; in *Berwickshire Naturalist's Club* **5**, 427-37.

TAYLOR, C C, 1983, *Village and Farmstead*. London.

TAYLOR, G N, n.d., *The Valley of the Fords: 900 Years of Redesdale*. Privately printed.

TAYLOR, G N, n.d. (b), *The Story of Elsdon*. Frank Graham, Newcastle upon Tyne.

THOMPSON, D M, 1977, *Female Agricultural Workers' Costume in the Borders from 1890 to 1939. A consideration of functional aspects and self-consciousness of style.* Unpublished MA thesis, Open University.

TOMLINSON, W W, 1888, *Comprehensive Guide to the County of Northumberland*. Newcastle upon Tyne.

TOPPING, P, 1981a, The prehistoric field systems of the College Valley, north Northumberland, *Northern Archaeology* **2(1)**, 14-33.

TOPPING, P, 1981b, Hethpool stone circle, *Northern Archaeology* **2**, 3-10.

TOPPING, P, 1983, Observations on the stratigraphy of early agricultural remains in the Kirknewton area of the Northumberland Cheviots, *Northern Archaeology* **4(1)**, 21-31.

TOPPING, P, 1989, The context of cord rig cultivation in later prehistoric Northumberland, in M Bowden, D Mackay and P Topping (eds.), *From Cornwall to Caithness: Some Aspects of British Field Archaeology*, Oxford; British Archaeological Reports, British Series **209**, 145-157.

TOPPING, P, 1997, Different realities: the Neolithic in the Northumberland Cheviots, in P Topping (ed.) *Neolithic Landscapes*. Oxbow; Oxford, 113-23.

TOPPING, P, 2004, Hillforts, farms and fields. Excavations on Wether Hill, Ingram 1993-2002, in P Frodsham (ed.) *Archaeology in Northumberland National Park.* York; Council for British Archaeology Research Report **136**, 190-201.

TREVELYAN, G M, 1931, The Middle Marches, in *Clio, a Muse.* Longmans.

TUCK, J A, 1971, Northumbrian Society in the fourteenth century, *Northern History* **6**: 22-39.

TUCK, J A, 1985, War and society in the medieval North, *Northern History* **21**, 33-52.

TUCK, J A, 1986, The emergence of a Northern nobility, 1250-1400, *Northern History* **22**, 1-17.

VINOGRADOFF, P, 1908, *English Society in the Eleventh Century: Essays in English Medieval History*. Oxford.

WADDELL, J, 2003, Mills around Otterburn, *Northumbrian Mills* **22**, 5-6.

WADDINGTON, C, 1998, Cup and ring marks in context, *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* **8(1)**, 29-54.

WADDINGTON, C, 1999, *A Landscape Study of the Mesolithic-Neolithic in the Milfield Basin, Northumberland*. Oxford; British Archaeological Reports, British Series **291**.

WADDINGTON, C, BLOOD, K, and CROW, J C, 1998, Survey and excavation at Harehaugh hillfort and possible Neolithic enclosure, *Northern Archaeology* **15-16**, 87-108.

WALLIS, J, 1769 *The Natural History and Antiquities of Northumberland*. W & W Strahan; London.

WALTON, J, 1962, *The Border – a National Forest Park Guide*.

WARN, C R, 1975, *Rural Branch Lines of Northumberland*. Frank Graham; Newcastle upon Tyne.

WATTS, S J, 1971, Tenant-right in early seventeenth-century Northumberland, *Northern History* **6**, 64-87.

WATTS, S J, 1975, *From Border to Middle Shire, Northumberland 1586-1625*. Leicester.

WELFARE, A, 1995, The Mote Hills, Elsdon, *Northern Archaeology* **12**, 45-50.

WELFARE, H, 2002, The Uplands of the Northern Counties in the First Millenium BC, in C. Brooks, R Daniels and A Harding (eds.) *Past, Present and Future: The Archaeology of Northern England*. Durham; Architectural and Archaeological Society of Durham and Northumberland Research Report **5**, 71-77.

WELFARE, H, BOWDEN, M and BLOOD, K, 1999, fieldwork and the castles of the Anglo-Scottish Borders, in P Pattison, D Field and S Ainsworth (eds.), *Patterns in the Past: Essays in Landscape Archaeology for Christopher Taylor*, Oxford, 53-60.

WELFARE, H, and SWANN, V, 1995, *Roman Camps in England: The Field Evidence*. RCHME/HMSO, London.

WELLS, J A, 1998, *The Railways of Northumberland and Newcastle-upon-Tyne 1828 – 1998*, (Powdene Publicity).

WELSBY, D A, 1982, *The Roman Military Defence of the British Provinces in its Later Phases*. BAR 101, Oxford.

WHITTAKER, H, 1949, *A Descriptive List of the Maps of Northumberland 1576-1900*. Newcastle upon Tyne.

WILSON, K, AND LEATHART, S, 1982, *The Kielder Forests. A Forestry Commission Guide*. Forestry Commission.

WILSON, R J A, 1988, *A Guide to the Roman Remains in Britain*. 3rd Edition, London.

WINCHESTER, A J L, 1978, The medieval vill in the Western Lake District: Some problems of definition, *CW*$^{2}$ **78**, 55-69.

WINCHESTER, A J L, 1987, *Landscape and Society in Medieval Cumbria*. Edinburgh.

WINCHESTER, A J L, 2000, *The Harvest of the Hills: Rural Life in Northern England and the Scottish Borders, 1400-1700*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.

WOOD, J, 1822, Some account of a Saxon inscription, on a stone found near Falstone in the County of Northumberland, *AA*$^{1}$ **1**, 103-4.

WRATHMELL, S, 1975, *Deserted and Shrunken Villages in Southern Northumberland from the Twelfth to the Twentieth Centuries*. Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Cardiff.

WRIGHT, G, 1989, *The Northumbrian Uplands*, David and Charles.

YOUNG, A, 2003, *Railways in Northumberland*. Martin Bairstow; Farsley, Leeds.

YOUNG, R, 2002, The Palaeolithic and Mesolithic periods in Northern England, in C. Brooks, R Daniels and A Harding (eds.) *Past, Present and Future: The Archaeology of Northern England*. Durham; Architectural and Archaeological Society of Durham and Northumberland Research Report **5**, 19-27.

# 12. APPENDICES

*APPENDIX 1: LIST OF HISTORIC DOCUMENTS*

*APPENDIX 2: LIST OF MODERN PHOTOGRAPHS*

*APPENDIX 3: LIST OF AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHS*

*APPENDIX 4: LIST OF SITES AND MONUMENTS*

*APPENDIX 5: LIST OF HISTORIC BUILDINGS (GRUNDY 1988)*

*APPENDIX 6: PUBLIC RECORDS OFFICE CATALOGUE*

*APPENDIX 7: NORTHUMBERLAND RECORDS OFFICE CATALOGUE*

[**NOTE**: Historic Maps & Documents (M&D), Historic Photographs (HP) and Modern Photographs (MP), listed in Appendices 1 & 2, are archived in digital form with the Northumberland National Park Authority and Northumberland Records Office]