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Editorial: Oakham Castle: Risk or Opportunity?

Two facts regarding Oakham Castle sit uncomfortably side by side: first, its Great Hall can fairly claim to be Rutland’s finest piece of early vernacular architecture; and secondly, the site of the castle appears on English Heritage’s register of monuments at risk, and has done so for some years. One might justly ask how such a situation could arise considering that the castle site is in public ownership.

The Great Hall and the inner bailey were given to the then Rutland County Council by Major J R Hanbury in 1944, although he retained ownership of the horseshoes in the Great Hall. Oakham Town Council acquired Cutts Close, part of the outer bailey. The hall, always an object of curiosity, was left open to the public, still playing a part as the symbolic heart of Oakham and of Rutland. Indeed, it remained the county’s regular seat of justice until only a few years ago and still hosts the occasional Crown Court.

The Great Hall, restored in the early years of the twentieth century, suffered the unsympathetic addition of judge’s rooms. Limited archaeological excavations were carried out by John Barber, and archaeological discoveries were recorded during the construction of the over-grand 1950s GPO. Little else was done until Rutland became part of Leicestershire in 1974, when both the castle and the Rutland County Museum became the responsibility of Leicestershire’s museum service.

Investigations soon revealed that the bailey earthworks were being eroded by people climbing over them and damaged by the roots of trees, some of considerable size, that still grow on the ramparts. Research into the history of the castle and its horseshoes resulted in the publication of two booklets (still available in more recent editions), and reports were submitted to the Council’s committees pressing for remedial action. But the fact was that the local government purse was no deeper than it is now. Little could be done to alleviate the situation regarding the ramparts, although money was found to rewire and redecorate the Great Hall ready for octocentenary celebrations which were held in 1980.

There was no Heritage Lottery Fund then, nor was there any realistic prospect of central government funding, but things could have been worse: a particularly insensitive and inappropriate proposal to turn Cutts Close into a car park was thankfully defeated. So if Leicestershire, a county whose prestigious museum service was highly regarded across the country, could not find money for the castle, then what would be the prospects for it when Rutland was granted independence as a unitary authority in 1997? Bleak indeed, one might suppose.

Not necessarily so. There have been changes. The inclusion of the castle in the monuments at risk register strengthens the case for the works that the earthworks need. Rutland County and Oakham Town Councils, working with English Heritage and supported by the Civic Trust, have set up anOakham Town Partnership. A scheme to bring vitality to the historic core of the town is in preparation. Oakham Castle, as a focus for community events, is central to this scheme. The Friends of Rutland County Museum have now included Oakham Castle in their charitable objects; our own Society is keenly interested in its future. Indications are that a viable scheme to safeguard the castle site for future generations could be favourably received by the Heritage Lottery Fund. If such a scheme is not forthcoming, then the outlook for the earthworks is dire. Rutlanders too should do whatever they can to ensure the future of this great site.
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Rutland and the Medieval Wool Trade

MARGARET BONNEY

The contribution made by Rutland to that most important of English medieval trading commodities, wool, is examined. Rutland, along with its neighbouring East Midland counties, provided successive monarchs with a considerable amount of wool of a middling quality, which was exported through Boston from at least the early fourteenth century. The profits to be made from this trade are revealed in a number of case studies of wealthy wool merchants, members of the Company of the Merchants of the Staple, who resided in the county from the late fourteenth century. Oakham, in particular, benefited from their prosperity and philanthropy, and echoes of their preoccupations are still reflected in the fabric of the town today.

In the town [of Oakham] did reside divers wealthy Merchants of the Staple at Calais, who dealt in several staple commodities of this kingdom, chiefly wool, a trade of very great account, while that town was possest by the English. Of what quality and condition these merchants were, may be guest by the Charities exprest in their wills... (Wright 1684, Additions, 8).

James Wright, in his History of Rutland of 1684, was in no doubt of the importance of the wool trade in Rutland. Although he was referring in this quotation to the history of Oakham itself, there were signs of the importance of the trade in different parts of the county. Wright emphasised the contribution made by wool merchants to the social life of the town, not least in terms of their philanthropic work, and this theme will be examined further. But first the historical context in which these merchants operated will be explored, in an attempt to elucidate some of the mysteries of the wool and cloth trade of medieval England.

The Wool Trade

It makes a pleasant change to be discussing something economic and commercial where England led Europe for at least a couple of centuries! Today, the trade in commodities seems to be all the other way, but in the Middle Ages England was the principal exporter of a major commodity, wool. England’s sheep produced the finest quality wool in Europe in the medieval period. People wanted this wool, and were prepared to pay top prices for it in the markets of Europe. Merchants told the king in 1341 that it was his ‘rich treasure’, and in 1352 they told him it was ‘the sovereign merchandise and jewel of this realm of England’ (Power 1941, 18). Wool originating from the Low Countries and Tuscany was coarse in comparison, and was used only to manufacture inferior grades of cloth. A good part of the Italian cloth industry and almost the whole of the industry in the Low Countries depended on the supply of English wool.

In the earliest days of the trade, from the twelfth century onwards, English wool was exported by Flemish merchants, and then the Italians took over in the thirteenth century. Both countries had a close interest in the trade, because there were famous centres of cloth manufacture in both. But the Italians operated at an advantage: the task of collecting papal taxes had been given to them (hence the origins of Italian banking and credit firms in the Middle Ages), and they had travelled extensively in England, making connections with the English monasteries as they collected money. They found out at first hand where the best flocks of sheep were, and which produced the finest wool, and they set up arrangements for exporting wool and fleeces direct from the monastic producers (Power 1933, 52; 1941, 53). However, by the later fourteenth century, English merchants had taken over the bulk of wool exports, for mainly political reasons.

There is a fascinating interplay between politics and economics in the history of the wool and cloth trade in the Middle Ages. Because so much of England’s economy was tied up in this trade from the thirteenth to the sixteenth centuries, the stakes were high and the Crown was always intimately concerned with price fluctuations and the quality and quantity of the product. Wool was the prime export, the prime revenue-raiser for the Crown. It is no exaggeration to say that for much of the medieval period, England’s politics were constructed on the back of sheep! Wool was a bargaining counter. To give a famous early example, Richard I’s ransom was paid out of wool revenues, either actual or anticipated (Power 1941, 17). In June 1347, wool was being collected for sale so that Henry de Lancaster, earl of Derby, and others held overseas could be released. Two hundred sacks
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from Leicestershire and 100 sacks from Rutland were collected for this purpose alone (Cal Cl R 1346-9, 231). The crown operated a protectionist policy towards the trade, issuing licences for exporting wool and determining where it should be exported from. Taxation, a huge subject in itself which will be considered in a little more detail later, was raised on the production of wool and cloth — it kept the monarchy afloat. Furthermore, the English wool trade reflected the vicissitudes of England’s foreign policy and changes in royal policy towards exporters had a truly international effect. At the outset of the Hundred Years War, in 1336, there was a blockade on trade with France, and starving hordes of Flemish weavers, their livelihoods at stake, came over the border into France begging. In 1444 there was a stoppage of trade which led to an exodus of 2,000 unemployed from Leyden (Power 1941, 16). But aggressive English foreign policy could also work against the trade. The period 1450-1470 marked the lowest levels of both wool and cloth exports from England, coinciding with political events like the loss of Gascony in 1453 and conflict with the Hanse, a trading organisation involving northern European merchants. Once the Treaty of Utrecht was signed in 1474, bringing the trade war to end, and there was peace with France in 1475, then cloth, if not wool, exports took off again (fig. 2) (Carus-Wilson & Coleman 1963, 32).

Although English wool was considered of the best quality abroad, there was no uniformity of quality within England itself. There were areas of the country noted for producing high-quality wool, and where a better price could be obtained from exporters. The bulk of fine wool exported in the Middle Ages came from Cotswold and Lincoln sheep, and to a lesser extent, Leicesters, common to most of the Midlands. Evidence derived from what is known as Pegolotti’s list, a late thirteenth or early fourteenth century commercial handbook written for the Italian merchant house of Bardi on the evidence of someone who clearly knew his English sheep, shows where the finest wool was being produced. Rutland was included in the list, in a kind of middling grade of wool common to most Midland sources, whereas Lincolnshire, especially the Lindsey area, was producing highly-priced and highly-prized wool (Munro 1978). In 1337, Rutland and Lincolnshire had to provide 4,500 sacks of wool for export, the largest levy demanded by the king from any part of England (the next highest was 4,000 sacks from London). But quantity does not necessarily equate with quality or thus with high prices for exporters. Rutland’s wool was assessed at 7½ marks per sack, which, if a mark is considered to be the equivalent of 13s 4d in old money, was a price of £5. Derbyshire wool was assessed at the same price, but both counties were valued below Nottinghamshire and Northamptonshire (at 8½ marks per sack), Leicestershire (at 9 marks), Lincolnshire (10 marks), Shropshire (10½ marks) and Herefordshire (12 marks or £8) (Cal Cl R 1337-9, 148). Calculations on the prices of wool during the medieval period have shown that Rutland’s wool remained at a fairly steady price, around £5-£6 per sack, during the later fourteenth century.
Fig. 2. Two graphs which demonstrate the steep decline in wool exports (above, raw wool; below, cloth) during the late fourteenth century, during a time of heavier taxation, with stagnation in the fifteenth century as more wool went to satisfy the local cloth industry. Cloth exporting takes off during the late fourteenth century. Taken from Carus-Wilson & Coleman 1963, 122-3, 138-9, by permission of Oxford University Press.

In 1454, when Parliament tried to fix a schedule of internal wool prices to guarantee the levels of income from any tax on wool, Rutland came out at a middling price, valued at £4 6s 8d per sack of 364 lb, the same price as for Nottinghamshire, Warwickshire, Berkshire, Leicestershire and Huntingdonshire wool, but less than Lincolnshire or top-end-of-the-market prices for Cotswold wool (£8 6s 8d) or Leominster wool (£1 3s) (Power 1941, 49). The price for Rutland wool rose to £11 by 1475, falling back to a little over £9 in 1499 – again, in comparison with other parts of England, it was a middling price for a middling quality wool. In the sixteenth century, the market continued to distinguish different places of origin of English wool and thus to value it differently. Most costly were the fine fleeces from the Welsh Marches, then Cotswold wool; Lincolnshire, and perhaps also Rutland wool, was of middling quality, although Rutland was not mentioned specifically in the sixteenth-century lists, and at the coarser end of the market there were Suffolk and Sussex wools, with wool from Cornwall and the North country propping up the table at the cheapest end.

The monasteries played a major part in the wool trade in the early Middle Ages because they were in the business of large-scale sheep farming, and the size of their flocks was growing in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. The Fenland abbeys of Peterborough and Crowland, for example, had 16,300 sheep between them (Power 1941, 33-5). During the boom years, the big producers like these abbeys, or important secular landholders, negotiated wholesale contracts directly with exporters: a monastery would sell the whole of its produce to an exporter directly. Some monasteries made contracts on the expectation of a good ‘clip’ from their sheep – they could sell wool for two to three years in advance, or even fifteen years ahead, for which merchants paid a lump sum up front. Of course, these were really loans made on the security of wool – a form of credit which attracted heavy interest rates. As long as there was a favourable tax regime this system prospered, but as the burden of taxation fell heavily on wool producers in the late fourteenth century, then a decline set in.

The response of landlords, whether monastic or secular, was to move out of sheep farming directly, by leasing out sheep pastures to small-scale producers – the move away from demesne farming, to give it a posh name. So a change came about in the export of wool. No longer was it feasible or economically viable for merchants to tour around the country, inspecting the produce for themselves and
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negotiating prices directly with producers, because there were just too many producers. Middlemen dealers become necessary to mediate between small-scale producers and exporters and to collect and pack the smaller amounts of wool produced over what could be a wide area. Middlemen had always been around to manage wool sales for the smaller producers, but they grew in importance with the decline of demesne farming. In the fifteenth century, these men were known as ‘woolmen’ or ‘broggers’ (brokers). The ‘brogger’ was the person responsible for packing up the wool and getting it ready for export, either in the form of sacks of shorn or wound wool from the clip, or as wool-fells, which were sheepskins with the wool still on them. Some were Londoners, but most lived in the district where they collected wool. Secure central places had to be identified as collection points for wool from a wider district, so in 1347, for example, Richard Burgeys of Melton, the farmer of the Abbot of Westminster’s manor of ‘Hokham’ (ie, Oakham Deanshold), was ordered to provide a ‘strong house’ for the wool of Rutland – in much the same way as a secure depot had been required in the same year for 100 sides of Rutland bacon requisitioned for the English army stranded in Gascony (Harrop 1999, 400-02). Richard Burgeys probably acted as the ‘brogger’ in the area for the collection of local wool, and because of his position in local society, he may well have been the leading wool collector in the area responsible for dealing with the exporters (Cal Cl R 1346-9, 293).

Wool was exported from the Midlands mainly via Boston, with a much smaller amount going out of Lynn. For Rutland’s wool, this was very convenient, geographically speaking. During the fourteenth century, there were various experiments to appoint what were known as ‘staple’ towns inland, through which the wool trade could be channelled (Carus-Wilson & Coleman 1963, 7-9). It was a convenient way of ensuring that the wool from all over a county or district could be weighed and checked in a standardised way and customs duties applied to it before it was exported from a specified port. In 1353 Lincoln was made such a ‘staple’ town, with Boston named as its export port, and perhaps Rutland’s wool went for checking to Lincoln and then on to Boston at this time. Once the Calais staple had been established in the late fourteenth century, however, virtually all the wool trade was channelled that way. It fell into the hands of a group of English merchants who monopolised the trade with Europe north of the Alps, the Merchants of the Staple, about whom more later.

Financing the Monarchy

The taxes on wool were imposed at the staple towns or ports, and this leads on to another very important aspect of the medieval wool trade, its role in financing the English monarchy. Successive kings made the most out of this valuable export commodity by taxing it throughout the Middle Ages. In the early medieval period, at a time when it seemed that English wool was a bottomless source of revenue, under Richard I, Edward I and Edward III there were direct appropriations and loans in wool – the word ‘loan’ being somewhat of a misnomer because the money raised by the king in this way was rarely repaid. In 1275, the first specific export tax on wool was introduced by Edward I with the weasel-word title, the ‘Ancient Custom’ – it wasn’t actually either a custom or ancient! All exporters of wool were charged 6s 8d (or ½ mark) per sack, generating revenue to the crown of £8,000 to £11,000 pa. The crown used this ‘Ancient Custom’ to anticipate revenue by borrowing on the security of this tax, just as the monasteries had done when they sold their ‘clip’ to merchants. Once established, this tax continued for three centuries, year on year (Bolton 1980, 174-5). In 1303, the crown imposed a further wool tax, the ‘New Custom’ or Petty Custom, which set the precedent of differentiating between home and foreign merchants in the levels of duty payable. For the first time in the customs records there is the concept of ‘alien’ versus ‘denizen’ merchants. ‘Aliens’ were foreign merchants, ‘Denizens’ were English merchants plus some foreigners, treated for customs purposes as if they were English-born subjects of the king, privileged by letters of denization to pay customs at home rates. In addition, some Italian merchants continued to have licences to export a few hundred sacks of wool, a result of the English monarchy’s indebtedness to Italian bankers. The ‘New Custom’ added a duty of 3s 4d per sack on all wool exported by ‘alien’ merchants and on a range of other exports, including cloth. ‘Aliens’ therefore had to pay 10s per sack of wool in total (a combination of the Ancient and the New Custom), while ‘denizens’ remained at the old 6s 8d rate (Carus-Wilson & Coleman 1963, 12-13). Merchants passed on the cost of taxation to buyers in Europe, and as English wool became more expensive, so there was a gradual shrinking of foreign market share and a decline in exports. The heady days of free trade with low taxation and the domination of foreign merchants were over, English merchants took over the bulk of shrinking wool exports by the late fourteenth century.

As successive kings tried to maintain English military dominance in Europe, they searched for more ways of extracting money from their subjects. Indirect taxation was less unpopular than direct taxation, and so wool exporters, along with exporters
of other English goods, were taxed more heavily throughout the fourteenth century. From the 1330s onwards, the monarchy was in need of money for the Hundred Years War against France, and in 1336 came the grant by Parliament of 40s on the export of wool, known in the trade as the ‘maltote’. From 1337 onwards, wool was taxed regularly and more heavily. Every sack of wool (364lb, ie. the clip from 260 sheep) or 240 woolfells had not just the wool custom imposed on it (6s 8d for denizens, 10s for aliens), but also a subsidy (yet another misnomer!) of 33s 4d for denizens and a sliding scale of 43s 4d up to 100s for aliens (Power 1941, 81-2). One sack of shorn wool was the equivalent of 240 wool fells for taxation purposes after 1368, and equalled 260 skins before this date. The Crown was being ‘subsidised’ by the wool trade, as it tried to balance out its finances by raising money wherever possible. These subsidies, however, had to be passed by Parliament, and to get a grant through, the king needed the support of the wool merchants in Parliament – so on the back of the sheep came the growth of the power of Parliament in the Middle Ages, and the power of the wealthiest wool merchants, the great exporters.

Heavier taxation was not entirely responsible for the stagnation and decline in wool exports by the later Middle Ages. Many other factors come into play, not least the growth in the English cloth manufacturing industry. More and more wool was required to satisfy this local industry, and so less wool was exported. The tax regime did not fall so heavily on cloth producers, and so the export trade in cloth replaced wool in pre-eminence by the fifteenth century. By the end of the sixteenth, the home textile industry had all but absorbed the home-produced wool.

A burgeoning tax regime led to the growth of officialdom at the main wool exporting ports, and in the staple inland towns the king was employing men he trusted to collect the taxes, men whose names were familiar from a reading of the Close and Patent Rolls, where their instructions from the king are recorded. It is no accident that our knowledge of many of Rutland’s wool personalities comes from the period of heavier taxation of wool, the 1330s onwards. Overseers were appointed to monitor the whole collection process and to make sure everything happened on time. In November 1347, Hugh de Notingham, the king’s serjeant at arms, was appointed in the counties of Lincolnshire, Rutland, Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire, and other places to ‘stir the collectors and receivers of wool to do their duty’ (Cal Cl R 1346-9, 412).

Roger de Wollesthorp, Henry de Tiddeswell, Robert de Dalderby and Hugh Cokheued were the men appointed by the king in August 1337 to buy 4,500 sacks of wool as the contribution from Lincolnshire and Rutland towards the total of 30,000 sacks of wool he required that year. These men and other named merchants were given priority in selling this wool overseas: no other merchants were allowed to export wool from England until all 30,000 sacks had been sold. By September 1337, John de Notingham of Uppingham joined this group and the same names cropped up in October 1337 as appointees of the king to take and buy 4,500 sacks of wool in these two counties ‘with all speed’ for the king’s use. Henry de Tyddeswell and Roger de Wollesthorp were described as ‘receivers of the king’s wool’ in Lincolnshire in 1338-9 (Cal Cl R 1337-9, 148, 177, 268, 588, 599).

Now these men were not Rutland men, apart from John de Notingham of Uppingham, but they were sufficiently local to know the growers and to negotiate with them for the purchase of wool. Roger de Wollesthorp came from Grantham. From other sources, we know he was chief taxer and receiver of the 10th and 15th in Kesteven, as well as a wool collector and receiver for Lincolnshire and Rutland, and he acted as Henry de Tiddeswell’s deputy. Henry de Tiddeswell (or Tichwell) came from Stamford. He was collector and receiver of the 10th and 15th in Lincolnshire, as well as a wool collector and receiver for Lincolnshire and Rutland. Robert de Dalderby came from Lincoln, and Hugh Cokheued from Barton-upon-Humber (McLane 1988). They were the king’s factors in the area, entrusted to gather in the right amount of wool to raise the right amount of revenue for the monarchy. They were as much financiers as merchants – they were able to bankroll the monarchy, and the king was indebted to them for loans he could raise in anticipation of the customs revenue from the export of this wool.

Again, the Close and Patent Rolls reveal the levels of indebtedness of the king to men such as these. In May 1338, the king informed the customs collectors in Boston that certain named merchants had to be excused 20s of the 40s subsidy and custom on each sack of wool they exported to Holland and Zealand until his debt to them had been recovered. The debt owed to Hugh Cokheued of Barton was £1,000 on exports from Kingston-upon-Hull; to Robert de Dalderby the debt was £512 10s 10d on exports from Boston. Roger de Wollesthorp of Grantham was owed a massive £2,735 8s 8d from shipments from Boston; and Henry de Tydeswell was owed the most – £1,843 11s 3d for shipments from Boston, and £1,000 for shipments from Kingston-upon-Hull. This was big money, and it shows the scale of operations of these men (Cal Cl R 1337-9, 424).
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The Merchant Staplers

By the late fourteenth century, there began to emerge wealthy merchants with a new title, the Merchant Staplers, who dealt with the king in the bulk export of wool from England to the continent, and some of them were Rutlanders. What does this title mean? The establishment of Calais as the prime staple town by the late fourteenth century, with wool exports being directed this way compulsorily, led to the growth of an association of merchants based there, called the Merchants of the Company of the Staple of Calais, or the Fellowship of the Staple. It was a kind of medieval trade union, essentially a company of merchants whose main trading activities centred on selling English wool to the Netherlands. It evolved for the mutual convenience of merchants, for the maintenance of a protectionist attitude to English wool exports and for the simplification of tax collection in the form of export duties for the English monarchy during the time of Edward III. It was the first great English trading company to emerge, with a monopoly of the wool trade with Europe. The Merchant Staplers were those men who traded in the wool coming to the staple. Calais was chosen to be this special place because it was an English possession in Europe, with a strong garrison (from 1466 the Company of the Staple paid the wages of the Calais garrison) and in easy reach of the cloth-making towns of Flanders and Holland where English wool was destined to go. Calais was very important to the economy of England, especially in relation to the wool trade. When Calais was lost to the English crown in 1557, the economic effects were felt not just in important wool-exporting towns like Boston, but also in smaller collection centres for wool, such as Oakham. VCH Rutland (II, 24) suggests that Oakham was impoverished after the loss of Calais, because its chief citizens were Merchants of the Staple and forced to leave town. This point needs further investigation.

Merchants of the Company of the Staple had a close relationship with the king; they were involved in contemporary politics, and many were known personally by the king or by members of his council. There were somewhere in the region of 300-400 Staplers, mostly Londoners, but some came from elsewhere in England. They were men of substance and importance in the local community. They travelled to the wool growers, inspecting the goods, sampling and bidding for the clip. Increasingly through the Middle Ages, they were in competition with country dealers and with the ‘broggers’, the middlemen, for English wool. They were also very vulnerable: they advanced money to the king in good faith that they would be repaid, but sometimes the king defaulted on his payments, and then blamed the merchants for his financial difficulties. The so-called ‘pardons’ which appear at regular intervals in the Close and Patent Rolls are quite often fictions, covering the monarch’s inability to refund his merchant lenders. This may well have been the case in 1395, when John Clerk of ‘Wyssunden’, merchant, and John Reynold, alias Ryngnal, of Langham, wool buyer, were pardoned, and in 1471, when a general pardon was issued to Staple merchants, including William Boyyyle (of Calais, esq., alias gentleman, alias “soldour”, alias late of co. Rutland’, and the extraordinarily well-travelled William Rosse of the Staple, ‘alias burgess of Calais, alias late of Bam- burgh, Northumberland, alias late of Oakham’ (Cal Pat R 1391-6, 628-9; 1467-77, 290).

Several Rutland merchants were described as ‘Merchants of the Staple’ in the later Middle Ages, and the remainder of this article will concentrate on them, because it is through them that something can be learned about the wealth, power and even psychology of this important segment of later medieval society.

The WAREYN Family of Oakham

Monuments remaining in the Church of Oakham

In a Chappel on the South side of the Chancel, on a Plate of Brass fixt in a Marble Gravestone.


Fig. 3. The memorial to Francis Wareyn, merchant of the Staple of Calais, in a chapel on the S side of the chancel of Oakham church, as described by Wright (1684, 98).

On 25th August 1470, the king pardoned various Merchants of the Staple of Calais for all their ‘offences’. Included in the list were Thomas Adam of Langham, Richard Salesbury of ‘Brooke’, and William Trafford, John Kyrton and William Wareyn, all three of ‘Wokeham’. It is not clear what ‘offence’ had been committed, but the group included one man who left his mark on the town of Oakham. According to Wright’s History of Rutland, there was a monument to William Wareyn on the south side of the chancel, in the Lady Chapel of All Saints, Oakham. ‘Hic jacet Willemius Waren quondam hujus Villae Burgensis et Mercator Stapulæ Villae Caloisie, ac etiam Domina Agnes uxor ejus et relicta, qui quidem Willemhus obit.
1499' (Wright 1684, Additions, 4). Cox also mentioned this monument in his History (Cox 1720, 521-22). However, in the church today, there is no sign of William Wareyn’s monument, nor of the marble monument to his son, Francis, also described by Wright in 1684 (fig. 3). Francis Wareyn was another merchant of the Staple of Calais, who died on 20th August 1510. It may be that both memorials were lost during the Victorian restoration programme on All Saints church, certainly the current excellent Guide to the church does not mention either man (Aston 2003).

There may be no visible memorial, but William Wareyn’s will of 1499 sheds some interesting light on the valuable contribution he made to his parish church, and more generally on the preoccupations of men of his type. His legacies are substantial, and although he makes ample provision for his wife and his children, his mind has turned to religious concerns, principally storing up treasure for himself in heaven. For example, £5 is left to ‘have my soul prayed for’ at the High Altar, and to discharge any duties forgotten in his lifetime; £200 is put aside for two priests to say masses for his soul and for his parents’ souls for the next 20 years at Oakham, and 40 marks for a priest at Osolweston (Owston) in Leicestershire to pray for ever for his and his wife’s souls. Owston Abbey also had the rents and revenues from two of William’s tenements in Oakham held by William Eltham, and his ‘new house’ purchased from Alexander Malpeas, on condition that the property was maintained and the anniversary of his death remembered. But perhaps more revealing still is the rider to his provision of land for his family. His wife was to enjoy the income and security from his land for her lifetime, then it would pass to his son Francis, then to his son James and finally to his daughter Elizabeth, with a remainder in trust to the following use: the vicar and wardens of the parish church could take the rents and profits from his mansion or dwelling place, ‘wherein I now dwell in Okeham’, provided it was kept in repair, as long as they continued to commemorate his soul and that of his father and mother in mass every Sunday each year. If they failed to observe this condition for three Sundays without reasonable excuse, the land was to be sold and money distributed in ‘works of mercy and deeds of charity for the welfare of his soul.’ Woe betide the clergy who forgot to pray for the Wareyn family!

But William seems to have been a devout man, whose wealth was put at the disposal of the church. He was generous in the amount of money he left to local churches ‘to thentent that my soule among other soules may be recommended by name to the prayers of the people every Sunday in the church’: 10 marks spread over five years in equal portions for repairs to Oakham church and 100 marks for vestments for this church; and smaller donations to churches at Lyddington, Upperingham, ‘Aston’ (Ayston), Preston, ‘Pysbroke’ (Bisbrooke), Somerby, Cottesmore, Langham and Brooke (Lyddington did best out of this with a bequest of 20s). The four orders of Friars in Stamford benefited to the tune of 13s 4d each, with the same amount left to the nuns there. The magnificent sum of £40 was earmarked for building a Frater at Owston Abbey, but only on condition that lead was used to cover the Frater. Then there is the social side of religious life, expressed in Wareyn’s membership of a number of religious guilds or associations: £4 to the Guild of Holy Trinity, and Our Lady in Oakham, ‘whereof I am a brother’; and 6s 8d to a guild he belonged to in Preston. His philanthropic nature is revealed in legacies to the poor: 10 marks were allocated to provide ‘Frye clothe and linen cloth for garments, shirts and sheets for poor people’ for five years after his death. He remembered his apprentices by leaving 40s to each one living with him when he died. Finally, there was a small mention of the fabric of the town of Oakham itself, as he earmarked 10 marks for the repair of highways and bridges (TNA, Prob/11/11).

William Wareyn’s will was proved on 25th October 1499. His son, Francis, died just over 10 years later, and again his will reveals this mixture of shrewd business sense (getting the most for his money in the hereafter) as well as devotion to the religious practices of the day and a desire to leave behind a fitting memorial to his family. Like his father, he requested burial in ‘Our Lady’s aisle’ in the parish church, but specified that 400 masses were to be said within the four days after his death. Money was left to a variety of philanthropic causes, with the provision that 20 nobles be distributed to the 20 towns nearest to Oakham, ie 6s 8d to the poorest people of each town. But perhaps the most interesting part of this will was the description of goods left to members of his family. Here was a rich household – Elizabeth, his wife, was left 250 marks, 12 silver spoons, three of his best silver goblets with covers and a pair without covers, and one of his best rings. Elizabeth and his brother James were to share ‘a cofter with a certain piece of linen cloth’ to be divided between them, and as befitted a Merchant of the Staple, there was a flock of sheep to be entrusted to the family. Elizabeth was allocated 100 sheep, and another 100 were divided between his children (TNA, Prob/11/16).

Both William and Francis Wareyn’s wills reveal something of their business contacts and the world in which these men moved. The overseers of William’s will were the two Merchant Staplers, Christopher Browne and William Saxby, and William Saxby was also one of Francis’ executors;
fellow wool merchants could be trusted to carry out the testator’s wishes beyond the grave.

As a footnote to the Wareyns, we should remember that their era has been described earlier as one of retrenchment, or stagnation and decline in the wool export trade, and yet these men were still in a position to expend considerable resources on their local parish church and to live in some style. Decline was relative, at least in its effects on individual merchants!

**The DALBY Family of Exton and Oakham**

If we back-track to the end of the previous century, at a time when the English wool trade still played a major part in exports, we come across a leading Rutland wool merchant who enjoyed a close relationship with the monarchy in a trade which carried its own risks. William Dalby was mentioned in the Fine Rolls in 1392, when he and John Clerk of Whissendine (a business associate who was named as one of his executors) were given a royal commission to collect taxes in Rutland. But by 13th February 1394, Dalby’s business suffered a blow. A royal order was issued to the collectors of customs at Lynn on the petition of William Dalby and other merchants (including Roger Flore, of whom much more later in this article), asking them to check their records, to confirm that the petitioners had paid customs on 40 sarplers of wool (a sarpler is a unit of weight of wool) and 106 woolfells loaded on a ship belonging to John Frost, destined for Calais. The ship had been hit by a storm outside port, it split open and its cargo had been damaged. The cargo had been salvaged, and returned to England to be dried off, but this meant that the merchants were in danger of having to pay customs a second time, hence the royal instruction that the check be carried out. It was a case of preventing double-entry book-keeping here by hitting the same men where it hurt most – charging double for a cargo which was, in any case, of damaged goods! (*Cal Cl R, 1392-6, 199*)

William Dalby also suffered from a somewhat stormy relationship with the king. On 16th October 1395, the Patent Rolls refer to Dalby ‘of Exton, co Rutland, merchant’, being pardoned by the king of all ‘contempts, trespasses, frauds, deceits, and unjust and excessive weighings and purchases of wools contrary to statute’. It is not clear what had been going on here – perhaps William had been trying to mix his woools in an attempt to conceal good quality wool, thus paying less in export charges (*Cal Cl R, 1391-6, 627*). However, despite Acts of God in the form of shipwrecks, and the disapproval of the monarch on one occasion at least, William was a success story in terms of status and wealth within his community, for he left it a permanent and still-visible sign of his business successes in the form of a building to accommodate the poor of the town.

At some stage between 1395 and 1397 William Dalby moved his interests, and probably his home, from Exton to Oakham and began to make his dispositions for the future. Perhaps he had intimations of mortality, because he was planning for the hereafter. In 1399, Richard II gave William Dalby licence to found and establish a Hospital in honour of Saints John and Anne at Oakham. It was to be staffed by two chaplains, one perpetual (‘custos’) and the other removable, and it was to house twelve poor men. The chaplains were to pray for the king and queen and for the ‘good estate of William Dalby and his wife Agnes’. The hospital was endowed with a messuage and two acres of land in Oakham. William was also given permission to assign the advowson of this Hospital to the Prior and Convent of St Anne of the Carthusian order near Coventry as a way of ensuring its continuity, and a sum of £40 was to be given by the Priory to the chaplain of the Hospital annually for its upkeep (*ROLLR, DE1782/1*). The land in question was the site bought by Dalby in 1397 which now lies check by check with the railway, known as Chamberlayne’s Croft because it was once owned by William Chamberlayne, a sub-constable of Oakham Castle. The Hospital was shaped in a quadrangle enclosed by a wall, to the north of which Dalby built a house for himself with access to the Hospital’s chapel. We know the idea came to him in later life, because of this wonderful phraseology in his son-in-law’s Ordinances for the Hospital: ‘reflecting that the flower of his life had been spent in the care of earthly occupations and levity of pleasures and wishing to offer an evening sacrifice to the Highest’ (*ROLLR, DE1782/2*). William endowed this Hospital, and it was only six or seven years later that he died, on 24th March 1405. His will included a bequest to the first Warden of his Hospital, Simon Thorp, and to two named and other unnamed poor men. It is possible that Dalby’s widow went on living at the house by the Hospital long after this, because the property was only conveyed to the Dalby charity by his executors in 1421 (Parkin 2000, 8).

**The FLORE Family of Oakham**

The most famous Merchant Stapler of Oakham was probably Roger Flore. There was a direct connection between the Flores and the Dalbys – Roger Flore married Catherine, daughter and co-heiress of William Dalby, in an interesting and revealing dynastic linkage between Stapler families and business interests. This may well be another reason why William Dalby moved from Exton to Oakham as he became older – to be near his daughter and his very prosperous son-in-law. There was obviously a relationship of trust between the men,
Fig. 4. The chapel of the Hospital of St John and St Anne at Oakham, founded by William Dalby in 1399 and reorganised and endowed by Roger Flore in 1421.

Figs. 5 and 5a. The tomb in the chapel to the Holy Trinity, on the north side of the chancel in All Saints’ Church, Oakham, perhaps belonging to Roger Flore or another wealthy wool merchant of the town, with wool weights or sheep bells around it.
because Dalby settled the patronage of his Hospital in Oakham (fig. 4) on Flore when he became dissatisfied with the management style of St Anne’s Priory, near Coventry. Roger Flore kept a close eye on the running of the Hospital, and in 1421, he added to its statutes. The future of the Hospital was important to him and his provisions for its continuity have the air of belt and braces: if his own heirs were negligent in ‘bestowing the respective places of the ‘Custos’, chaplain or 12 poor men’, the power would pass to the Vicar of Oakham. If Flore’s heir was a ward of court, or if the Vicar was negligent or ‘in parts beyond the seas’, then the power to appoint the chaplains and to choose the poor inmates would pass to the Abbot and Convent of Westminster, proprietaries of the church at Oakham. If there was no abbot in place at Westminster, then the Abbot of Owston, Leicestershire, was to be responsible (ROLLR, DE1782/2).

Roger Flore also gave consideration to the Hospital’s endowment of £40 in his new ordinances: of the total, £6 13s 4d was to be allocated to the ‘custos’; £5 to the other removeable chaplain; 10½d per week to each poor man; 3s 4d pa to the vicar of Oakham; and the residue of 16s 8d was to be put towards any repair work deemed necessary to the fabric of the Hospital. Flore’s ordinances go on to give the form of Oath for the chaplains and the poor inmates. After all this careful attention to detail, it was sad to see that the endowment was considered insufficient in 1436 to keep more than six poor men going, and the Hospital was in decline in the sixteenth century. Its revival took place in 1597, with a new royal charter, which reiterated the original Dalby foundation.

So Roger Flore’s life was intertwined with that of the Dalby family in personal, business and even spiritual ways, but he was, in his own right, probably the most wealthy Oakham merchant in the early fifteenth century. He held a freehold estate of 10 messuages, 100 acres of land and 10 acres of meadow. He farmed the tithes of the parsonage of Oakham, and the residue of 16s 8d was to be put towards any repair work deemed necessary to the fabric of the Hospital. Flore’s ordinances go on to give the form of Oath for the chaplains and the poor inmates. After all this careful attention to detail, it was sad to see that the endowment was considered insufficient in 1436 to keep more than six poor men going, and the Hospital was in decline in the sixteenth century. Its revival took place in 1597, with a new royal charter, which reiterated the original Dalby foundation.

because Dalby settled the patronage of his Hospital in Oakham (fig. 4) on Flore when he became dissatisfied with the management style of St Anne’s Priory, near Coventry. Roger Flore kept a close eye on the running of the Hospital, and in 1421, he added to its statutes. The future of the Hospital was important to him and his provisions for its continuity have the air of belt and braces: if his own heirs were negligent in ‘bestowing the respective places of the ‘Custos’, chaplain or 12 poor men’, the power would pass to the Vicar of Oakham. If Flore’s heir was a ward of court, or if the Vicar was negligent or ‘in parts beyond the seas’, then the power to appoint the chaplains and to choose the poor inmates would pass to the Abbot and Convent of Westminster, proprietaries of the church at Oakham. If there was no abbot in place at Westminster, then the Abbot of Owston, Leicestershire, was to be responsible (ROLLR, DE1782/2).

Roger Flore also gave consideration to the Hospital’s endowment of £40 in his new ordinances: of the total, £6 13s 4d was to be allocated to the ‘custos’; £5 to the other removeable chaplain; 10½d per week to each poor man; 3s 4d pa to the vicar of Oakham; and the residue of 16s 8d was to be put towards any repair work deemed necessary to the fabric of the Hospital. Flore’s ordinances go on to give the form of Oath for the chaplains and the poor inmates. After all this careful attention to detail, it was sad to see that the endowment was considered insufficient in 1436 to keep more than six poor men going, and the Hospital was in decline in the sixteenth century. Its revival took place in 1597, with a new royal charter, which reiterated the original Dalby foundation.

So Roger Flore’s life was intertwined with that of the Dalby family in personal, business and even spiritual ways, but he was, in his own right, probably the most wealthy Oakham merchant in the early fifteenth century. He held a freehold estate of 10 messuages, 100 acres of land and 10 acres of meadow. He farmed the tithes of the parsonage of Oakham for Westminster Abbey, and held land in Whitwell and Little Hambleton, and in Lincolnshire and Leicestershire, in addition to property in Oakham. His fine town house in Oakham on the south side of the High Street, though sadly altered in the 1920s, remains one of the oldest examples of late medieval domestic architecture left in Oakham. In the Abbey of Westminster’s rental for its manor of Oakham, dated 1513-14, Roger Flore paid the largest of all the rents there, 17s 8d, probably for his town house. The Hospital Ordinances mentioned earlier reveal the depth of his business contacts, for they are witnessed by an impressive array of London merchants, like John Coventre, sheriff of London 1416-17, alderman of Aldgate Ward 1420-29, and Lord Mayor of London 1425-26. Roger Flore was well connected. His father William had been Controller of the Works of Oakham Castle from 1373-80 and Sheriff of Rutland from 1386-87. Roger himself sat as the local Member of Parliament for twelve sessions from 1397 to 1419. He was Speaker of the House of Commons a record four times, in 1416, 1417, 1419 and 1422. He was a leading light in Rutland’s fifteenth-century set (VCH Rutland II, 5-6; Oxford DNB 2004-5; Parkin 2000, 9).

Roger Flore, like the Wareyn family and William Dalby, wanted to leave a permanent record of his good works on the fabric of his parish church, as his will, dated 15th April 1424, reflects. His loyalty to the parish church in Oakham was paramount – his body was to be buried there, and he left 5 marks to the mason responsible for work on the spire, a noble to be paid in ‘earnest money’ if the contract between them for the rebuilding of the vault of the steeple was not completed before his death. He left 40s to the Guilds of Holy Trinity, St Mary and St Michael in this church. Like Wareyn and Dalby, he was very concerned with the state of his soul, and he left money to a variety of religious organisations to ensure the best possible outcome – to the Order of Friars at Stamford, the Carthusians at Coventry, to Westminster Abbey and to Laund Priory for prayers to be said for his own soul, the souls of his late wife, his father William, his mother Ellen, his brother William, for his in-laws, William Dalby and his wife Agnes, for his sons William and John, and for Agnes Plessington, his daughter. His interest in philanthropy, so clear in his concern for the future of his father-in-law’s Hospital, is apparent. He left 50 marks to be distributed to the poor and 50s for the ‘almshouse’, ie the Hospital, of Oakham to repair the chapel and to provide ornaments for the altar, and 4d to each poor man living there. His philanthropy was practical: he asked that ‘a gown of Coventry freese and a new shirt’ be provided for 20 poor people of Oakham (Wright 1684, Additions, 12). Perhaps the big tomb in the chapel of the Holy Trinity on the north side of the chancel, very close to the High Altar, is Roger’s tomb, for around it, carved into the fabric, there are some objects which Nigel Aston identifies not as sheep bells but, more likely, wool weights (figs. 5 & 5a). It would be an appropriate monument in an appropriate setting for such a benefactor of this church (Aston 2003).

The BROWNE Family of Tolethorp
William Browne, lord of the manor of Tolethorp, was a Merchant of the Staple of Calais with a more tenuous connection to Rutland. The Browne family was given the manor by Sir Thomas Burton in November 1376, although they probably retained
Fig. 6. Almshouse for the poor, called the Bedehouse, established by William Browne in Stamford in 1493, probably showing the figure of the donor above the main entrance.

Figs. 7 & 7a. Brasses commemorating the Browne family in All Saints’ Church, Stamford, which they restored and enlarged. The source of their wealth is clearly seen in the wool sack below the feet of one family member.
their principal residence in Stamford (Wright 1684, 129; Cox 1720, 567). Their mark is left very clearly on the fabric of Stamford, where the steeple of All Saints’ Church was built at William’s expense along with much of the rest of the church which he and his brother John, another wool merchant, restored and enlarged. William is buried in the chapel to the south of the High Altar, as close as possible to the central and most significant part of the church in terms of liturgy and worship. A series of wonderful brasses commemorates his family in the church (figs. 7 & 7a), and in a nice touch, the glass doors of the south porch, installed in 2003, carry images of William and John Browne.

William Browne’s interest in the fabric of his parish church resonates with the activities of the other Merchant Staplers mentioned earlier. His philanthropy was demonstrated in his foundation of a house for the poor, called the Bedehouse, in Stamford in 1493 (fig. 6), endowed with the manor of Swayfield, Lincolnshire, and other lands for the upkeep of twelve poor old men, a nurse, and a warden ‘confrater’. Like Roger Flore in Oakham, Browne was public-spirited: he was Alderman of Stamford in 1466 and in 1470. This combination of piety, philanthropy and a concern to leave a visible mark of his wealth and status in the town was common to many Merchant Staplers.

Conclusion
It is clear to see that Rutland played its part in providing wool for export to the continent throughout the Middle Ages. The wool, of middling quality, commanded a middling price, but that was enough to reward some of its leading merchants with a more than adequate income to lead a prosperous life and to leave a permanent legacy in the form of building work on local churches and establishments for their fellow townsmen who had fallen on hard times.

The relationships between these merchants were obviously close. Those who worked together in the risky export trade in wool and were members of the exclusive club called the Fellowship of the Staple could be relied on to make sure that their colleagues’ final wishes were carried out to the letter after death. They form a very interesting, if numerically very small, slice of Rutland’s society in the later medieval period, and they will repay further study in both central and local documents.
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The extraction and marketing of Ketton Freestone in the nineteenth century

JOHN COOPER

Office for Leicestershire, Leicester & Rutland. In particular the activities of Thomas Nutt, farmer, quarryman, quarry owner and stone merchant are examined through his daybook, which records his transactions and those of his sons Robert and William from 1836 to 1868.

Introduction

Limestone is one of the most widely available natural minerals. It is utilised in the production of Portland cement, soap, pharmaceuticals and constructional and agricultural lime, in iron and steel making, and as a building material, to name but a few of its uses. Here the focus of attention is on Ketton limestone as a building and ornamental material in the middle to late nineteenth century. Consideration is given to those involved in quarrying, the location of the pits, transportation, and the marketing and use of the stone.

Ketton stone is an even-textured oolitic limestone. It forms part of the Jurassic stone-belt running from Dorset through Gloucestershire, Oxfordshire, Northamptonshire, Rutland, Lincolnshire and into Yorkshire. The Jurassic succession comprises mainly alternating clay, limestone and sandstone formations laid down in a shallow sea between 200 and 140 million years ago. The limestones of Rutland belong to the Lincolnshire Limestone Formation of Bajocian age which lies in the lower part of the Inferior Oolite Group. The Ketton freestone is a 1 to 2m-thick bed of rock at the top of the Lincolnshire Limestone. Beds of oolite occur below this but they are less evenly textured and are more thinly bedded, often lying between layers of non-oolitic limestone. The freestone is virtually devoid of megascopic fossil material. It consists of even grains of elliptical ooliths cemented by a calcite matrix which develops little or no lamination. The rock can therefore be split or cut in all directions as a dimension stone. The freestone varies in colour and hardness. In the unweathered condition it is a hard blue-grey crystalline rock (blue-heart), the blueness deriving from finely disseminated iron pyrites. When weathered the rock turns into the familiar softer golden-yellow building stone, the pyrites having oxidised to iron oxides (limonite). There are colour variations from pale cream to brownish yellow and pink, depending on the iron and manganese content.

After the stone has been extracted and dressed it forms a work-hardened surface of an even creamy-yellow, which protects it from flaking and general wear. Work-hardening or strain-hardening is well known to engineers, and is the result of crystalline deformities or imperfections which result in entanglement of the crystals. This increases the shear stress of the material, thus increasing its strength. In the case of limestone, the blows of the quarryman's dressing tool form this protective layer. However, during and since the nineteenth century, industrial pollution and acid rain have eroded this hard surface, damaging many fine buildings throughout Europe. The homogeneous texture and deep bedding planes combined with its weather resistance and attractive colour led to Ketton freestone being highly prized for ashlar building blocks as well as window, door and quoin dressings encasing rubble-stone buildings. In addition, its homogeneity enabled the mason to carve and turn complex forms, and so freestone was popular as a sculptural and monumental material. Morton, the eighteenth-century Northamptonshire historian, states:

The more homogeneous and uniform the matter that this Freestone consists of; and particularly the freer it is from a mixture of shells, and other extraneous things of bulk, the fitter it is for carving. In these regards the Freestone of Ketton in Rutland is excellent: and I cannot forbear to mention it, tho' belonging to another county (Morton 1712, 110).

Historical background

The principle manor of Ketton came into the hands of the Benyon family in 1631. Sir John Benyon, Bt, succeeded to the estate on the death of his father in 1775. He was MP for Evesham, and was created Baron Northwick in 1797. When he died in 1800,
the title and estates passed on to his son John and then after his death in 1859 to his nephew George Rushout-Bowles of Barford in Shropshire. George died without male issue and the title became extinct in 1887 (VCH Rutland II, 257-8). His estates, including the manor of Ketton, passed to his widow and then to her grandson Edward George Spencer Churchill. The Northwicks, who lived in Worcestershire, were absentee landlords, owning most of Ketton including the main quarries. In 1919 the Churchills broke up the Ketton estate and sold it.

The earliest reference to quarrying is in a royal charter of Edward I (1272-1307) granting 'the taking of stone' in Ketton (VCH Rutland II, 257-8; DE 2148/1/42-143); however, the location of these pits is not clear. The enclosure award and maps for Ketton Parish dated 28th January 1769 (DE1381/600) refer to old stone pits which were on Ketton Heath, the pits to the west near to Edith Weston quarry, local farm pits in and around the village centre, and the pits to the north-east between Ketton and Tinwell. Modern excavations have made the location of the latter impossible to determine although uneven award boundaries on the enclosure map imply their location. Part of this map is missing and although some pits are shown, it is likely that there were more pits further north in the region of the missing part of the map. These pits may have been used over several centuries and would have been shallow bell pits; they are recognisable by adjacent small hills and hollows, now grassed over. Many mounds can be found west of Pit Lane and at SK 973057 there is an artificial cave which was built by Castle Cement to replace existing drift mines, thus providing a new habitat for bats when the company wished to extend its operations (del Strother 2003, 72). Nearby is an old deep quarry with the working face still visible, part of which is now filled with water and is attractive to wildlife. It is a seventeenth century stone-pit extended when demand became greater. The 1769 enclosure map was amended in a different hand, indicating that the pits were extended to the east. The extension cannot be seen on the 1st edition 6in Ordnance Survey map of 1876, but records of the Ketton Cement Company together with Ketton deeds and estate papers including an 1875 map (DE2676) show that the quarry near the brickworks was later called Starts Hill pit; this was on the enclosure award plot no 149, Haggards Close Hill. This latter quarry was opened as a result of deterioration in the product from older quarries. T C Molesworth was by this time the major quarry owner in Ketton and he continued in business until the 1930s. He informed his prospective clients through an advertising sheet of the new excavation and the possibility of blocks of 'large dimensions and there is practically no limit to quantity'. A 1908 photograph reproduced in the Stamford Mercury (24th October 1980) shows a block of approximately 80 cu ft from Molesworth's quarry.

In addition to Molesworth, other names associated with twentieth century quarrying are Walker, Lewis, Wing and today André Vrona. Vrona has run Ketton Architectural Stone and Masonry since the late 1980s, having previously worked on the kilns at Castle Cement. Ketton Architectural Stone is a successful company with premises in Pit Lane where limestone from various sources including Ketton is cut using large circular saws. In recent years the company has supplied stone for the Queen's Building at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, the Southwark Gateway Monument in London, and the Millennium Tower at Bury St Edmund's Cathedral. Andréa Vrona informed the writer that occasionally Castle Cement finds a seam of freestone and they stop work whilst he extracts it using diesel machines.
Kelton freestone

A: pre-1768 pits; B: post-1824 pits; C: post-1906 pits; D: modern cement quarry.


Ketton stone is now used only for renovation work, and a small stock of the rough blocks can be seen in Vrona’s stock yard in Pit Lane.

**Working the quarries**

The 1861 census identifies Petre (Peter) Sharpe of the High Street as the surveyor of quarries. He was 65, married to Julia, 59, and had two daughters, Julia and Elizabeth. By 1871, Petre is not listed and may have moved home or died. Amongst his responsibilities would have been ensuring payment of commission based on cubic footage to the landlord, the payment of taxes, and the honest and safe working of the pits. The blocks were marked with the mark of the quarry-master and sometimes the individual quarryman’s mark, the cubic footage, and a mark indicating to whom royalties or commission were owed. In some cases, as with Thomas Nutt and the Earl of Gainsborough, the contact was direct between merchant and client; in others the quarry-master acted as an intermediary between them. In Ketton a number of marks have been identified, a typical example being **T XIII**, indicating a 13 cu ft block of freestone, quarried by Turner, the arrow...
In the nineteenth century the power source in quarries was manual labour – black powder, although used in some quarries, would have damaged the valuable freestone (Clifton-Taylor & Ireson 1983, 67). However in 1797 the *Stamford Mercury* (3rd February 1797, 3, col 2) stated that gunpowder was used in a 2:1 ratio with quicklime for blowing large stones to pieces. Steam power was utilised towards the end of the century but most photographic evidence is of the early twentieth century. The pits would have been dug to a depth of a few feet, and as work became difficult they would have been abandoned. The method was to clear the ground and to dig down using picks and shovels to reveal a stone face. A jadding pick or jad-pick was then used to create a wedge-pit or groove approximately 5–6in deep which was used as a guide for sawing vertically. The quarryman would then either use the natural bedding plane or create another wedge pit horizontally, into which wedges or wooden levers were placed to cleave the stone from the pit. An alternative and more efficient method was to drill a line of holes using a hand-held drill or spike, gradually hammering it in. Into each hole were placed two feathers (protective semicircular guides) between which a plug (wedge) was hammered in, probably indicates the bedding plane. Identification marks found at Ketton together with possible names are H – Hibbins, N – Nutter or Naylor, M – Molesworth, P – Perkins, T – Turner, and W – Wade (Goodwin 1994, 38). Such marks are quarry or merchant marks and identified quarry owners; they should not be confused with masons’ marks, which were symbols used by masons preparing the stone for building and enabled poor or incorrect work to be associated with the craftsman. In addition they formed part of a piecework system (Clifton-Taylor 1983, 93-4; Samuel 1977, 48-9, 61) in which workers were paid by results.

Where there was tunnelling the surveyor probably ensured that shoring was used and that water was controlled. In addition he would ensure that the pits were efficient, avoiding wastage through bad practice. The 1849 House of Commons Commission found that supervisors of mines were often illiterate and technically incompetent (*Parliamentary Papers 1893-4*, (C7237) LXXIII). Nothing is known of Sharpe in this respect; however, Ketton stone was a highly sought-after commodity, and it is likely that Lord Northwick employed a competent person. By 1861 the census no longer refers to a surveyor of quarries; however the 1861 White’s directory and the 1881 Kelly’s directory both list William Hercock as the surveyor of quarries, and the 1891 Kelly directory identifies John Keeble in post. It is possible that Hercock lived elsewhere and travelled into Ketton but no address is given in the directory. In the 1861 census William Turner of High Street is the quarry superintendent. It is not clear how this position differed from that of surveyor.

In the nineteenth century the power source in quarries was manual labour – black powder, although used in some quarries, would have damaged the valuable freestone (Clifton-Taylor & Ireson 1983, 67). However in 1797 the *Stamford Mercury* (3rd February 1797, 3, col 2) stated that gunpowder was used in a 2:1 ratio with quicklime for blowing large stones to pieces. Steam power was utilised towards the end of the century but most photographic evidence is of the early twentieth century. The pits would have been dug to a depth of a few feet, and as work became difficult they would have been abandoned. The method was to clear the ground and to dig down using picks and shovels to reveal a stone face. A jadding pick or jad-pick was then used to create a wedge-pit or groove approximately 5–6in deep which was used as a guide for sawing vertically. The quarryman would then either use the natural bedding plane or create another wedge pit horizontally, into which wedges or wooden levers were placed to cleave the stone from the pit. An alternative and more efficient method was to drill a line of holes using a hand-held drill or spike, gradually hammering it in. Into each hole were placed two feathers (protective semicircular guides) between which a plug (wedge) was hammered in,
gradually applying even pressure to each plug to split the stone along the required line, severing it from the quarry. Once freed, the block was raised using levers to enable a chain to be inserted around it; it was then raised and placed in an area for initial dressing or scappling using a hammer and chisel. Much of the mason’s skill lay in the angle at which the chisel was presented to the face and the force exerted by the hammer (Clifton-Taylor & Ireson 1983, 64-7).

The block would be placed on a cart for transportation to its nearby destination or to the river Welland at Stamford. Samuel states that limestone was transported by water and refers to complaints that canals were being overcrowded by the volume of limestone transport. Clifton-Taylor and Ireson refer to flatmen who used flat-bottomed boats on the rivers and dykes of the fens in East Anglia and suggest that the average annual value of limestone transported in this way during the mid-nineteenth century was £10,000 (ibid, 71-2). On 6th May 1831 Samuel Staniforth advertised in Drakard’s Stamford News, offering freestone blocks between 10 and 100 cu ft for sale with free transport on lighters on the River Nene at Wansford Bridge. Similarly on 7th July 1826 an item in the Stamford Mercury refers to Ketton stone being transported by land carriage to Wansford and thence to Bury St Edmunds on barges by river and land drain for the construction of Ickworth House. It is also worth noting that Francis Simpson and Sons of Stamford advertised in the Stamford Mercury on 24th May 1844 that they could deliver freestone by land carriage from Little Casterton Quarry at a rate of ‘One Halfpenny per Cubic Foot per Mile’ in addition to the price. They also specified that they were one mile from Stamford and the river Welland, six miles from Wansford and the river Nene, and ten miles from the Bourne Eau and from the Oakham Canal.

The railway was opened through Ketton in May 1848. It then became more convenient to transport the limestone by rail. There were sidings near the station but no link to the quarries during the nineteenth century. However fees were expensive and it is possible that water continued in use for a while. The limestone was transported by cart or sledge to the rail head, with small loads being hauled by two horses and larger weights by several pairs of oxen, these being more manageable than horses. There is evidence of an inclined plane with the track sleepers visible at SK 974056. This was possibly used to haul stone from the deeper part of the quarry for loading onto carts. Alternatively the railway or tramway may have been used to carry waste from the quarry to the spoil heap, which may have been an integral part of the incline.

### Stonemasons and Stone Merchants

During the nineteenth century quarrymen extracted stone on Northwick land. Some were self-employed, while others worked for stone merchants, farmers and masons, but no evidence has been found of any quarrymen working directly for the estate. Stone merchants / quarry masters leased quarries from the Northwick estate and employed men to work them (del Strother 2003, 80). In Portland in 1896, each small quarry was worked by four men who cleared the land and extracted the stone for about 10 or 12 shillings per tonne (Samuel 1977, 61). Although no records have been found for working practices in Ketton it is probable that a similar system existed there.

In 1830, Joseph Buckworth, Thomas Nutt, Joseph James Tallis, William Turner, Turner and Whitehead, and John Wade paid rent and royalties to the Northwick estate, and were quarry masters or stone merchants (DE2627). Some are referred to in the census returns as quarry owners, which may indicate that they owned a farm quarry (Samuel 1977, 29-30). In the 1851 census Wade, Nutt, and Turner were joined by Molesworth, Swingler and Hibbins. The 1851 census states that there were fourteen farmers in Ketton (Table 1), several of whom had more than one occupation. John Wade was a farmer (90 acres) but it is not clear whether he was involved in the stone industry. In 1846 White’s directory lists his son Richard as clerk of the quarries; however, in the 1861 census he is listed as a stonemason, aged 54 and living in High Street with his wife Harriet. By 1867 he is listed in Dolby’s Stamford Almanack as a stone agent. Richard’s son Thomas, aged 21, was a farmer and stone merchant in 1861 living in High Street with his wife, Mary, and their son and daughter. On the north side of St Mary’s Church, Ketton, there is the gravestone of Richard Wade, mason, who died on 25th November 1872 aged 65. It is distinctive, being a small dome-shaped piece of limestone approximately 18in high and 12in in diameter, lightly dressed with a small rectangular recess upon which the inscription is engraved.

Several other people record themselves with more than one trade. In 1851, Thomas Nutt was a farmer and stone merchant, and in 1861 Charles Hibbins and Thomas Perkins were innkeeper / publican and mason; the latter is also described in Dolby’s 1867 Stamford Almanack as a stone merchant and beer retailer. In 1871 George Hibbins was a stonemason and quarryman and Ann Clayton was a farmer and stonemason. This suggests that there may have been a degree of seasonality to the work and in particular that those involved in agriculture were able to take advantage of the opportunity offered by the presence
of freestone on the edge of the village.

The 1851 census lists nine stonemasons (Table 2). There were three Hibbins: Robert employed a boy, perhaps his son William, recorded as working at trade, indicating a son following in his father's footsteps. The Hibbins family was associated with quarrying and masonry work for several generations from 1785 to 1945 (Stamford Mercury, 30th March 1979). The gravestone of William Hibbins (1764-85) is near the lych gate of St Mary's Church; it is a fine representation of a tradesman's gravestone but quite worn and difficult to decipher, rococo in style with carvings of masons' tools. It is probable that it is William Hibbins who was mentioned in the 1768 enclosure award which refers to: No 64 Prebendary allotment, 15 acres 4 perches, allotted to Sir John Rushout, formerly belonging to the Prebendary and including a 'Ten acre piece occupied by Hibbins' (DE1381/600). Returning to Robert Hibbins (1805-1865), his gravestone is a Gothic Revival monument north of the church, after the style of Robert Gibbs of Oxford who introduced the idea of a pattern book for gravestones (Burgess 1979, 124-6). This grave marker has similarities in style to the monument erected in the main square in Banjul, Gambia, which he carved for HM 1st West India Regiment to commemorate officers who died of yellow fever in 1859 (Stamford Mercury, 26th Oct & 2nd Nov 1979).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farmer</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Labourers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Hornbucle Betts</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Buckworth</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bunning</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Brocklehurst</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Green</td>
<td>Smallholder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Hunt</td>
<td>Smallholder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Nutt</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Osborn</td>
<td>Smallholder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Stranger</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>5 + 2 boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Swingler</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>6 + 6 boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Turner</td>
<td>Smallholder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wade</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Wilford</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Whincup</td>
<td>Smallholder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Farmers in Ketton in the 1851 census.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>1851 age yrs</th>
<th>1861 age yrs</th>
<th>1871 age yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hibbins</td>
<td>94 High St</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hibbins</td>
<td>94 High St</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Naylor</td>
<td>2 The Green</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Gilbert</td>
<td>21 Aldgate</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Shaw</td>
<td>155 High St</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hibbins</td>
<td>96 High St</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Naylor</td>
<td>229 Aldgate</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Perkins</td>
<td>140 High St</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Perkins</td>
<td>180 High St</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Gilbert</td>
<td>210 Aldgate</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Perkins</td>
<td>140 High St</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Perkins</td>
<td>180 High St</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Parry</td>
<td>206 Aldgate</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Medwell</td>
<td>12 The Green</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hibbins</td>
<td>8 High St</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Perkins</td>
<td>140 High St</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Perkins</td>
<td>111 High St</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Perkins</td>
<td>130 High St</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Stafford</td>
<td>58 High St</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Clayton</td>
<td>26 High St</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Clitherow</td>
<td>203 Aldgate</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. 1851, 1861, 1871 census returns for Ketton stonemasons (— in the age column indicates that the individual does not appear in that year). Numbers in addresses refer to the enumerators' entries, not street numbers.
Thomas Naylor, married to Ruth, had one son living at home, John, aged 19, who was a ‘balder’ (builder), further evidence of continuity of trade. It should be noted that Ruth gave birth to John when she was 45 years old.

Of those masons recorded in 1851 all appeared in the 1861 census (Table 2). Thomas Naylor was recorded as ‘late mason’, suggesting possible retirement; he had moved and lived alone, indicating that Ruth may have died. Thomas’s son Joseph was married to Ann; both were masons. Robert the son of Thomas Perkins of the Barley Mow was a mason. The older William Hibbins had moved to Little Lane. By 1861 there was a 55% increase in masons in Ketton. This was the decade in which Thomas Nutt increased his business as a stone merchant (see below).

By 1871 (Table 2), Robert Hibbins was no longer in the census, having died in 1865. Robert and Mary’s son George was a mason and was digging his own stone from the pits. Thomas Naylor, James Gilbert and James Parry have also disappeared from the records.

The 1861 census and Drake’s directory of the same year list Beaumont Clayton, aged 41, living with Ann his wife at 38 High Street, as a farmer and stone merchant. Dolby’s 1867 *Stamford Almanack* lists Mrs Clayton on her own, and the 1871 census shows Ann Clayton as a farmer and stone merchant continuing with the business alone. Whether Ann did the work herself or employed someone is not clear; however there is evidence of women serving apprenticeships in stone masonry in the eighteenth century (Pinchbeck 1930, 286). Snell (1987, eh 6) discusses in detail the apprenticeship of women and suggests that this had not entirely ended by the nineteenth century. Whilst the 1842 Mines Act prevented women working underground it would not have prevented Ann Clayton from being a stone merchant.

Thomas Perkins (married to Mary) and Robert now had John working with them. Thomas and Prudence Perkins’ son James, first recorded in 1851 at the age of 2 and their seventh surviving child, was now a stonemason. His brother Charles was also a stonemason, residing in High Street.

Even with losses through death the numbers of masons had increased by 89% between 1851 and 1861 and 21% between 1861 and 1871. Despite a declining rate stonemasonry was still expanding. This may have been driven by Victorian middle class wealth and desire to build country houses for industrialists and public buildings. In 1865 *The Builder* devoted a special section to town halls and

---

**Table 3. Stone Merchants in late nineteenth century directories and census returns.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census 1831</th>
<th>Drake 1861</th>
<th>Census 1861</th>
<th>Barker 1866</th>
<th>Census 1871</th>
<th>White 1877</th>
<th>Kelly 1881</th>
<th>Census 1881</th>
<th>Census 1891</th>
<th>Kelly 1895</th>
<th>Wright 1895</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

exchanges. Raphael Samuel supports this view, stating that:

*Urban growth in the nineteenth century produced a multiplication of quarries, quite apart from the increase of building in the stone districts themselves. Public buildings, such as new post offices, museums and town halls, were distinguished by the heaviness and abundance of their masonry* (Samuel 1977, 14, 82).

It should not go without mention that the railways themselves incorporated a great deal of stone in their station buildings, some of which was from Ketton, for example Ketton station (Goodwin 1994, 56) and Wansford station (Biddle 2003, 196). The railway increased the distance that stone could be taken, shortened journey times, and enabled hitherto inaccessible places to be reached. Later it will be shown that Thomas Nutt supplied stone to Norwich, London and Oxford as well as places in between and that most of his customers had a railway depot nearby.

The 1891 census indicated a decline in the number of stonemasons. Joseph Naylor, Charles Perkins and William Stafford were still working, whilst some individuals had disappeared and others had changed their occupation; for example George Hibbins now styled himself stone merchant. The 1891 census recorded 26 quarry labourers, suggesting increased activity since 1851 when four labourers were recorded.

Table 3 offers a résumé of stone merchants recorded in the census and local directories. This is indicative of stone still being extracted but used elsewhere, suggesting the need for more stone merchants and fewer local stonemasons in the middle of the century but with a gradual decline towards the end of the century. The difficulty however is in relying upon the information in the census; some authors (Higgs 1973, 27-9; Mills & Schurer 1973, 136-8) identify a number of amplifications and modifications by householders and suggest that this may have been a marketing strategy, though how this would promote them if the records were closed is obscure.

Thomas Nutt described himself as a farmer, quarryman, quarry owner and stone merchant, but it seems likely that he relied primarily on stone quarrying and selling activities. Indeed his daybook from 1856 to 1868, described in detail below, suggests that he was involved in an extremely lucrative trade. In 1851 he was living in High Street. By this time he was 48, having been born in Uppingham in 1803. He was married to Susannah, aged 43, who was born in Ketton, and at the time they had five surviving children, Mary Ann (16), Julia (11), Robert George (9), William Thomas (7) and Alfred (5). Thomas had a brother, George (42), who was a freestone digger and was married to Ann from Yarwell in Northamptonshire. They had a daughter, Emma (19), who was the schoolmistress. The Nutt monument on the north side of the church shows Alfred dying on 30th April 1858 aged 12, and also commemorates the death of seven other children who died in infancy. Mary Ann married Charles Hibbins, the son of the grocer, postmaster and census enumerator, she died in
Worcester on 8th August 1868 aged 34 and was interred at Ketton. Susannah Nutt, their mother, died on 15th March 1875 aged 68. Thomas survived his wife by three years, dying on 9th November 1878 aged 75. Thomas left behind two interesting and unique records of his life and business, a conveyance for the purchase of land and a daybook recording some of the transactions of his stone merchant business. Both of these are discussed below.

Mills & Schurer (1973) suggest that the social status of a farmer was higher than that of a trader or quarryman. The Nutt family may have preferred to use the title farmer rather than stone merchant. The son Robert tends not to call himself a stone merchant in the census returns. The directories for Rutland (Table 3) show a different picture from that in the census. They indicate more stone merchants; perhaps there was an advantage in using the title stone merchant in that context – they would have gained financially from stating all of their businesses. This supports the notion of multiple occupations, for it is clear that farming, stone quarrying, stone selling and masonry were linked and that individuals moved between each occupation. As well as seasonal effects this was also due to trade fluctuations and to the success of the activity. In addition the individual’s primary focus would have determined which activity took preceedenets. Snell states that there was seasonal unemployment for men between May and October in the locality in the mid-nineteenth century (Snell 1987, 19-22). This, it is stated, was due to enclosure and a more scientific approach to farming, with the use of fertilisers and machinery reducing the need for continuous employment and causing considerable poverty.

There is some difficulty in identifying quarry labourers. In 1861 twenty individuals identify themselves in the census returns as quarry labourers; in 1851 four labourers, one freestone digger, one stone breaker and one pitsman were listed, while in later years labourers are less specific. Goodwin (1994, 58) suggests that in 1851 there were 68 labourers associated with building and fitting, but examination of the enumerator’s return does not directly support this, for although there are large numbers of labourers their particular industry is not always identified. Samuel suggests that quarrymen in the nineteenth century were largely invisible. He states:

The census records 60,000 of them in 1891. Yet within four years of the passage of the Quarries Act in 1894, no fewer than 134,478 persons were registered as being in quarrying employment - a figure which on the evidence of the mines inspectors themselves, must have represented only about half the total number (Samuel 1977, 4).

Samuel emphasises the absence of records indicating the numbers in this occupation and states that after the introduction of the Act better statistics were available. The Quarries Act 1894 refers to the first legislation for the protection of workers in the quarrying industry and in particular controls the employment of women and children. Samuel also suggests that quarry workers were migratory; however in Ketton this is likely to have been only partially true. Freestone working requires skilled labour and there would have been considerable advantages in retaining a core work force of labourers. Labourers employed from the migrant population may have carried out the quarrying of lower grade stone. A note in the Thomas Nutt file for 23rd August 1879 indicated a weekly wage to farm labourer Luke Burrows of a sum of 1s 2d, to J Burrows 1s 6d, and to N Burrows 1s 9d; others were paid less, with an overall average of 1s 0d per week. Comparing these wages with various texts (Snell 1985, 416; Cole 1938, 352; Mingay 1976, 73; Thirk 1989, 85), it may be deduced that Nutt paid above the average wage for the time and locality. Nutt’s wages may have been inflated due to the success of his stone business and in order to keep workers on the farm, when they might have been tempted to move to more lucrative occupations.
Another note in Nutt’s file dated 16th August pays a similar amount to agricultural workers but also records wages to quarrymen of £4 0s 0d to Freeman & Co and £3 8s 0d to Mark Brown & Co. The latter may have been Mark Brown and his son William recorded in the 1871 census. If this is so then quarrymen were probably paid significantly more than agricultural workers; however it is not clear, and there is no knowledge of how many hours they worked or of the tasks they carried out.

**Thomas Nutt’s Archive**

Those who were involved in the stone industry fit into three categories: upper class landowners, of whom Lord Northwick is the most important; other minor gentry and farm owners, who fit into the second or intermediate class along with the masons and stone merchants; and labourers. The first two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No of customers</th>
<th>No of orders</th>
<th>Cu.ft of freestone</th>
<th>Loads of ballast</th>
<th>Average Cu.ft per order</th>
<th>Mass estimate in tons</th>
<th>Cart journeys estimate</th>
<th>Total annual income from stone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pt.1856</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt.1868</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>124.8</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5976</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10138</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16676</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>166.8</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6985</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>18812</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>118.3</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>1781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>10078</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8726</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>10975</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>10634</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>10200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>7286</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1857-1867</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>116486</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6600</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>10706</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean 1857-1867</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>10590</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Data from Thomas and Robert Nutt’s Day Book
(Note: 1856 and 1868 are not full years, hence they are not included in the totals).

categories were wealthy, owning property and taking a lead in village life. For example the Chairman of the first Parish Council under the 1894 Parish Councils Act was Mr T C Molesworth, stone merchant. The Vice-Chairman was Mr Robert Nutt, stone merchant, his brother William was also on the same council (Kelly 1895), and by 1905 Mr R G Nutt was Chairman (Dolby's Stamford Almanack, 1905).

Thomas Nutt was one of six Ketton quarry masters / stone merchants who paid rent and royalties to the Northwick estate in the 1830s (DE 2627). In 1834 he advertises that he has opened a freestone quarry and has superior freestone for sale (Stamford Mercury, 17th Oct 1834, 3, col 4). In 1877 seven stone merchants were advertising in local directories, one of whom was Nutt (White 1877). It is fortunate for the historian that Thomas Nutt and his sons Robert and William left a record of some of their transactions (DE3369). Their archive includes a conveyance of a farm and land to Thomas, a daybook, a note regarding Thomas Nutt’s death and other miscellaneous items of paper. The daybook is a card and paper bound book approximately 8 x 6 x 1 inches in dimension; it lists the daily dealings of Thomas, Robert and William and is mostly concerned with stone sales. It spans the period from 18th June 1856 to 21st November 1868 and lists by year, month and day the amount of stone sold, to whom and at what cost. Table 4 shows a transcript of a selection of details from the daybook together with an estimated mass in tons, and extracts from it are reproduced in figs. 5 and 6. Partway through the book, orderliness seems to be abandoned and the latter part of the book is used in a rather ad hoc fashion, perhaps indicating a decline in the stone business or the loss of influence of Thomas. These jottings, which extend into the 1870s, include some references to farming, which appears to be William’s main activity. Thomas Nutt lived in High Street, Ketton, in 1851 and farmed 200 acres, the sixth largest farm in the village; however in the census and directories he is styled farmer and stone
merchant, and from his daybook it is also clear that he had a carting business. In 1873 Nutt purchased land from Henry Noel amounting to 109 acres 39 perches. It included several buildings and a brickyard, as well as several allotments under tenure for which an annual rent was paid of £297 17s 5d. This entire holding would have made Nutt the second largest independent farmer in the village, always assuming that the other farmers had not also increased their holdings. From the daybook it is clear that during the middle to latter part of the nineteenth century, stone quarrying was a significant part of his business, to the extent that in 1851 he employed twelve labourers, half of whom were primarily working in the stone business. Robert Nutt owned a thrashing machine; indeed the ownership of this and other

Fig. 5. Extract from Thomas Nutt’s daybook, showing stone supplied to customers in Ely, Stamford, Leicester, Thrapston and Oakham in February 1868 (ROLLR DE3369/1).
machines may have enabled the Nutts to redirect their workforce whilst making their farm more efficient and thus competitive. The machine initially comes to light in Kelly’s 1871 directory as ‘Robert Nutt, machine owner’ and later in the 1891 directory as ‘thrashing machine owner’. Clearly Robert diversified, perhaps anticipating a reduction in the stone market. There is no indication of any subversive anti-mechanisation rioting (often referred to as ‘The Swing’: Hobsbawm 1968) or machine breaking in Ketton in the earlier part of the century and even Stamford appears to have escaped, the nearest activities being at Warmington, Elton, Yaxley and Sawtry. Nevertheless it is possible that Robert Nutt wanted to keep a low profile for fear of loss or antagonism towards his family.

Thomas Nutt acquired part of his land on 4th February 1873, buying the freehold to a farm on the north side of the High Street together with tenancy agreements from the Hon Henry Lewis Noel, the Rev Horace George Noel and Thomas Laxton. The purchase price was £7,600, giving Nutt the freehold of the property. It appears that the Noels held the land in tenure for 40 and 80 years from Laxton but the conveyance (DE3369/6) indicates that the property would be conveyed free of all encumbrances, including tithes and other responsibilities to the church. It is possible that he had a quarry on this land – indeed the 1886 25in Ordnance Survey map (sheet X.15 field no 225) does show evidence of pits in this area – as well as renting from the Northwick estate: hence his claim to be a quarry owner.
Considering the mass of stone moved, if the figures are extrapolated backwards using a five-year moving average (Table 5) Thomas Nutt is likely to have sold in the region of 582 tons of stone in 1846. Considering these figures it can be seen that Nutt had approximately 10-12% of the stone market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tonnage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Extrapolated tonnage of Thomas Nutt's business based on 5-point moving average using 1857–1861 data.

Based on the figure of 4,750 tons of freestone being sent from Lord Northwick's quarries in that year. Thus Nutt had a significant portion of the stone business in Ketton and the destination of his stone is likely to be representative of the total. By summing the individual order prices, it can be seen that even without his income from farming, which is unknown, he had an income of some magnitude and it is likely that his total income would have enabled the purchase of the land from Henry Noel, after which he would also have had the aforementioned rents. The price per cubic foot varied considerably and this is indicative of the variation in both the size and quality of the blocks. Table 7 lists the variation in these prices.

**Thomas Nutt's customers**

In this final section an attempt has been made to identify some of the buildings in which Ketton stone was used. A selection (Table 6) was taken from Nutt's daybook and used as a basis for examining nineteenth century buildings in a range of places including villages, towns and cities. The criteria used were colour and texture, using a hand lens, together with supporting sources of local people and historians as well as both local and national texts. The exercise was inevitably speculative, and it should be pointed out that it represents only a proportion of Nutt's customers, but does provide an insight into the Ketton stone trade.

In Ketton the Nutts did not sell a great deal of stone. A small quantity of stone was purchased by various stonemasons, possibly for grave stones and for the repair of seventeenth and eighteenth century cottages in the village. Major new work would have been carried out by stonemasons who had their own quarries such as Hibbins, Swingler and Molesworth. Mr Burman placed six orders in 1859, which could have been for a substantial building. In 1882, 1883 and 1884 the surveyors of Ketton's main roads ordered several loads of granite, one of which was for 28 tons 10cwt.

In Lyddington Hugh and Robert Clarke (fig. 6) were customers of Thomas Nutt, both being listed in Kelly's directory as stonemasons. Robert's grave is in Lyddington churchyard: he died on 18th April 1871 aged 83. In addition nearby Uppingham, whose buildings are also mostly of ironstone with limestone architraves, quoins and other mouldings, received limestone from Nutt amounting to 60 tons. It is worth noting that towns and villages in the ironstone area often used limestone in parts of buildings exposed to the weather to protect them, limestone being more wear resistant than ironstone.

In Exton the Noel family (Earls of Gainsborough) still own Exton Hall. A new house at Exton and alterations to Ketton Hall was commissioned from architect John Linnell Bond in 1810. On the face of it this was too early for Nutt's involvement; however much of the work at Exton was carried out after the death of Gerard Noel between 1851 and 1853 under the control of the architect Henry Roberts (Noel 2004, 91-2). His son Charles Noel ordered over 200 tons of freestone from Nutt. This may have been for the work on the hall or for the chapel which was begun in 1857 and completed in 1858.

Edith Weston had its own quarry, with virtually identical freestone, and it is not clear why stone was bought from Nutt. Henry Stones, stonemason, ordered large amounts annually over a six-year period and may have been involved in a significant project, drawing supplies from several sources. Edith Weston Grange, built in 1855, and the two sets of cottages at Well Cross appear to be of freestone. Richard Lucas Esq, Lord of the Manor, purchased four loads of stone for personal use on his own property. A Mr Nutt (possibly a relative of Thomas Nutt) only ordered one load, and this may have been for jobbing building or for headstones.

In Stamford, Tinkler (fig. 5), Beach and Gilbert ordered 30 tons, but there is no evidence as to where it was used. However it is likely that this amount was possibly for repairs and maintenance to such buildings as the Shambles portico, St Michael's Church, Burleigh House or the Stamford Hotel, all of which are in part Ketton stone. The latter was also designed by Bond for Gerard Noel in 1810 (Noel 2004, 91-2). Bassendine's order was for one headstone. Joseph Norman of Star Lane, Bourne, and Abraham Blackwell of Rippingale were both listed in
Kelton freestone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Orders</th>
<th>Cu.ft.</th>
<th>Ton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarke Hugh</td>
<td>Lyddington</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke Rob'</td>
<td>Lyddington</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Henry</td>
<td>Lyddington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drake &amp; Son</td>
<td>Uppingham</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel Henry</td>
<td>Exton</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3687</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stones</td>
<td>Edith Weston</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>Edith Weston</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutt</td>
<td>Edith Weston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinkler</td>
<td>Stamford</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassendine</td>
<td>Stamford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Bourne</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>Rippingale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>N Walsham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9849</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blow</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>Downham Mkt.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>Downham Mkt.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomson</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>10366</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2056</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naylor</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell &amp; Son</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willshire</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball &amp; Son</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside?</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>Ely</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>Ely</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Ely</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman</td>
<td>Ely</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capron</td>
<td>Southwick</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2673</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peplow</td>
<td>Southwick</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>Oundle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rippiner</td>
<td>Oundle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>Ely</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>Ely</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Ely</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman</td>
<td>Ely</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. A random selection of customers, destinations and quantities delivered by Thomas and Robert Nutt.

Kelly’s directory (1892, 584-5) as builders. Between them eleven orders were placed, too large an amount going to one location to be solely for grave markers. Rippingale is a village with nineteenth century red-brick buildings inset with the coat of arms of the Earl of Ancaster in limestone, which may have been from Nutt. These buildings are similar in style to those in Empingham, one of the Earl’s closed villages.

In Norfolk there were a number of destinations for Nutt’s stone, the furthest being North Walsham. Mr Moore (fig. 6) ordered 16 tons for this red-brick market town, where there is little evidence of stone except in the 15th century parish church dedicated to St Nicholas, the largest wool church in Norfolk, known for its damaged tower and beautifully carved south porch. It was originally built of Caen stone transported across the English Channel in barges; however subsequent repairs may be of Ketton stone. The council offices in New Street, which are not on the 1814 map of the town, were converted from an eighteenth century house in the mid-nineteenth century, when the new wing was added (Pevsner 1975, 626). It is of brick with stone details, being typically middle to late nineteenth century in style; when examined with a hand lens the stone is identifiable as a shell-free limestone. A special note in Nutt’s daybook records the purchase of 173 cubic feet of stone (at 1s 11d per foot) by North Walsham council in 1869, and this was probably used for the council offices. The North Walsham elementary school (fig. 7) was built to comply with the requirements of the 1870 Forster Act requiring councils to provide education. The first phase of the building on the corner of Marshgate and Hall Lane was completed in 1874 and is Victorian Neo-Gothic, of red brick with limestone quoins, window and door dressings. The limestone is of fine quality with a homogeneous oolitic structure but with a small amount of shell, and could be of Ketton freestone. It
seems reasonable to suppose that the council would have used the same supplier for this new project. Also worthy of note and of a similar style are the Methodist Chapel in Grammar School Road of 1890 and the police station in Old Yarmouth Road of 1903, both of which have freestone details to an otherwise red-brick structure.

The railway to North Walsham passes through Thorpe St Andrew on the outskirts of Norwich, where Horace Lacey, one of two Norwich builders, had his works in the Station Yard; his office was at 11 Upper King Street in the city. The second Lacey was James Wilkin Lacey, Blackfriars Wharf, St Andrews, Norwich, close to the city centre. One or other of these two was Thomas Nutt’s customer but it is difficult to determine where the stone was used. The order was for 550 tons over five consecutive years between 1862 and 1867 and must have been part of a major project. In Thorpe St Andrew a large lunatic asylum was built in 1857 by John Brown; this was mostly of brick with freestone portico and detailing. The southern part is now apartments with the north being retained by the health service. In Norwich many commercial buildings had classical frontages added, and in 1863 St Andrew’s church and hall were restored and limestone altar rails and reredos were added to the church. Examination of records and buildings suggest that one of these may have been the destination for Nutt’s stone.

Downham Market is on a rise above the Fens and close to the River Great Ouse. William J Donthom was a prolific architect in the mid-nineteenth century in this area and was involved in both Neo-Gothic and Neo-Tudor work, including workhouses (among them that for Oakham) and several country houses. It is possible that Ketton freestone was used in some of these. William Laurie (fig. 6) of Queens Gate was an ecclesiastical builder and stonemason. He placed fourteen orders amounting to 1,498 cubic feet; and part of this in 1860 was for two loads in 124 pieces at 2s 3d per foot, ledgered and sawn; these can be estimated as the volume of a headstone, window sill or door-step. The remainder is not specified in detail but in 1867 he placed six orders for 620 cubic feet, which may have been for the limestone detail of the carrstone cottage and two chapels in the cemetery. Thomas Bennett and his son William were builders and stone merchants living in Railway Road and they may have had some involvement with railway buildings. Their eleven orders were spread fairly evenly over six years at about 11 tons per annum. This was not a huge quantity and could have only been used for detail work, typically seen in buildings.

Table 7. Range of prices recorded per cubic foot for stone charged by Thomas and Robert Nutt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1s 0d</th>
<th>1s 8d</th>
<th>1s 9d</th>
<th>1s 10d</th>
<th>2s 0d</th>
<th>2s 3d</th>
<th>2s 5d</th>
<th>2s 6d</th>
<th>3s 0d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 7. North Walsham elementary school (photo: author).
such as Donthorn’s Tudor-style workhouse of 1836, now called Howdale Home. Thomas and William are buried in the cemetery along with several other members of their family.

The most notable building in Norfolk to use Ketton stone is Sandringham House, the home of Albert Edward, Prince of Wales, and today the winter retreat of Queen Elizabeth II. In 1870 the new house, designed by A J Humbert and built by Goggs Brothers of Swaffham, was built of red-brown local carrstone and brick with Ketton freestone embellishments.

To the south is the city of Ely, where another of Donthorn’s Union Workhouses reflects the west front of the magnificent Gothic Cathedral dedicated to the Holy Trinity. To the rear of the south-west transept of the cathedral is the semicircular chapel of St Catherine (fig. 9), rebuilt in 1860 by Professor Willis. This together with other renovation work in the mid-nineteenth century was of Ketton freestone. Pearson, Powell, Wood (fig. 5) and Freeman ordered 230 tons of limestone from Thomas Nutt and this may have been used in the chapel.

Mr Tomson of Cambridge (fig. 6) took delivery of more stone from Nutt than anyone else and was also consistent with regular orders. In addition there were ten other customers from Cambridge importing a total of around 20,000 cubic feet (1,100 tons), some of which must have been used in major projects, for example Trinity Chapel (1868-73) and Peterhouse (1872) by Sir Giles Gilbert Scott. Some work was done to the east range of Downing College in 1873 and the stone may have been supplied by Robert Nutt. It was not until 1931 that further building at Downing College was carried out, again in Ketton stone. By this time the Molesworth family were the major quarry owners and suppliers of stone from Ketton. Later additions to Downing College in 1950, 1959, 1961 and 1969 were all of Ketton stone. The use of Ketton stone in Cambridge is well documented, and included the following:

- Wren’s Library, 1676-95
- Chapel Pembroke, 1663-64
- Chapel Emmanuel, 1668-72
- Christ’s South Gate, 1738
- Christ’s Court, 1758-61
- Trinity Hall, 1743-45
- Peterborough House, 1738
- Corpus Christi, 1823
- Kings, 1824-28
- Trinity, 1825

West of Peterborough is the village of Southwick, where the Rt Hon George Capron lived, having bought the Hall on 21st March 1834. Bailey (1973, 405-6) states that the courtyard buildings are mid-nineteenth century, as are the three Gothic windows to the west end of the medieval block (Pevsner 1973, 405). These constructions would have fitted in well with the purchase of 112 tons of freestone from Nutt in 1864.

Anthony Rippener, of North Street, Oundle, stonemason, ordered one load in 1865. Rippener’s brother Joseph, aged 7 (d.1818), their sister Ann, aged 10 (d.1818), and four others who died in infancy are buried in Oundle churchyard; the headstone is of good quality, probably Ketton limestone. This headstone is likely to have been made by their father Samuel, a well-known local stonemason who died in 1832 and is buried with his wife Ann in a grave next to their children. The parents’ headstone records Samuel’s occupation and may have been carved by Anthony, although rather light in colour to be Ketton limestone. Many other gravestones in the churchyard display the familiar pink tinge and lack of shell associated with Ketton stone. Also William Howe and Son, North Street, Oundle, bought 16 tons of stone from Nutt. Many of the buildings of Oundle School are of limestone, for example School House (1887), and Laxton Grammar School (same foundation as Oundle School) has its main buildings adjacent to the churchyard (1881-5). The Oundle Union Workhouse was erected in 1836, designed by Sir Giles Gilbert Scott and built of red brick with limestone details. Nearby is the workhouse chapel.
designed by Sir Ninian Comper and built in 1896 of Ketton limestone.

These customers mainly illustrate the extent to which Thomas Nutt supplied his stone eastwards. Others, like Mr Barfield of Leicester (fig. 5) to the west, are also to be found in the day-book.

Returning to Ketton, a survey of the main thoroughfares shows a village mostly of limestone with many seventeenth century cottages; however there are also some notable nineteenth century houses. The Firs at the east end of High Street was the home of the Molesworth family, who were involved in stone quarrying and farming but expanded into brewing, becoming a wealthy local family. Sadly the house appears deserted today with shutters at the windows and part of the garden being built upon to extend a care home. Further east is the White Hart Inn, now a private house, with a date stone of 1848. Moving to the opposite end of the village there is Hibbins House, but also on The Green amongst earlier seventeenth and eighteenth cottages are a few nineteenth-century houses.

Conclusion

Quarrying of limestone in Ketton has been carried out over many centuries. In particular, after the demise of the Barnack quarries in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Ketton stone was used across a wide area from London to Nottingham and across a wide expanse of East Anglia. Some of the most famous destinations were the colleges of Cambridge and Oxford, the Houses of Parliament, St Paul's Cathedral, and the cathedrals of Ely and Peterborough. It should also be noted that there is some evidence of Ketton limestone being used in the Roman remains at St Albans. However here much of the focus is on the vernacular use of the stone, especially during the nineteenth century when the use of limestone as a building material was being challenged by the mass production of bricks in such places as Fletton. In the nineteenth century Ketton freestone was used in the repair, maintenance and extension of village churches and great cathedrals, and in the grave markers that surrounded them. It was used in the building and repair of cottages and classical mansions. However, a new use was emerging. In the Victorian era much of the stone was used to frame windows and doors and as quoins in the otherwise brick structures of commercial buildings, factory frontages, banks and railway buildings. Much of the extraction and transportation relied on manual labour but the development of steam had begun to make these tasks easier. One can see through the details in his day-book, local directories and the census enumerators’ returns that Thomas Nutt, his sons and other stone merchants in Ketton were able to transport their stone considerable distances, in large quantities and with comparative ease compared with previous centuries. The village was able to continue to prosper even though the stone quarries were beginning to decline and brick building was becoming increasingly popular. As a group, the stone people formed a sub-set of the community, providing an important contribution to the village revenue. Stone was not the only activity in Ketton; there was also involvement in agriculture, brewing, trading and transport, all of which formed links with other places. Ketton in the nineteenth century was an open village with an absentee landlord and an outward-looking and entrepreneurial population trading on its natural resource.
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The Returns to the 1851 Religious Census by the Rutland parishes in the Stamford registration district.

At the time of the 1851 Religious Census the majority of Rutland parishes were included in the Oakham and Uppingham registration districts, and the rest were in the Stamford registration district. The returns to the Oakham and Uppingham districts have been transcribed and discussed previously. This paper deals with the places of worship in the remaining parishes, and by combining their data with that from the parishes already reviewed it is possible to give a picture of accommodation and attendance in churches and chapels for the whole of the county of Rutland.

**Introduction**

The purpose of the religious census was to assess how far the provision of accommodation in all places of worship in England and Wales had kept up with the requirements of an increasing population. Thus the most important questions in the census concerned the available seating in each church or chapel and the attendance on a particular Sunday, 30th March 1851. The background to the census and the way in which it was conducted are described in a previous paper (Tomalin 2002), which also gives details of papers dealing with the census results in nearby districts.

The previous paper dealt with the returns to the registration districts of Oakham and Uppingham, which covered most of the Rutland parishes. The boundaries of these registration districts were based on the Poor Law districts and did not correspond with the county boundary. They included some parishes in the adjacent counties of Leicestershire and Northamptonshire, and excluded the Rutland parishes of Great Casterton, Little Casterton, Clapham, Essendine, Ketton, Pickwell, Ryhall, Tinwell and Tixover on the eastern edge of the county. These latter Rutland parishes were in the Stamford (Lincolnshire) registration district.

In this paper the returns for the Rutland parishes in the Stamford registration district have been transcribed. Also, the accommodation and attendance figures have been combined with the results from the other Rutland parishes to give figures covering all parishes in the county of Rutland. The Evangelical Dissenters and the Reformed Methodists are not referred to as they were only found in the Leicestershire and Northamptonshire parishes.

**The Transcription of the Returns**

The original returns for the Stamford registration district are at the National Archives, reference HO 129/421. These are bound in random order of parish but for convenience they have been presented in alphabetical order in the transcription. The sequential reference number given to each in the original volumes has been quoted alongside the heading of the entry.

The headings show the parish and the name of the place of worship given in the return. For the Church of England the name is the dedication if given or ‘Parish Church’ if not.

Where there are blank or nil entries in returns the sections concerned have been ignored in the transcription. The average attendance quoted is for twelve months. The address of the respondent is given only if he lived elsewhere than in the parish concerned. In addition, a list of the respondents and their places of worship is given in Table 1.

**The Responses to the Census**

Of the five types of form available for the census, which are illustrated in the previous paper, only two were required for the parishes concerned, the standard Church of England form and the standard non-conformist form (see Figs.1 and 2). There were eleven returns from the nine parishes, a Church of England return from each and in addition Wesleyan Methodist returns from chapels at Pickwell and Ryhall.

The accommodation and attendance information had been completed in most of the returns, the exceptions being the return from Tixover, which gave no information on sittings, and those from Ketton parish church and Pickworth Methodists, which did not provide attendance data.

**Information from the Census**

From the information in the returns it is possible to see how much seating, both free and not free, was provided in the places of worship, the relative attendances at parish churches and non-conformist chapels, and the number of Sunday scholars. The
### Table 1 – List of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Place of Worship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arnold, Charles</td>
<td>Rector</td>
<td>All Saints, Tinwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlay, Henry</td>
<td>Rector</td>
<td>St Peter &amp; St Paul, Bridge Casterton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett, G H</td>
<td>Curate</td>
<td>All Saints, Pickworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis, George</td>
<td>Leader &amp; Steward</td>
<td>Wesleyan Chapel, Ryhall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimes, John</td>
<td>Steward</td>
<td>Wesleyan Methodist, Pickworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petchett, Charles</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>St Mary, Essendine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petchett, Charles</td>
<td>Vicar</td>
<td>St John, Ryhall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twopeny, T Nowell</td>
<td>Rector</td>
<td>All Saints, Little Casterton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake, B</td>
<td>Vicar</td>
<td>Parish Church, Ketton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake, B</td>
<td>Vicar</td>
<td>Parish Church, Tixover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, John</td>
<td>Rector</td>
<td>St Mary, Clipsham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2 - Accommodation

- = no return for a place of worship  * = entry missing or illegible  WM = Wesleyan Methodists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sittings</th>
<th>Free / Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>C of E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Casterton</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clipsham</td>
<td>264 note</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essendine</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketton</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Casterton</td>
<td>119 note</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickworth</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryhall</td>
<td>1075 note</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinwell</td>
<td>287 note</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tixover</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes to Table 2**

*Clipsham:* In the parish church the free sittings exclude forms and stools, and of the other sittings 106 were in the church and 10 in the chancel.

*Little Casterton:* In the parish church the free sittings are recorded as 14 x 6 = 84, and the other sittings as 9 x 6 = 54, suggesting the allocation of sittings was on the basis of six-seater pews.

*Ryhall:* The population in 1851 included 285 labourers temporarily present, employed on the works of the Great Northern Railway *VCH Rutland I, 231*.

*Tinwell:* In the parish church the free sittings included 24 for children.

### Table 3 – Attendance on 30th March 1851

- = no return for a place of worship  * = entry missing or illegible  WM = Wesleyan Methodists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total Attendance</th>
<th>Sunday School Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>C of E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Casterton</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clipsham</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essendine</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketton</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Casterton</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickworth</td>
<td>157 note</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryhall</td>
<td>1075 note</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinwell</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tixover</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes to Table 3**

*Pickworth:* Although the Steward of the Wesleyan Methodist Chapel gave no estimate of attendance on 30th March, he entered a figure of 40 for the average number attending.

*Ryhall:* For the population, see note on Table 2.
census figures for accommodation and attendance for each parish are shown in Tables 2 and 3. The population given in the 1851 population census (House of Commons 1852-53) has been included in the tables.

As can be seen from the transcriptions, the census also provided some information about the history of the church or chapel, details of endowments, and in two cases there were additional remarks by the respondent.

**Accommodation**

*In relation to Population*

The population of the nine parishes was 3,763. However, as the vicar of Tixover did not record accommodation, the population of that parish has been deducted from the total so as to calculate more accurately the sittings per head. For a corrected population of 3,648 there were 1,883 sittings available, giving accommodation for 51.6% of the population. If the appropriate population and sittings figures for the other Rutland parishes are added, this gives 15,863 sittings for a population of 21,222, accommodation for 74.7% of the population of the county of Rutland.

*In relation to Denomination*

In considering the accommodation in places of worship of different denominations all parishes have been taken into account. Of the sittings recorded for the nine parishes, 1,763 (93.6%) were provided by the Church of England and 120 (6.4%) were in Wesleyan Methodist chapels. Combining these figures with those for the other parishes, in the county of Rutland as a whole 11,564 sittings (70.2%) were provided by the Church of England, and 4,898 (29.8%) by non-conformist denominations.

The percentage of sittings provided by all denominations in the county was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Methods</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptists</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particular Baptists</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational Dissenters</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primitive Methodists</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society of Friends</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latter Day Saints</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Free and Other Sittings*

The census forms did not specify how ‘Free’ and ‘Other’ were to be interpreted. This question may have referred to the payment of fees for the use of pews, or to the reservation of pews for selected or privileged groups. There is no indication of how this question was viewed by the respondents and they may not all have replied on the same basis.

All the parishes in the Stamford registration district except Tixover completed the section of the form on Free and Other sittings. In the Church of England places of worship 40% of the seats were free, 60% were not free. In the two chapels all seats were free.

When the returns from the rest of the Rutland parishes are added the combined figures are: for the parish churches 34% free, 66% not free; for non-conformist places of worship 65% free and 35% not free.

**Attendance**

The census forms requested details of attendance at each service conducted on 30th March 1851. However, it is not known how many parishioners attended more than one service, so it is unclear how many individuals attended church or chapel on that day. In this review of the census returns, as in the previous paper, the total attendance including Sunday scholars has been used as a measure of the support for each place of worship and as a basis of comparison between the various denominations.

*In relation to Population*

For parishes where no attendance information had been provided, the population figure and all the entries for that parish have been omitted from the calculations to ensure an accurate relationship between population and attendance. The parish church at Ketton and the Wesleyan Methodist chapel at Pickworth did not record attendance on 30th March 1851 in their returns, therefore in calculating the relationship between population and attendance the figures from these two parishes have been disregarded.

The total population of the remaining parishes was 2,468 and the attendance 1,119 (45.3%). If the equivalent figures for the other Rutland parishes are added, the relevant population is 19,938 and the attendance 14,627 (73.4%).

*In relation to Denomination*

In considering the support for different denominations all the returns have been taken into account and no parishes have been omitted. The returns which did not include attendance figures were those for Ketton parish church, and for the Methodist chapel at Pickworth.

The total attendance for the Stamford registration district parishes was 1,119, of which 1,041 (93%) of the parishioners attended the parish churches and 78 (7%) the Methodist chapels. For the county of Rutland as a whole, from a total attendance of 15,479, 9,469 (61.2%) of the parishioners attended Church of England places of worship and 6,010 (38.8%) non-conformist chapels.
The support for the various denominations in the county as a percentage of the total attendance was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Methodists</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptists</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particular Baptists</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational Dissenters</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primitive Methodists</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latter Day Saints</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society of Friends</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sunday School Attendance**

In the nine parishes there were 304 Sunday school attendances, all at parish churches. There were no returns from the parish churches at Ketton and Tixover, nor from the Methodist chapel at Pickworth.

When added to the returns for the rest of the Rutland parishes the figures show that out of a total attendance of 3,899, 2,593 (66.5%) were at Church of England places of worship and 1,306 (33.5%) at non-conformist chapels.

**Other Information**

The curate at All Saints church in Pickworth comments that it was consecrated in 1824, and was ‘erected at private cost of the late Rector’. He also refers to a previous church, presumably the one said to have been partially destroyed at the time of the Battle of Losecoat Field (1470), and which lost its spire in 1728 and its tower in 1731 (VCH Rutland 1935, 267).

The income at the church of St John in Ryhall is said by the vicar to have been reduced by one third as a result of a grant from Queen Anne’s Bounty towards the building of a vicarage house. According to the 1851 population census the 1,075 inhabitants of Ryhall included 285 labourers employed on the ‘works of the Great Northern Railway’.

The church at Tinwell had recently been repaired and reseated at a cost of £600. The Rector remarks that three principal houses in the village were at that time unoccupied and there was much sickness in the village.

**Summary**

The returns from the Rutland parishes in the Stamford (Lincolnshire) registration district have been transcribed, and the figures for accommodation and attendance reviewed. The results from these nine parishes have been combined with those from the rest of the Rutland parishes, which were transcribed in a previous paper (Tomalin 2002), to give data for the administrative county of Rutland as a whole.

The returns from the parishes in the Stamford registration district show that there was accommodation for 51.6% of the population of which 93.6% was in parish churches and 6.4% in the two Methodist chapels. All seats were free in the chapels, but in the churches 40% of the seating was free and 60% not free. As far as attendance was concerned 45.3% of the population attended the services on 30th March and of these parishioners 93% were in Church of England places of worship and 7% in the two chapels. Seven of the nine churches gave a return for Sunday school attendance. Of the chapels, one indicated there was no Sunday school, the other did not reply to the question.

The nine parishes in the Stamford registration district are a very small sample and do not by themselves provide meaningful information. However, when their returns are combined with those for the other 43 parishes in the administrative county of Rutland the resulting information is more valuable. In comparing the combined figures with those in the previous paper, which covered the Rutland registration districts of Oakham and Uppingham, it should be noted that the data from sixteen parishes in Leicestershire and Northamptonshire have been excluded and replaced by data from the nine parishes in the Stamford registration district.

In the county of Rutland seating was available for 74.7% of the population and of that accommodation 70.2% was in churches and 29.8% in non-conformist places of worship. The Methodists and the Baptists provided the most seating of the non-conformist denominations. In the churches 34% of the seating was free, in the chapels 65% was free.

In the county there was a total attendance at all services of 73.4% of the population, and of this attendance 61.2% was in churches and 38.8% was in the non-conformist place of worship. The Methodists and Baptists attracted the largest attendance among the non-conformist denominations. Of the attendance at Sunday school 66.5% was at the churches and 33.5% at the chapels.

There was a significant difference between the figures for the towns of Oakham and Uppingham and those for the rural parishes. This is discussed in the previous paper, and those observations are not affected by the substitution of the rural Rutland parishes in the Stamford registration district for similar parishes in Leicestershire and Northamptonshire.
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Bridge Casterton, [Great Casterton], St Peter & St Paul

Consecrated: Before 1800.
Sittings: Free nil, other 220.
Attendance: 30th March: afternoon, 110 general congregation, 33 Sunday scholars. Average: afternoon, about 100 general congregation, 36 Sunday scholars.
Signed: Henry Atlay, Rector.

Clipsham or Kelpisham, St Mary

Consecrated: Of great antiquity.
Endowments: Tithe commuted at £259. Glebe, fifty acres, let at £63 in 1846. Fees nominal.
Sittings: Free 26, exclusive of forms and stools. Other, 106 in the church, 10 in the chancel.
Attendance: 30th March: morning, 80 general congregation, 34 Sunday scholars; afternoon, 101 general congregation, 34 Sunday scholars.
Signed: John West MA, Rector.

Essendine, St Mary

An ancient chapel or church of a parochial chapelry.
Consecrated: Before 1800.
Endowments: Rentcharge in lieu of small tithes £95.
Sittings: Free 84, other 45.
Attendance: 30th March: morning, 10 general congregation, 13 Sunday scholars.
Address: Ryhall.

Ketton, Parish Church

Consecrated: Before 1800.
Sittings: Free 132, other 214.
Signed: B Wake, Vicar.

Little Casterton, All Saints

Consecrated: Before 1800.
Sittings: Free 84, other 54.
Attendance: 30th March: morning, 28 general congregation, 25 Sunday scholars; afternoon, 54 general congregation, 21 Sunday scholars. Average: morning, 30 general congregation, 20 Sunday scholars; afternoon, 52 general congregation, 20 Sunday scholars.
Signed: T Nowell Twopeny, Rector.

Pickworth, All Saints

Consecrated: 1824. A church once existed in the parish, but not for centuries. Erected at private cost of the late Rector.
Sittings: Free 120.
Attendance: 30th March: afternoon, 65 general congregation, 12 Sunday scholars. Average: morning 40-50 general congregation, 12 Sunday scholars; afternoon, 60-70 general congregation, 10-12 Sunday scholars.
Signed: G H Brett, Curate.
Address: Stamford.
**Pickworth, Wesleyan Methodist**  
Not a separate building, not used exclusively for worship.  
Sittings: Free 60.  
Attendance: Average: morning, 40 general congregation.  
Signed: John Grimes, Steward.

**Ryhall, St John**  
Consecrated: Before 1800.  
Endowments: Land £150.  
Sittings: Free 150, other 328.  
Attendance: 30th March: afternoon, 160 general congregation, 87 Sunday scholars.  
Remarks: The income is reduced one third by a grant from the Commissioners for Queen Anne's Bounty  
towards the erection of a Vicarage House completed in 1850.  
Signed: Charles Patchett, Vicar.

**Ryhall, Wesleyan Chapel**  
Occupied about 1840. Separate building, used exclusively for worship.  
Sittings: Free 60.  
Attendance: 30th March: afternoon, 23 general congregation; evening 55 general congregation. Average:  
afternoon, 40 general congregation.  
Signed: George Francis, Leader and Steward.

**Rinwell, All Saints**  
The church has been lately thoroughly repaired and reseated at a cost of nearly £600, principally by subscription.  
Sittings: Free 110, including 24 childrens. Other 80.  
Attendance: 30th March: morning, 80 general congregation, 28 Sunday scholars: afternoon, 87 general  
congregation, 17 Sunday scholars.  
Remarks: At the present time 3 principle [sic] houses are unoccupied, and there is much illness in the village.  
Signed: Charles Arnold, Rector.

**Tixover, Parish Church**  
Consecrated: Before 1800.  
Attendance: 30th March: afternoon, 19 general congregation.  
Signed: B Wake, Vicar.  
Address: Ketton.
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Review article: The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography

MIKE TILLBROOK

The new edition of The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, available in print and on-line, is a magnificent and successful achievement. Amongst thousands of other biographies are those of conspicuous Rutlanders, including many educated in the county. It is a valuable and reliable source of information for most of them, placing them well in their historical contexts, with few obvious deficiencies.

The Dictionary of National Biography was a great monument to Victorian industry and scholarship. Producing a completely new version in both on-line and paper versions which could match the comprehensiveness and scholarship of the original was a daunting task undertaken by the Oxford University Press with little chance of their ever being able to recoup their original outlay. The venture took twelve years, involved 10,000 contributors, totalled 62 million words and cost in the region of £25 million pounds. The gargantuan editorial task was begun by the distinguished Oxford historian Colin Matthew and, after his tragically early death, was completed by his Oxford colleague, Brian Harrison, the whole version being made available from 23rd September 2004. One of Matthew’s earliest editorial decisions was to publish lives of all who featured in the original DNB, making it a ‘collective account of the attitudes of two centuries’. Changing academic and cultural trends have ensured greater representation of women in the new version, along with more scope for including lives of the quirky and eccentric. The ‘great and the good’ continue to dominate, but there is ample room also in the new version for the mad and the villainous.

Few will be able to afford the paper version, retailing at a mere £7,500. The on-line version is available on annual subscription and should be available through public and academic libraries. The on-line version is easy to use. Searches can be made for individuals. Advanced searches can be made for places and for specific chronological periods. Keying in <Rutland> on Advanced Search brings up 137 entries. Scrutiny of these entries reveals that 12 of these had no discernible connection with the county of Rutland at all. A significant minority of the rest comprises those who were educated in Rutland, overwhelmingly though not exclusively at Uppingham and Oakham Schools. Most of these were Uppinghamians, including such sporting cavaliers as A P F Chapman and Donald Campbell, as well as the writers Ronald Firbank and E W Hornung and the painter C R W Nevinson. Chapman, a dashing, humorous and for a time successful captain of the England cricket team, never recovered from his displacement by the more ruthless and single-minded D R Jardine, and his subsequent and tragic descent from ‘a taste for conviviality’ into alcoholism is succinctly and poignantly described by Ivo Tennant. Not one of Firbank, Hornung or Nevinson had cause to look back on his time at Uppingham with affection. Firbank lasted only two terms, Hornung was obliged to leave on health grounds, and in Nevinson’s case ‘excessive bullying caused his early departure’.

Education figures prominently amongst the other entries. Archdeacon Johnson’s ‘enduring achievement’ in founding and endowing Oakham and Uppingham Schools is given due weight by Charles Knighton. Edward Thring’s distinguished career at Uppingham is recorded in a comprehensive memoir by Donald Leinster-Mackay, in whose opinion he was ‘the greatest public school headmaster of the second half of the nineteenth century’. Leinster-Mackay places due importance on the distinctiveness of Thring’s educational philosophy. Thring ‘differentiated, as many have done before him and since, between teaching and “pumping” or cramming’, which rather suggests that he would be ill at ease if confronted with current educational practice. Other educational entries include an intriguing entry on Thomas Arnold (no, not that one). Rutland’s Arnold was a conscientious writer of mid-Victorian Greek and Latin primers, but his literary works were of ‘very uneven quality’, only a small part of which has stood the test of time.

A chronological survey of Rutland entries reveals that medieval entries are rare. The earliest life is that of Robert of Ketton, who had a distinguished career as a twelfth-century clergyman and scientist. Unfortunately, from the point of view of Rutland, he seems to have spent most of his career in Spain and, in any case, it seems that the links with our Ketton might be conjectural. He might, perhaps, have been from Chester. The paucity of sources for reconstructing medieval lives is certainly evident in this case. In the fourteenth century the most incontrovertible example of a ‘local
boy made good’ is that of Simon Langham, Archbishop of Canterbury from 1366 to 1368. His biographer, W J Dohar, definitely identifies him with Langham in Rutland. From ‘modest beginnings’ Langham enjoyed a ‘spectacular career’. He was an especially distinguished Abbot of Westminster from 1349 to 1362. Faced with the challenge of taking over Westminster in the immediate aftermath of the Black Death his shrewd estate management and successful building projects resulted in a spectacularly successful abbacy. Unfortunately, his episcopal career was less successful. After four years at Ely he was appointed Archbishop of Canterbury in 1366, but held the post for only two years, falling out with Edward III after accepting a papal prebend without consultation with the monarch, the subsequent dispute eerily foreshadowing some of the issues which would be at stake during the break with Rome almost two centuries later.

If Langham was a fourteenth-century ‘local boy made good’, then there can be little doubt that Eustace Folville, Vicar of Teigh, came into the opposite category. He was involved in murders, rape and robbery, escaping punishment on entering the armed service of the Crown. Opinions of Folville vary. On the one hand, his career demonstrated clearly the fragility of royal authority during Folville’s lifetime; on the other hand, he can be identified as a ‘Robin Hood’ whose crimes were often directed against those of ill repute. Whichever is nearer the truth, he never suffered for his crimes, receiving a royal pardon from Edward III. Otherwise, Rutland plays a fairly peripheral role in the medieval entries, largely through connections with great families such as the de Montforts and the Despensers or for the propensity of distinguished bishops of Lincoln (Grossteste, Longland) to have the good taste to enjoy rest and recuperation at Lyddington.

From the sixteenth century entries become more frequent. One reason for this is the interest of the original Dictionary of National Biography in sixteenth and seventeenth-century clergymen. One such distinguished Rutlander was the separatist Robert Browne who at one stage held the living of Casterton before falling foul of the Elizabethan authorities. Rutland quickly became a Protestant stronghold. Archdeacon Johnson’s role was not solely educational. Appointed to the living at North Luffenham by the puritan Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Walter Mildmay, he flirted with nonconformity, refused to wear the surplice and permitted unlicensed preaching. ‘No doubt his friendship with (Lord Burghley) kept him out of trouble.’ The link between Oakham School and evangelical Protestantism continued. Jeremiah Whitaker, appointed a master there before becoming Rector of Stretton, was one of the leaders of a group of clergymen within the diocese of Peterborough who resolutely opposed the imposition of the Laudian canons; his son William Whitaker was a prominent clergyman ejected from his living after the accession of Charles II (despite their views they both continued to attract the support of the ‘Exeter’ branch of the Cecil family). The Laudian divine Jeremy Taylor, briefly the incumbent of Uppingham in the years before the Civil War, must have found some of his colleagues somewhat uncongenial. Arguably the least distinguished product of Oakham Puritanism was the villainous Titus Oates. His biographer Alan Marshall does little to rehabilitate Oates, a ‘fantastic’ who possessed a ‘raucous and difficult personality’. One of Oates’s victims in the ‘Popish Plot’ of 1679 was his fellow Rutlander, the dwarf Jeffrey Hudson, whose fascinating career, embracing courtly fame, the killing of a fellow-Cavalier in a duel and twice being taken by pirates, is excellently summarised by R Malcolm Smuts.

The distinguished Rutland families of the early modern period are treated comprehensively. Sir Everard Digby entered into the Gunpowder Plot with ‘heart and soul’. The first and second Barons Harrington of Exton are thoroughly treated by Jan Broadway and Simon Healy respectively. The importance of the second baron’s sister Lucy, Countess of Bedford, as a patroness of learning is excellently described by Helen Payne. The political role of Edward Noel, Viscount Campden, in the 1630s and early 1640s is effectively treated; there are clear hints that his royalist affiliation in the Civil War carried a trace of reluctance.

Arguably, the most politically distinguished Rutlander was Daniel Finch, Earl of Nottingham and Winchelsea, who played a pivotal role in the Glorious Revolution as the leader of those Tories who, no longer willing to offer absolute obedience to a non-Anglican monarch, allied with the Whigs to ensure the succession of William of Orange. The honour of writing Finch’s life in the Oxford DNB has fallen to the distinguished American historian Henry Horwitz, whose grasp of Finch’s political influence is first class but who is less convincing not only on his significance within Rutland but also on his role as a naval administrator.

Perhaps the most interesting notice in the Rutland collection is Professor Bernard Capp’s treatment of the Wing family of North Luffenham. Vincent Wing (1619-68) was the ‘founder of a remarkable dynasty of mathematical practitioners’. As an astronomer he published three important
works, *Practical Astronomie* (1649), *Harmonicon Coelesti* (1651), 'the first significant English treatise on planetary astronomy since the Copernican Revolution', and the posthumously published *Astronomia Britannica* (1669), his most important work. He also applied himself to the problems of surveying, producing *The Art of Surveying* in 1664, 'a thorough exposition of the principles and practices of quantity surveying'. This emphasis on useful learning was continued by his nephew John Wing and his great nephew Tycho Wing. The latter combined the teaching of mathematics, surveying and navigation with public service as the Rutland coroner. What is particularly interesting to the non-expert is the way in which the Wings combined interests in both astronomy and astrology. Not only was Vincent an astronomer, he also produced an annual astrological *Almanac* from 1641. This was allowed to lapse in 1672, but was continued after a gap by John Wing. Astrological almanacs from the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries differed from the nonsense produced in the popular press nowadays and were often directly political. Parliamentary sympathies can be inferred from Vincent's publications in the 1640s. Later, John Wing made no secret of his Whig sympathies and he became involved in a bitter political conflict with his Tory astrological counterpart, George Parker.

Perhaps the most disappointing Rutland entry is that of Thomas Barker of Lyndon (1722-1809). His biographer mentions Barker's weather journals, but gives no indication of having read them, and the Society's publication *The Weather Journals of a Rutland Square*, edited by John Kington and published in 1988, does not feature in the bibliography.

In the later eighteenth century and nineteenth centuries many of the lives become less distinctive. Rutland's role, except in education, appears to have been largely as an adjunct to hunting and other sporting activities. Three lives in particular should be noted in this context. Sir Richard Sutton (1798-1857) took over the Cottesmore Hunt in 1842, but departed 'in disgust' four years later 'because the local farmers preserved game birds to the detriment of foxes'. Henry Chaplin, a distinguished Conservative politician, was born in Ryhall. He was a 'dedicated rider to hounds'. Despite owning a Derby winner, his financial affairs became increasingly desperate, though he 'remained very fond of good food and society' and was 'more striking for his girth than his height in later years'. The most important sportsman associated with Rutland was undoubtedly Hugh Lowther, Earl of Lonsdale (1857-1944). Mark Blackett-Ord's article comprehensively discusses Lonsdale's role in race walking, boxing, hunting and racing. His triumph in the 100-mile walk along the Great North Road, completing the course in 17 hours and 21 minutes, is discussed, along with his contribution to the codification of the rules of boxing. Surprisingly, there is no mention of Lonsdale belts, but Blackett-Ord does think that Lonsdale rather than the Marquis of Queensberry should be given the credit for the formulation of the Queensberry rules. Blackett-Ord is, perhaps, too discreet on the financial misadventures which befell the Lowther estate during the earl's lifetime.

The publication of the *Oxford DNB* in September 2004 stimulated a debate on the greater representation of women in the new work compared with its Victorian predecessor. This is not reflected in the Rutland entries. There are only two entries for twentieth-century Rutland women, though their careers could hardly be more contrasting. Janet Erskine Stuart (1857-1914), daughter of the Rector of Cottesmore, converted to Roman Catholicism, became a nun and rose to become Mother General of the Society of the Sacred Heart before her premature death from cancer. On the other hand, Beryl Markham (née Clutterbuck), born in Ashwell though brought up in Africa, followed a wild childhood with an 'exceptionally promiscuous' adulthood. 'Free with her sexual favours', she divided her attentions amongst a large number of male admirers, including at least one member of the royal family. Nevertheless, she had the time and energy to achieve distinction as an aviatrix, race-horse trainer in Kenya and writer.

No project as vast as the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* can ever be perfect. Newspaper reviewers have detected errors and at least one Rutland entry is noticeably weak both in content and interpretation. Nevertheless, this is a huge publishing achievement. In any case, the on-line version can be amended, a clear opportunity for members of the Society to demonstrate their erudition.

Book Review

_Sir Gerard NoelMP and the Noels of Chipping Campden and Exton_, by Gerard Noel

For a family which featured prominently on the Rutland landscape of the past three hundred years, it is surprising how little has been published of the history of the Noels of Exton. Curious students have so far had to content themselves with _Some Letters and Records of the Noel family_, compiled by Emilia Noel nearly a century ago. Now a present member of the family has taken up his pen to add to the record with an immensely readable biography of his colourful namesake, Sir Gerard Noel MP, 1759-1838.

Locals who recall that the Rutland County Museum was once Sir Gerard Noel’s Riding School for the Rutland Fencible Cavalry, can now discover other less solid achievements of the `missing link` between the first and second creations of the Earldom of Gainsborough. Although born Gerard Noel Edwards, this nephew of the childless sixth Earl, Henry Noel (of `Fort Henry` fame), took on his late uncle`s surname when in 1798 he moved from his Oakham home at Catmose Lodge, to inherit the rich estates which included Exton and Chipping Campden. His nineteen children would secure the Noel dynasty into the twenty-first century, although, despite much lobbying, Gerard Noel himself failed to obtain the recreated title of Earl of Gainsborough, which was bestowed upon his son in 1841.

Ill-judged financial adventures led to the loss of Sir Gerard Noel’s immense fortune, and political eccentricities damaged his public reputation, despite 50 years’ service in Parliament. In 1794 he raised the short-lived regiment of Rutland Fencibles, of which he became Colonel. Living at Exton apart from his first wife, Sir Gerard Noel encouraged and became First President of the Rutland Agricultural Society, while his indomitable land agent, Richard Westbrook Baker, introduced many beneficial agricultural reforms. However it is in Chipping Campden that Sir Gerard’s benevolence is most remembered, and commemorated by the striking portrait in Campden’s Town Hall which illustrates the cover of this book. Although largely an absentee landlord, he made various grants of land, encouraging the foundation of schools for both girls and boys. He served as the town’s High Steward, spending more time in Campden after the disastrous fire at Exton Hall in 1810, although he never had funds to begin his long hoped-for rebuilding of Campden House and died at Exton at the age of 79. His easy going, thriftless nature is summed up in an anonymous Rutland poem of 1812:

... Now this puts me in mind of a jolly good Squire
High Sheriff this year for a proud little shire. 
Whose character rambles all over the county,
For his great love of fun, for his heart full of bounty,
To take things as they are, is his constant endeavour,
With all things content, but satisfied never...
To provide a context for the life of Sir Gerard Noel, the author begins Part I of his book with a brief account of Noel family history from the eleventh to the eighteenth century. Given the dramatic lives of individuals such as the brothers Baptist (3rd Viscount Campden) and his tragic brother Henry in the seventeenth century, these thirty pages are tantalizingly brief. While Part II concentrates on the main subject of the book, a substantial Part III brings the story of the Noels up to the present day, explaining the divergence between the `Noels of Gloucestershire` (the rebuilt Campden House served as home to younger members of the family) and the `Gainsboroughs of Exton`. In the mid nineteenth century, the Noel family demonstrated in microcosm significant religious divisions of the age. Four of Sir Gerard Noel’s sons entered holy orders, with his sixteenth child, the Rev Baptist Wrothesley Noel becoming a Baptist Minister in 1849. In the same year the heir to the new earldom of Gainsborough, Charles, Viscount Campden and his wife Ida, converted to Roman Catholicism. Since that date heads of the Noel family have continued as Catholics while younger members have often remained within the Church of England.

The author, Gerard Noel, is well qualified to recount his namesake’s history. Younger brother of the present Earl of Gainsborough and author of many important works, he draws on his family connections and long acquaintance with the town of Chipping Campden to flesh out the bones of the appealingly flawed figure of Sir Gerard Noel. The Exton archives now in the Record Office of Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland provided an extensive source, and the help of Mrs Jenny Clark, who catalogued these, is credited among other acknowledgements. In his relaxed, elegant style, the author enlivens factual information with entertaining anecdote and evocative personal reminiscence. This attractively produced book contains eight pages of coloured illustrations and a large number in black and white. There are helpful appendices and a comprehensive index, while the brevity of the bibliography demonstrates the extent to which this work is the result of thorough documentary research.

Even to those unfamiliar with Campden, Exton or the Noel family, this volume offers an engaging, informative read. Focus on one powerful family and its endearing if unreliable head offers a window into the social and political complexities of a significant period in national history. To all interested in Rutland’s own past, this account of its dominant dynasty over nearly four centuries will add greatly to the local historical record and to our appreciation of crucial influences on Rutland’s unique development.

_Sue Howlett_
Rutland History and Archaeology in 2003

The following abbreviations are used in this section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APS</td>
<td>Archaeological Project Services, The Old School, Cameron Street, Heckington, Sleaford, Lincolnshire NG34 9RW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHS</td>
<td>Leicestershire Heritage Services, Room 500, County Hall, Glenfield, Leicester, LE3 8TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCM</td>
<td>Rutland County Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLHRS</td>
<td>Rutland Local History &amp; Record Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Rutland Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMR</td>
<td>Leicestershire &amp; Rutland Sites &amp; Monuments Record (Leicestershire Heritage Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULAS</td>
<td>University of Leicester Archaeological Services, University Road, Leicester, LE1 7RH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I - Archaeological Fieldwork during 2003

Short reports, arranged in alphabetical order by parish

**Barrowden, Durant Farm, Main Street (SK 94490002)**

An archaeological field evaluation by trial trenching was undertaken by ULAS for Mr Richard Tyler between 7th-12th August 2003 in advance of proposed residential development. The work revealed evidence for medieval settlement activity in the form of two substantial limestone walls, probably contemporaneous with, and possibly directly associated with, the medieval farmhouse located to the north. The walls were heavily disturbed by probable robber features and rubbish pits possibly dating to the early 13th century (RCM).

**Roger Kipling**

**Belton-in-Rutland, Main Street (SK 81570116)**

Development close to the historic core of the village was monitored by F. Walker of APS for Mr. Jones. A medieval subsoil was identified and a pit of 16th-17th century date, perhaps associated with agricultural activity, was revealed. Four other pits, all of 18th century date, were recorded. Two of these were small, about 1m across, and contained pottery, metal and animal bone and probably functioned as domestic refuse pits. One of the others was large, 4.2m long, 2.6m wide and 0.9m deep and may have been a clay pit. The fourth pit was only partially revealed but was 2.6m wide and may similarly have been for clay extraction (RCM A3.2002).

**Michael Bamforth**

**Bisbrooke, Graniton Lodge, Top Lane (SP 88459970)**

On behalf of Acrabuild Ltd, C. Moulis of APS carried out a watching brief during development near the historic centre of Bisbrooke. Beneath the current topsoil a large pit was revealed. This yielded a prehistoric flint core, though this artefact is considered to have been re-deposited in the feature and not to provide a chronology for the pit, which remains undated (RCM).

**James Albone**

**Cottesmore, Lilac Farm, Mill Lane (SK 902139)**

An archaeological evaluation by trial trenches was undertaken by ULAS in September 2002, on land at Lilac Farm on behalf of Exton Estates. The evaluation revealed evidence of late Saxon and early medieval activity, in the form of ditches, pits and gullies. Linear deposits of limestone pieces may possibly be padstones that relate to the foundations of timber-framed buildings. Large quantities of iron slag recovered from spreads of silty material are a good indication of smelting activity in the immediate vicinity of the application area (RCM A1 2002).

**Sophie Clarke**

**Empingham, St Peter’s Church (SK 95050850)**

A Russell of APS supervised an evaluation, for Purcell, Miller and Tritton on behalf of Empingham PCC, within the graveyard of St Peter’s church. The church may have its origins as a Saxon minster but is largely of 13th century date. A undated but probably medieval graveyard soil was revealed. This was substantially truncated by a clearance cut for the removal of steps to the church, an operation that had occurred by 1856. A single fragment of Roman pottery was recovered, together with a piece of dressed masonry of probable medieval date and a range of 17th-19th century artefacts including pottery, glass and clay pipe (RCM).

**Paul Cope-Faulkner**

**Great Casterton, St Peter & St Paul’s Church (TF 001088)**

During the dismantling of the west wall of the graveyard, V Mellor of APS carried out a watching brief, on behalf of Great Casterton PCC. Dating from the 13th century, the church is located at the southern end of the Roman town. Precursors to the existing wall were revealed, some of them thought to relate to post-medieval farm buildings that previously butted up against the graveyard. However, the older walls were undated. An undated but probably medieval graveyard soil was also recorded. No artefacts were recovered (archive: LHS).

**Paul Cope-Faulkner**

**Lyddington, Gretton Road (SP 87639667)**

Development in an area of Iron Age and Roman finds and on the southern edge of the medieval core of Lyddington was the subject of a watching brief, carried out by F. Walker of APS for Priory Homes (Rutland) Ltd. However, no archaeological remains were revealed and only modern pottery was retrieved. Earthworks of ridge and furrow were noted in adjacent fields and it is possible the investigation site had an agricultural function in the medieval period and later (RCM).

**James Albone**

Edited by T H McK CLOUGH
Rutland in 2003

Oakham, 29-33 Northgate (SK 85860899)
A watching brief was carried out by staff of APS for Wynbrook Homes during development in the historic core of Oakham. Northgate is referred to as early as 1501 and forms part of the early street pattern. However, no medieval remains were encountered, though wall foundations, a brick-lined well, drain and dumped deposits of late post-medieval date were recorded (RCM).

Seaton, All Hallows Church (SK 90429825)
A watching brief was carried out by F Walker of APS during excavations for the installation of services at the Norman church of All Hallows. A graveyard soil containing disarticulated humans was revealed but was undated. Cut into this graveyard soil was a culvert of dry stone construction and although also undated it is thought to be post-medieval (archive: LHS).

Thistleton Romano-British Town (SK 908173)
Further fieldwalking on land adjacent to that walked in 2001 (R39, SK 912171) took place in October. The finds included over 1,200 sherds of pottery, brick and tile, a quantity of iron slag, flint tools, flakes, cores and a gunflint, burnt stone, and a number of ‘small finds’ including nails and clay pipe stems. Taken together with the evidence from the first phase of fieldwalking, it is apparent that the town extends over an area of 100 acres and corresponds with the estimate made by Ernest Greenfield in the late 1950s. The large quantity of iron slag recovered confirms that iron smelting was an important industry for the town. Evidence of Iron Age occupation is further substantiated by two sherds (one from each phase of walking) identified by Dr Richard Pollard. No evidence of post-Roman settlement was found. The small quantity and wide scatter of medieval and post-medieval pottery is attributed to manuring. Reports and maps of the finds for both stages of fieldwork are lodged with the Sites and Monuments Record at Leicester (R39 and R39 (II)).

In September members of the group assisted Dr Jeremy Taylor of Leicester University to undertake a gradiometer survey of approximately 300 sq m of the site. The images, particularly of the temple, are stunning and confirm the basilican form and surrounding temenos ditch noted by Greenfield. Numerous iron-smelting sites were identified which correspond with the finds of burnt stone and slag. Evidence of other stone buildings, ditches, a road and enclosures was also found. Dr Taylor intends to carry out further work in 2004.

Tinwell, 1 Welland View (TF 00800630)
Staff of APS undertook a watching brief for Liberty Homes Ltd during development in the historic core of Tinwell. However, only modern disturbance was revealed and no medieval remains were identified (archive: LHS).

Uppingham, 50 High St East (SP 86859956)
On behalf of Clive Breakspear, a watching brief was carried out by staff of APS during development close to previous discoveries of medieval and Roman remains in the historic core of Uppingham. Postholes, perhaps part of a former boundary, were revealed. These were undated but were sealed by subsoil and are probably early. Several post-medieval walls and recent pits were dug into the subsoil. Above the walls was a demolition deposit that yielded 18th-19th century artefacts (RCM).

Whissendine, Stapleford Road (SK 825145)
Following an earthwork survey an archaeological excavation and watching brief was carried out by ULAS, directed by Jennifer Browning, on behalf of Miller Homes, in advance of proposed development at Stapleford Road, Whissendine.

Full excavation took place in three separate areas. Area 1 was located close to Stapleford Road. A substantial ditch, almost parallel with the modern road, must have demarcated the boundary with the earlier road. Medieval and post-medieval features, comprising gullies, pits and substantial cobbled surfaces, were recorded west of the ditch. Most of the stonework was post-medieval in date, including cobbled yard surfaces and a stone-capped drain. However, beneath the cobbles were a series of cut features, consisting of ditches, pits and postholes. These were evidence of earlier activity stretching back into the medieval period. At the back of the area, a deep ditch had been twice re-cut. This represents successive boundaries, separating tofts from fields or perhaps dividing one property from another. A large quantity of 13th century pottery was recovered from these ditches, suggesting that when it fell out of use it had been used to dump domestic rubbish.

Area 2 was located further west, away from the road frontage and towards the medieval fields. The area targeted one of the suspected ‘house platforms’, which had been visible as a low indistinct earthwork. When the topsoil was removed it revealed a raised dump of stone fragments with the remnants of a foundation wall beneath. This is likely to be the remains of a collapsed building and its associated yard surfaces. A number of postholes and a small stone-built wall were located close to this platform. To the north, a series of rich organic spreads lay within a shallow linear depression. These may represent refuse and animal waste swept off the platform into an adjacent hollow-way or track. Beneath the stone, however, were several substantial ditches and gullies, which lay on both N-S and E-W alignments. The pottery from Area 2 indicates that occupation dates from the late Saxon to the early medieval period. Some of the ditches may be contemporary with the earlier phase on Area 1. However, there is no clear suggestion of post-medieval activity, which suggests a shift in occupation towards Stapleford Road in the later period.

Area 3 was excavated to the west of Area 2, revealing a wealth of archaeological features, far earlier in date than the medieval occupation to the east. The archaeology was clearly sealed by the medieval ridge and furrow. Initial examination of the pottery suggests a late Iron Age to Roman date. A number of ditches and gullies ran across the area, possibly forming enclosures. There was at least one roundhouse, which had fallen out of use and was subsequently replaced by a second larger building. The later roundhouse had a central hearth, lined by cobbles.
and filled with scorched debris. So far the evidence suggested a farmstead. However, close to the roundhouse gullies an unusual discovery was made. A single burial was uncovered. The body had been placed in a crouched position, with the head at the south end. Unfortunately the bone was in a very poor state of preservation and represented only by the teeth, a few bone fragments and a dark soil stain in the clay. The burial is certainly prehistoric but no finds were recovered which might date it more closely. As yet we do not know whether the burial was contemporary with the settlement or if it was far earlier and the builders of the roundhouse had no knowledge of its presence. Radiocarbon dating may help answer this.

The excavation has produced a wealth of information about early Whissendine. It has revealed not only good quality medieval and post-medieval archaeology but also evidence of a previously unknown Iron Age settlement.

ULAS would like to thank Miller Homes, who commissioned the work, for their help and co-operation during its progress.

Jennifer Browning

II - Other Reports for 2003

Lincolnshire Archives

Contact information:
Lincolnshire Archives, St Rumbold Street, Lincoln, LN2 5AB.
Tel: (01522) 525158 (search room appointments and enquiries), (01522) 526204 (other enquiries).
Fax: (01522) 530047.
Website: www.lincs.gov.uk/archives.
E-mail: lincolnshire.archive@lincolnshire.gov.uk.

Northamptonshire Record Office

Contact information:
Northamptonshire Record Office, Wootton Hall Park, Northampton, NN4 8BQ.
Tel: (01604) 762129. Fax: (01604) 767562.
Website: www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/community/record.office.

Record Office for Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland

Contact information:
Record Office for Leicestershire, Leicester & Rutland, Long Street, Wigston Magna, Leicester, LE18 2AH.
Tel: (0116) 2571080. Fax: (0116) 2571120.

During the year April 2003 – March 2004 the Record Office received sixteen deposits of Rutland records. These included:

DE6373 Correspondence files, building plans, etc, of Messrs Traylen and Lenton, Chartered and Registered architects, of Stamford (later W J Hemmings and partners)


DE6427 Public Monuments and Sculpture Association: files on monuments researched and recorded, arranged by place (in two series: Leicester City, Leicestershire and Rutland) with photographic negatives, working files, etc.

Whitwell, 4 Church Close (SK 924088)

Construction of an extension to a cottage of probable 17th century date immediately east of the Saxon and later church in the historic centre of Whitwell was monitored by B Martin of APS for Mrs K Mullins. A stone-filled soakaway, undated but probably contemporary with the 17th century cottage, was the only archaeological feature revealed and no artefacts were recovered (archive: LHS. Paul Cope-Faulkner

Negative watching briefs carried out in 2003

Braunston-in-Rutland Snowdrop Cottage, Knossington Road (SK 83090669).

Great Casterton Community College (TF 002094).

Ketton Nutts Farmyard, Manor Green (SK 975045).

Oakham Cutts Close (SK 8619084).

Ridlington Main Street, Old Rectory (SK 84802).

Ryhall Essendine Road (TF 03651150).

South Luffenham The Square (SK 93960203).

All the above were carried out by ULAS.
Assistant, David Surfleet, retired and a new Museums Services Manager arrived. The new, flatter structure also completed in April 2003 when the Senior Museum structure. The introduction of a new structure was 2002 was followed by a review of the Service’s staff Service. The retirement of the Curator, Tim Clough, in 2003 was a year of great change for the Museums 182

LEICESTERSHIRE & RUTLAND FAMILY HISTORY SOCIETY

Record

Contact information:
Rutland County Museum, Catmore Street, Oakham, Rutland, LE15 6HW.
Tel (01572) 758440, Fax (01572) 758445.

Rutland in 2003

Two of the three Conservator posts were unfulfilled during this year, and the third Conservator was on extended sick leave for much of the first part of the year. Against this background it is not surprising to find the overall volume of conservation work dramatically reduced. However some Rutland work was in hand at the year’s end - on a very significant additional deposit of deeds and business papers relating to Dalton’s, solicitors, of Oakham and Stamford. These papers were ‘rescued’ from a farm building in a very dirty and damp state and several thousand items were being individually cleaned, dried and flattened prior to accessioning and listing.

Despite the lack of provision for ‘outreach’ work in the formal joint arrangement, assistance was offered in the form of documents and information provided for an exhibition by the Rutland Local History and Record Society at Glaston. In addition the Record Office hosted a visit (talk and tour) by the Rutland group of the Leicestershire & Rutland Family History Society.

Carl Harrison, County Archivist

Two deposits can be singled out as of particular interest. In the 1930s and 1950s Arthur Cossons published studies of the Turnpike Roads of five counties, but his manuscript study of the roads of Leicestershire and Rutland lay unpublished for 40 years after his death. Hence it was particularly pleasing not only to see it published finally by Leicestershire County Council in 2003, but also to have the delayed first edition edited and launched by the author’s son, Sir Neil Cossons (see review, Rutland Record 23 (2003) 136). The second notable deposit was of records of the Oakham and Melton Mowbray County Courts. These junior courts were established and continue as an accessible forum for ordinary people to pursue small claims, including Workmen’s Compensation, cheaply. As such the court records throw a unique light on the routine ups and downs of commercial and social life, particularly in market towns such as Oakham and Melton.

While the overall number of new collections accessioned was slightly down on 2002-03 the Rutland proportion remained almost exactly the same, while at the same time the proportion of Rutland accessions catalogued almost doubled. This satisfactory level of work reflects the resolution of long-term sickness issues which had plagued the Office during 2002-03, and some progress in getting to grips with the CALM archive cataloguing software. Despite this the latter process has been slower than anticipated, mainly as a result of other pressures on the Assistant Keepers’ (‘archivists’) time, and we are still some way from achieving the full benefits of the system.

Once CALM comes fully on stream, it will become much easier to network the new catalogues which will be ‘born digital’, and discussions can begin in earnest on the best means of sharing these with our joint arrangement partners (Rutland and the City of Leicester). In the interim a growing proportion of the Office’s catalogues are already available digitally on the internet via the national Access to Archives (A2A) programme hosted by The National Archives: Public Record Office. A search for ‘Rutland’ items will throw up hundreds of ‘hits’ from collections in the Record Office.

Two of the three Conservator posts were unfulfilled during this year, and the third Conservator was on extended sick leave for much of the first part of the year. Against this background it is not surprising to find the overall volume of conservation work dramatically reduced. However some Rutland work was in hand at the year’s end - on a very significant additional deposit of deeds and business papers relating to Dalton’s, solicitors, of Oakham and Stamford. These papers were ‘rescued’ from a farm building in a very dirty and damp state and several thousand items were being individually cleaned, dried and flattened prior to accessioning and listing.

Despite the lack of provision for ‘outreach’ work in the formal joint arrangement, assistance was offered in the form of documents and information provided for an exhibition by the Rutland Local History and Record Society at Glaston. In addition the Record Office hosted a visit (talk and tour) by the Rutland group of the Leicestershire & Rutland Family History Society.

Carl Harrison, County Archivist

2003 was a year of great change for the Museums Service. The retirement of the Curator, Tim Clough, in 2002 was followed by a review of the Service’s staff structure. The introduction of a new structure was completed in April 2003 when the Senior Museum Assistant, David Surfleet, retired and a new Museums Services Manager arrived. The new, flatter structure also

www.rutnet.co.uk/ree/rutlandmuseums
E-mail: museum@rutland.gov.uk
Opening times: Mon-Sat. 10:30am-5pm; Sun: 2pm-4pm.

saw the development of the post of Conservation Officer into that of Collections Manager and a revision of the work of the Museums Assistants, who became more actively involved in other aspects of the Service’s work.

Rutland County Museum
The Development Programme was the focus of the
Museum’s work for the whole year. The award of the grant had to be followed by a great deal of additional work before the Heritage Lottery Fund would give permission for work to start on site. The contractors finally arrived on 4th August and continued to work on the reconstruction of the Stable block for the rest of the year. The need to concentrate on this project impacted upon many aspects of our work, one notable result being the continuation of the moratorium on collecting that had been introduced in 2002.

Oakham Castle
HRH Prince Charles visited Oakham on 25th February

Rutland Historic Churches Preservation Trust

By June 2004 the Trust had been in existence for 50 years, and a Service of Thanksgiving was held in All Saints’, Oakham. In June 1954, nine people signed the Trust Deed, purposing to raise money for investment so that Rutland’s churches and chapels could be given aid and encouragement to put repairs in hand and prevent damage to ancient fabric. The Trust is a non-denominational lay body whose President is traditionally the Lord Lieutenant of Rutland, but Bishops of Peterborough have constantly been Vice-Presidents and the Archdeacons have been extremely helpful. The Trust’s Chairman, Sir David Davenport-Handley, who has served as a Trustee since inception, has now stepped down from the Chair to become a Vice-President. A huge debt of gratitude is owed for his 50 years of care and enthusiasm for the Trust’s aims. The Trust has recently welcomed the Lord Lieutenant, Dr Laurence Howard, as President and Sir Clifford Boulton as Chairman.

Since 1954, almost all of Rutland’s places of Christian worship have requested and received aid, some several times. In these 50 years, grants totalling £303,000 and loans of £43,600 have been made to 59 churches and chapels. The Trust recognises the dedication of those who look after these lovely and unique buildings, and hopes to continue to offer help. In 2003-04, grants of £19,000 and loans of £8,000 were offered to Rutland’s places of worship, as well as a donation of £1,000 to Peterborough Cathedral.

The Sponsored Bicycle Rides, begun in 1987 and held every other year, show that Rutlanders, whether regular churchgoers or not, value their churches and chapels. Each time, some 500 people take part, either riding, stowing or providing refreshments, and a remarkable £137,000 has been raised, half going straight back to sponsored places of worship. In 2003 all records were broken, with £18,579 raised. The Davenport Cup was awarded to Julian Hanson-Smith for reaching 60 churches and chapels in Rutland, and eleven riders were awarded certificates for reaching over 50, either in Rutland alone or by going over the border. The target for the next Ride in 2005 is £20,000.

Cycle Rides are the Trust’s main source of new income, but individuals and Church Councils also give donations. In 2003-04 these were received from the PCCs of Preston, Pickworth, Belton, Tickenhote, Teigh/Market Overton, Little Casterton, Stoke Dry, Morcott and Manton.

The Trust depends on income from hard-won invested capital for the amount that can be given to churches. The current reserve largely comprises one legacy received in 1989, without which the grants would be far less. Remembering the Trust in a Will would help Rutland’s churches and chapels to remain in good heart.

Another way of giving to the Trust is now possible, by nominating the Trust to receive all or part of any tax rebate or refund that may be due. The list of societies to which such donations can be made can be seen on the Inland Revenue’s web page: the identification number of the Rutland Historic Churches Preservation Trust is NAK 60 JG. If the appropriate details are entered on a self-assessment tax return, the donation will be transferred anonymously to the Trust’s bank account.

Rutland Local History & Record Society

Chairman’s Report 2003-04

Although elected as a somewhat reluctant chairman, I have to report that I have actually enjoyed my first year in this office. Much of this is due to a strong and committed team of officers and committee members. I thank them for their support. Over the year we have seen significant developments in some areas, and steady progress in others.

The Society’s office, the Prince Yuri Galitzine Room, at the Rutland County Museum is now fully functional. We now have our own personal computer (thanks to a donation by Ian Ryder) and printer. Our membership database is now on this pc, and therefore under our control. We must thank Sue Curtis for ably maintaining it on the museum’s computer in the past.

Thanks to significant donations of books by Prince Yuri Galitzine, Bryan Waite, Alan Rogers, Peter Lane and others, and some purchases, we now have an excellent local history reference library, available for members to consult. The Society would welcome the offer of other relevant titles.

Peter Tomalin, David Carlin and Sue Howlett have been sorting and organising the library collection.
Additional shelving has been installed, and a catalogue is in preparation.

Progress has been made towards implementing the recommendations of the Development Group Report produced under the leadership of Alan Rogers. The Society now has draft financial and editorial policy documents, and the recommendations regarding reaching out to the local community are about to be implemented in a big way, as noted below.

The publication of *Rutland Record* accelerated to the extent that issues 21 and 22 appeared in the last 18 months, and 23 was well advanced. The *Index of RR 11–20* was also nearing completion. Two further projected publications, on the 1712 Land Tax and on Rutland Enclosures were both well on the way. There has also been some progress on the Winchelsea Oakham Survey. Steps are being taken to bring the long-overdue Hambleton excavation report to publication, thanks to an offer of help from Leicester University.

The twice-yearly Newsletter, which I edit, is I hope avidly read by all members because it is the only way we can keep all members fully up to date on Society activities. On average, only one fifth of the membership attends any one Society meeting. This means that, without the Newsletter, the other 200 or so members are in the dark, so to speak. The newsletter also performs another important function, that of being a permanent historical record of the Society’s activities.

The Environmental Group is concerned in particular with the built environment of Rutland. Its main task is to monitor planning applications for developments which might threaten our heritage, and to make the appropriate representations. A slight reorganisation here now means that David Carlin is looking after the north of the county and Auriol Thomson the south. Each is building up a list of contacts who have detailed knowledge of particular parishes.

The work of the Archaeology Group, including its important fieldwork programme, is described separately by Kate Don.

Another significant event has been the opening of the new Welcome to Rutland gallery, study room and shop at the museum. These are magnificent new facilities which I hope the Society can use and enjoy to the full. It is opportunite at this point to thank Simon Davies and his team for their enthusiastic support and interest in our many activities. Our Society is well regarded in outside circles and I think some of this comes from our association with the museum.

We are approaching the end of what has been an excellent year of meetings and events. Reports on all of these have appeared in the Newsletter, and in the local press (thanks to Vicky Sanderlin-McLoughlin). I would like to thank all the speakers and organisers for their efforts. The most successful events, if audience size is anything to go by, were the village visit to Glaston, Anne Paul’s talk on the Manton to Kettering Railway, Tim Clough’s guided tour of the horseshoes at Oakham Castle, Tim Appleton’s talk on Rutland Water, and the Bryan Matthews Lecture on Industrial Archaeology at Uppingham School. This venue is becoming a regular for the BM lecture and we are particularly grateful to the School for providing it free of charge. Another interesting programme is planned for the next 12 months, and will no doubt be described in the next annual report; it includes a village visit to Langham.

A group of eight members, under the chairmanship of Edward Baines, have been working on an application for a grant from the Local Heritage Initiative, to cover the costs of involving the local community in a project to record the heritage of Rutland Water. I am pleased to be able to report that the application has been successful. We have been offered a grant of £24,591 to cover the whole cost of the project – equipment, materials, design and printing, promotional costs etc. We have two years to complete it.

*Robert Ovens, Chairman*

**Archaeological Activities**

Kate Don received the Miss Linford Award for the best amateur archaeological project submitted to the Leicestershire Museums Archaeological Fieldwork Group in 2003. It is a great tribute to all who have worked on the Romano-British Town at Thistleton.

As a result of anecdotal evidence from former quarry workers in Market Overton, Kate Don, Bob Sparham and Professor Roger Wilson of Nottingham University visited the offices of Corus in Corby. There they found a mosaic “fragment” 5.5 m square which had been removed in the early 1960s from the villa site which lay to the north west of the town at Thistleton (SK 90 11 79). A follow-up visit by Simon Davies resulted in the company agreeing to donate the mosaic to Rutland County Museum on completion of the sale of the building in which it is displayed. The remainder of this substantial, high status villa was sadly quarried away. Mr D Hollis, the farmer at the time, kindly supplied photographs of Greenfield’s excavation of the villa which are now lodged with the SMR.

In July Kate Don and Wendy Walden once again held an exhibition in Market Overton village hall of finds from the Romano-British Town at Thistleton. Much interest was shown, particularly in the mosaic, and several new fieldwalkers signed up.

In August Kate Don spoke to the Rutland Ladies Forum about Thistleton and in November visited English Martyrs RC Primary School to talk to the children who were undertaking a project on the Romans. The pupils were very excited at being ‘hands-on’ with the pottery.

The Archaeological Group is grateful to the farmers and landowners who permit work to take place on their land, to Leicestershire’s Heritage Services for their advice and support, and last but not least to the fieldworkers who often brave bad weather to further our understanding of the Rutland landscape.

*Kate Don*
RUTLAND LOCAL HISTORY & RECORD SOCIETY
Registered Charity No. 700273

The Society's publications, with their main contents, are currently available as follows:

**Rutland Record Series**
3. *Stained Glass in Rutland Churches*, by Paul Sharpling (1997). Complete survey and gazetteer; introduction; lists of glaziers, subjects, dedicatees, donors, heraldry (now £7.50, members £5.00)
4. *Time in Rutland: a history and gazetteer of the bells, scratch dials, sundials and clocks of Rutland*, by Robert Ovens & Sheila Sleath (2002) (now £20.00, members £15.00)

**Occasional Publications**
4. *The History of Gilson's Hospital, Morcott*, by David Parkin (1995). The charity, its almshouse, trustees, beneficiaries, and farm at Scredington, Lincs. foundation deed, Gilson's will (£3.50, members £2.50)
5. *Lyndon, Rutland*, by Charles Mayhew (1999). Guide to the village and church (£2.50, members £2.00)
6. *The History of the Hospital of St John the Evangelist & St Anne in Okeham*, by David Parkin (2000). The 600-year old charity: history, chapel, trustees and beneficiaries (£3.50, members £2.50)

**Postage and packing**
*Rutland Record*, *Index*, *Occasional Publications* 1-6: 75p each. *Land Tax*: £1.00; *Stained Glass*: £1.50; *Tudor Rutland, Weather Journals*: £2.00 each. *Time in Rutland*: £5.00. Maximum on any one UK order except *Time in Rutland*: £3.00, overseas charged at cost – please enquire for details: payment in sterling only.

All orders for publications, with payment in sterling including postage as shown above, and trade enquiries should be sent to: The Honorary Editor, RLHRS, c/o Rutland County Museum, Catmose Street, Oakham, Rutland, LE15 6HW, England. Membership enquiries should be sent to the Honorary Membership Secretary at the same address.
Rutland Record 24

Journal of the Rutland Local History & Record Society

Rutland and the Medieval Wool Trade

Ketton Freestone in the Nineteenth Century

1851 Religious Census

Rutland History and Archaeology in 2003