The Society is formed from the union in June 1991 of the Rutland Local History Society, founded in the 1930s, and the Rutland Record Society, founded in 1979. In May 1993, the Rutland Field Research Group for Archaeology & History, founded in 1971, also amalgamated with the Society.

The Society is a Registered Charity, and its aim is the advancement of the education of the public in all aspects of the history of the ancient County of Rutland and its immediate area.

Registered Charity No. 700723

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS 2016-17

PRESIDENT
Edward Baines

CHAIRMAN
Debbie Frearson

VICE-CHAIRMAN
Robert Ovens

HONORARY SECRETARY
c/o Rutland County Museum, Oakham, Rutland

HONORARY TREASURER
Dr Ian Ryder

HONORARY MEMBERSHIP SECRETARY
Dr Lin Ryder

HONORARY EDITOR
Tim Clough

HONORARY ARCHIVIST
Robin Jenkins

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
The Officers of the Society and the following elected members:
Carole Bancroft-Turner, Audrey Buxton, Elizabeth Bryan, David Carlin, Robert Clayton, Hilary Crowden, Michael Frisby (webmaster), Michael Hinman (minutes secretary), Jill Kimber (correspondence secretary), Paul Reeve, Dr Michael Tillbrook

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE
Edward Baines, Tim Clough (convener), Debbie Frearson, Robin Jenkins, Robert Ovens, Professor Alan Rogers (academic adviser), Dr Ian Ryder, Dr Michael Tillbrook

ARCHAEOLOGICAL GROUP
c/o Rutland County Museum, Oakham, Rutland

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT GROUP
Carole Bancroft-Turner (convener)

HONORARY MEMBERS
Mrs Betty Finch, Mrs Sue Howlett, Peter N Lane, Dr Michael Tillbrook, Bryan Waites

Enquiries relating to the Society’s activities, such as membership, editorial matters, history enquiries, historic buildings, archaeology, or programme of events, should be addressed to the appropriate Officer of the Society.

The Society welcomes new members, and hopes to encourage them to participate in the Society’s activities at all levels, and to submit the results of their researches, where appropriate, for publication by the Society.

For available publications and prices, see inside back cover or our website or www.genfair.co.uk.

Out of print publications may be downloaded free of charge from our website.

Publications can be ordered and annual subscriptions can be paid on-line via www.genfair.co.uk.

The address of the Society is c/o Rutland County Museum,
Catmose Street, Oakham, Rutland, LE15 6HW (telephone Oakham (01572) 758440)

website: www.rutlandhistory.org – e-mail: enquiries@rutlandhistory.org
Rutland Record

Journal of the Rutland Local History & Record Society

No 36 (for 2016)

Editorial

Notes on Contributors

Isaack Symmes and the Ridlington sundial
Robert Ovens

Belton (Rutland) and the Blount family
Bridget Wells-Furby

A social study of Vale of Catmose villages in the eighteenth century
M J Hinman

A Neolithic jadeitite axehead fragment from Martinsthorpe, Rutland
Alison Sheridan, Pierre Pétrequin & Michel Errera

Artefacts recorded with the Portable Antiquities Scheme in Rutland
Wendy Scott

Rutland History and Archaeology in 2015
Edited by T H McK Clough

Front cover illustration:
The Ridlington sundial (Rutland County Museum)

Back cover illustrations:
Detail of the Ridlington sundial (Robert Ovens)
The Martinsthorpe Neolithic axe (Alison Sheridan)
Medieval ring from Belton (Leicestershire County Council)

Contributions and editorial correspondence should be sent to the Honorary Editor,
Rutland Local History & Record Society, Rutland County Museum, Catmose Street, Oakham, Rutland, LE15 6HW

Published by the Rutland Local History & Record Society – Copyright © RLHRS and authors 2016

Printed by Leicestershire County Council’s Central Print Service, County Hall, Glenfield, Leicester, LE3 8RA
Editorial: Are we Rutlanders, Europeans, or both?

One of the most contentious issues of the recent European referendum was that of migration: yet none of us can really claim to be indigenous or aboriginal people, as DNA studies are tending to show. There have always been movements of people across Europe, often (though by no means always) northwards and westwards, and often bringing new cultures to Britain. Locally, the earliest evidence so far found for the presence of humans comes from a Neanderthal camp at Glaston some 40,000 years ago (Cooper, L, & Thomas 2012). At that time one could have walked from Europe to Rutland – not that either entity existed as such in that remote period. Then, as the ice of the last glaciation retreated and before ‘Doggerland’ had become submerged, thus separating Britain from mainland Europe, there is evidence for Upper Palaeolithic and Mesolithic activity at various sites in the county (Jones 2007).

Succeeding periods are well represented: continental contacts are spectacularly illustrated by the discovery in 2015 of a Neolithic polished jadeitite axe originating from the Italian Alps (Sheridan et al, this issue), although one can only speculate as to how and why it ended up here. Finds of Bronze Age metalwork whose technology reaches us ultimately from the Near East form an interesting corpus too (Clough 1979).

Thus even our small county has important cultural connections with Europe throughout prehistory. However, it is probably the late Iron Age and Romano-British periods that most readers will associate with the arrival of ‘foreigners’, first Celts and then Romans: Julius Caesar’s success was attributed by Sellar & Yeatman (1930) to his having landed ‘correctly’ in Thanet. Our main Romano-British sites, as at Great Casterton, Market Overton / Thistleton, and around Rutland Water need little introduction; they represent nearly five centuries of rule by an authority based in Italy. By the time the Romans relinquished their British province, they were dependent on mercenary troops from northern Europe whose possessions can sometimes be found here. They were to be succeeded by intrusive Angles and Saxons, whose Germanic grave-goods are found in their Rutland cemeteries such as Market Overton, North Luffenham and Empingham (eg Cooper, N J, 2000), and by Vikings (though there is minimal evidence for the latter in our county), and then in 1066 by the Normans – to one of whose continental barons we are indebted for the magnificent Great Hall of Oakham Castle.

From then on, each successive century depicts a history of European or wider contacts, whether it be Rutland supplying bacon to beleaguered forces in France in the fourteenth century (Harrop 1999) or Sir Gerard Noel buying timber from the Baltic in the eighteenth for the construction of his riding school in Oakham (now the Rutland County Museum) (Clough 1995), to cite but two relatively insignificant instances. More to the point perhaps, Rutland gave shelter to the Belgian royal household and its stables following the outbreak of the First World War (Phillips 1920).

Whatever we consider ourselves to be in a European context, even such a summary glance back through time only reinforces one point: history puts everything into its proper perspective. So long as we don’t rewrite it.
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Isaack Symmes and the Ridlington Sundial

ROBERT OVEENS

Fig. 1. The Ridlington sundial (Rutland County Museum).

Fig. 2. The sundial on its pedestal (author).

A sundial from Ridlington, dated 1614, was examined in 1976 by the then curator of Rutland County Museum and, from practice engraving on the rear, it was clear that it was almost certainly made for use in Ridlington churchyard, perhaps for regulating the church clock. Based on the inscription on the front of the dial, it was suggested that it was the gift of Sir William Bulstrode to Isaack Symmes, possibly a member of a local Symmes or Symmys family, but that more research was required. Subsequent research has now established that Isaack Symmes was, in fact, the maker of the dial. He was an eminent London goldsmith, clockmaker and watchmaker, and a number of his sundials and watches have survived. By examining the Ridlington sundial in detail, and by using wills, other publications, auction details and published research by others, it has been possible to establish a great deal more about the life and work of Isaack Symmes and his relationship with Sir William Bulstrode.

The Ridlington sundial first came to light when it was described in ‘An Early Seventeenth Century Dial from Ridlington, Rutland’ by T H McK Clough (1976-77). The article begins:

The dial which is described and illustrated here was the subject of an enquiry to the Rutland County Museum, Oakham, in 1976 by Mr. J. M. Moubray of Ridlington House, in whose garden it was standing. He had occasion to remove it from its station, and as a result found that the underside was of unexpected interest. I am grateful to Mr. Moubray for the opportunity to record these details of the piece. The face of the dial bears the following legend:

Isaack 1614 Symmes
*The*gift*of*Sir*Willyame*Bulstrode*

The article goes on to suggest that Isaack Symmes was perhaps related to local Symmes or Symmys families, although no link could be established, and that the dial was presented to him by Sir William Bulstrode, but also states that, ‘Further research is
necessary to establish the identity of Isaac Symmes and the relationship between him and his benefactor. In fact, subsequent research has established that Isaack Symmes was a goldsmith, clockmaker and watchmaker working in the Aldgate area of London, and he has been identified as one of a group of important Elizabethan instrument makers (Turner 2000, 250-2). Consequently, it is now clear that Isaack was the maker of the dial for Sir William Bulstrode who in turn presented it to Ridlington Church. Sir William was Member of Parliament for Rutland at the time when Isaack was frequently visiting Westminster on business, and this seems to be the most likely opportunity for their business relationship.

Isaack usually spelled his surname as Symmes and occasionally as Simmes. Others, however, used Simes, Symes, Symme, Symms and Symmys, as well as Sims and Simms. His first name was usually recorded as Isaac, but he almost always preferred Isaack when signing his sundials.

**Ridlington Church Clock and Sundial**

Prior to the invention in 1656 of the pendulum clock with an accurate escapement by Christiaan Huygens, a prominent Dutch mathematician and scientist, the earliest church clocks had a crude verge and foliot escapement, a wooden frame, and no dial, and required daily winding. One of these clocks, and the earliest recorded in Rutland, was at Ridlington (Ovens & Sleath 2002, 276). The evidence for this is in the Church Court records for the village which were transcribed by the Venerable E A Irons of North Luffenham in the 1920s (RLHRS website):

1618 The clock & chimes are out of reaipare and do not go
1620 Feb 22 Henry Good & Thomas Hansworth to certifie the reaipare of the clock

Ridlington church clock has not survived and there is no record of when it was removed.

Up to the introduction of commercial time-distribution services by electric telegraph around 1900, the only practical source of reasonably accurate time available to regulate the church clock was a ‘scientific’ sundial, and the Ridlington church sundial would have been used for this purpose.

The Venerable E A Irons’ notes on the arch-deacon’s visitation of 1681 (VCH Rutland II, 95) record that the churchwardens of Ridlington were ordered to amend the dial in the churchyard, almost certainly referring to the Symmes dial described here, which by then would have been 67 years old and, as this reference suggests, located in the churchyard.

At some stage, probably after the demise of the church clock, the sundial was removed to the grounds of the adjacent Ridlington House, which was the rectory until 1827 when it was replaced by a new rectory to the south-west of the church. Ridlington House is a Grade II listed property and the earliest part, the west (front) elevation, is of 16th century origin.

The Ridlington dial is a horizontal sundial. Horizontal sundials are designed for mounting on a flat horizontal surface, usually, but not exclusively, on the top of a purpose-designed decorative pedestal. In this case, the original pedestal has been lost and, until it was removed for preservation and security reasons, the Ridlington sundial was mounted on an unusual pedestal (figs. 1, 2). This is clearly a replacement pedestal made from a redundant carved limestone architectural or memorial feature which appears to be of ecclesiastical origin. It has not been possible to identify its source.

The dial plate would have been mounted with the gnomon aligned exactly North–South, the inclined shadow edge of this being parallel to the earth’s axis. To achieve this the gnomon angle has to be exactly the same as the latitude of the location of the sundial.

The dial consists of a 5.8mm thick brass base-plate, 158mm square, tapering forward to 155mm square. It was fixed to its pedestal through a 7mm diameter hole near each corner. The 2.74mm thick upright gnomon is a plain flat plate in the shape of a right-angled triangle. It is 75.54mm tall, 70.72mm wide, and 104.08mm along the hypotenuse. The gnomon is fixed in position by means of slots in the base-plate which are 4.68mm wide and 14mm / 12mm long. The slots are thus nearly 2mm wider than the thickness of the gnomon, which suggests that the gnomon is an inappropriate replacement, and this is confirmed by the following analysis of the gnomon angle.

A horizontal sundial of this form has to be designed for a specific latitude. As already indicated, the gnomon angle of a horizontal sundial (fig. 3) is the same as the latitude of the sundial’s location, making the shadow line (the hypotenuse) parallel to the earth’s axis. The tangent of the gnomon angle of the Ridlington dial (opposite/adjacent) is 75.54/70.72 = 1.0682. The angle whose tangent is 1.0682 is 46.89°. The Ridlington sundial will therefore only be correct for latitude 46.89° (46° 53’ 24") North or South which, for example in the northern hemisphere, is just south of Nantes, Loire Atlantique, France. Ridlington’s latitude is 52.62° N (56° 36’ 56’’), a difference of 5.73°. Consequently, the Symmes dial would be inaccurate in its intended location. However, an attempt to correct for this was made on the replacement pedestal by canting the top surface backwards by about 6°.
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The design of the Ridlington dial is typical for a basic horizontal sundial, showing the four cardinal compass points (N, S, E and W) and the hours from 4am to 8pm in roman numerals, each hour being divided into half and quarters. The centre has a sun face, personified in the familiar way. Initials in one corner, which can be read as D T or T D, are probably those of an unknown engraver. Isaack Symmes would have been responsible for designing and laying out the dial before passing it to his engraver.

The carefully executed geometric design is not readily apparent in the photograph of the dial (fig. 1) because of surface corrosion and it is therefore included as a drawing (fig. 5). Note that the letter N for north and the sun face are partly obscured by the gnomon on the actual dial. To create the drawing, the angles of the hour and intermediate lines on the original dial plate were carefully measured. In this case, these lines radiate from the root of the gnomon at the centre of the dial, which is the simplest form for such a dial, tending to mimic a clock dial. In more complicated dials, the root of the gnomon is below the centre of the dial. However, in both cases the angles of the hour lines (and any sub-divisions) either side of the north-south line are the same for any dial of this type, and can be calculated for any latitude. This provides a means of checking the accuracy of the layout of the Ridlington dial. The angle for any given time is derived from:

\[ \tan X = \sin \Theta \times \tan H, \]

where:

- \( X \) = the angle between the noon line and the hour line on the sundial;
- \( \Theta \) = the latitude of the sundial’s location;
- \( H \) = the angle between the noon line and the hour line on a clock dial (defined as Local Apparent Time).

This is the sun’s hour angle which is 15 degrees for each hour, starting from noon. Thus, the hour angles for 11am and 1pm are both 15 degrees, and for 10am and 2pm they are both 30 degrees, and so on.

For example, for 11am the tangent of the angle between the 11am hour line and the noon line is sin 52.6160 x tan 15 = 0.7946 x 0.2679 = 0.2129. The angle whose tangent is 0.2129 is 12.02°.

Comparing the calculated angles with the actual angles on the Ridlington dial we have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual from dial</th>
<th>Calculated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0°</td>
<td>0°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12° &amp; 12.5°</td>
<td>12.02°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.75° &amp; 24°</td>
<td>24.64°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.75° &amp; 38°</td>
<td>38.47°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.25° &amp; 53.25°</td>
<td>54°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71° &amp; 72°</td>
<td>71.36°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90° &amp; 90°</td>
<td>90°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109° &amp; 108.5°</td>
<td>108.64°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126°</td>
<td>126°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.75° &amp; 126.5°</td>
<td>126.75°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109° &amp; 108.5°</td>
<td>108.64°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comparison demonstrates that Isaack Symmes laid out the dial quite accurately for its intended location, the maximum error being less than 1°. It also confirms that the gnomon is almost certainly a replacement – if he knew how to lay out a sundial as accurately as this he would certainly have been aware of the importance of the gnomon angle.

However, one factor which would lead to a slight inaccuracy in time indication is that there is no gap at 12.00 to allow for the thickness of the gnomon (fig. 3). Later sundials incorporated a ‘gnomon gap’ or ‘noon gap’ by engraving the sundials as two semi-circles separated by this gap.

The Equation of Time

The Equation of Time is the difference between time measured using a sundial, also known as true or apparent solar time, and time measured using a clock, or mean solar time. Note that the word ‘equation’ is used here in the medieval sense in order to reconcile a difference. Most clocks run on the idea that a day is exactly 24 equal hours. Sundials have unequal hours which vary according to the time of year. A sundial is slow by nearly 15 minutes in February and fast by nearly 16 minutes in November, and correct
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Fig. 5. Drawing of the Ridlington dial with schematic lettering, and photograph of the engraved legends (author).
in April, June, September and December (fig. 4). The difference between apparent solar time and mean time has been recognized by astronomers since antiquity, but prior to the invention of accurate mechanical clocks in the mid-17th century, sundials were the only reliable timepieces and solar time was the generally accepted standard. When accurate mechanical clocks were introduced they agreed with sundials only on four dates each year, as noted above, so the Equation of Time was used to correct their readings to obtain sundial time.

Later, as clocks became the dominant means of telling the time, uncorrected clock time became the accepted standard. The readings of sundials, when they were used, were then, and often still are, corrected with the Equation of Time, used in the reverse direction from previously, to obtain clock time. Many sundials therefore have tables or graphs of the Equation of Time engraved on them to allow the user to make this correction.

The difference between sundial time and clock time is due to a combination of two factors:

1. The orbit of the Earth round the sun is an ellipse which is not centred on the Sun.
2. Earth’s axis is inclined by about 23.44 degrees relative to the plane of its orbit round the Sun.

The first tables to give the Equation of Time in an essentially correct way were published in 1665 by Christian Huygens. Isaack Symmes would not have been concerned by the Equation of Time because in his day sundial time was the accepted norm, but he would no doubt have been aware of it.

Today, there are two other factors which have to be taken into account when converting sundial time to clock time. The first is that sundials record local time, which may be several minutes before or after Greenwich Mean Time depending on the longitude of the sundial’s location (Ridlington is about 3 minutes after GMT), and the second is the change due to Daylight Saving Time or Summer Time.

**The Underside of the Ridlington Dial**

As noted by Clough (1976-77), the reverse or underside of the dial has been used for practice engraving, both in lettering and in scrolls and cartouches, all of which appears to be contemporary (fig. 6). Roman and italic styles of lettering can be seen, probably by the same engraver as the face of the dial. The main interest of this lies in the fact that the dial was evidently for Ridlington church because the words ‘Ridlington’, ‘Dial’, ‘Church’ and ‘Belong’ appear in full, and there are also fragments of these and other words, executed in a range of lettering styles. The intended message was clearly ‘This Dial Belongs to Ridlington Church’. Other literary fragments, such as ‘Sr Tho’ and the initials ‘T P’ within a heart-shaped outline, for example, may relate to other customers. Other engraving includes a representation of an eye (near the lower right fixing hole) and caricatures of a bald-headed man, whose neckwear may represent clerical or legal attire, and of a man smoking a pipe. The pipe-smoker is an

![Fig. 6. Practice engraving on the underside of the dial, with a detail of a man smoking a pipe (author).](image)
interesting reference to the habit of ‘drinking’ tobacco, only 30 years or so after its general introduction to England, and eleven years after King James I had published his A Counterblaste to Tobacco (1604) in which he expresses his distaste for tobacco, particularly tobacco smoking.

The Life of Isaack Symmes

The record of apprentices at Goldsmiths’ Hall in London has the following entry (Goldsmiths Company Apprentice Book vol 1 folio 102r) relating to Isaack Symmes:

_In that Isaack Symmes, the son of Roger Symes clarke of London have put myself prentis to John Harmfri for eight years. Beginning Michelmas 1594. By me Isaac Symmes._

It is interesting to note here that Isaack’s father was Roger Symmes, a clerk, perhaps indicating that he was a member of the clergy.

After his apprenticeship with John Humphrey, who was also a member of the Goldsmiths’ Company, Isaack Symmes moved to Richard Lytler, another master (ibid, vol 1 folio 114v):

_Memorandum that Isaac, the son of Roger Symes of London clarke have put my selfe prentis to Richard Lytler for ix years. Beginning at the birth of our Lord Ano 1596. By me Isaac Symmes._

The Goldsmiths’ Company Wardens’ Court Minute Book (vol O, pt 2, p322) record Isaack Symmes’ freedom from the company in January 1603/4, but now state that he served four years with John Humfrey and the rest of his apprenticeship with a Daniel Bennett who is not otherwise recorded:

_Isaac Symmes, Servant to John Humfre for four years and the rest with Daniel Bennett._

_Dated Frida 27th January 1603/4._

At this time, Goldsmiths’ Company apprenticeships normally lasted for nine years, starting at the age of 15. From this it appears that Isaack was born about 1580, and that he was about 24 years old at the date of his freedom.

His freedom from the Goldsmiths’ Company allowed Isaack to begin working and earning in his own right. Apprentices were not allowed to marry until they had received their freedom and he married Emma Howe (née Davy, of Lavenham, Suffolke), a widow, in March 1604. Their Marriage Allegation is recorded by the Archdeaconry Court of London (Chester 1887, 285) as follows:

_March 12th 1603/4. Isaack Symmes of St. Botolph Aldgate, London, Goldsmith and Emma Howe of St Bartholomew the Great, West Smithfield, widow of Henry Howe late of same, yeoman. At St. Botolph, Aldgate._

At this time, Emma, who was some twenty years older than Isaack, had a son, Robert Howe, who is mentioned in Isaack’s will, and a daughter, Em, later the wife of Samuel Purser. Also, a Jonas Howe is listed as Isaack’s first apprentice, starting in 1604, and he may have been another son of Emma and Henry Howe.

Isaack Symmes and his family lived at first in the area of St Botolph, in Aldgate, London, but after 1612 they were living in Houndsditch, in the parish of St Botolph Without, which is just outside the City of London. This is confirmed by an indenture dated 15th July 1612 in the Guildhall Library (MS Dept Add MSS 722) concerning the purchase of a house by Isaack Symmes. Some of Isaack’s work is signed ‘at Aldgate’, some with just ‘London’, but the rest does not indicate a location.

Houndsditch is a now one-way street in London linking Outwich Street in the north-west to St Botolph Street in the south-east. ‘Houndsditch’ first appears in the 13th century and it marks the route of an old ditch that ran outside part of the London Wall, renowned for being used as a site for the disposing of waste and, particularly, deceased dogs. Several dogs’ skeletons were unearthed at Houndsditch when the area was redeveloped in 1989 (Houndsditch, en.m.wikipedia.org).

The tenement on the east side of Houndsditch, between Gravel Lane on the south and Cock and Hoop Yard to the north, which was occupied by Isaack Symmes and his family in 1612, was surveyed by Treswell in 1607 who recorded the dimensions, the plan of which survives. In _Life in the suburbs: health, domesticity and status in early modern London_, Dr Mark Latham gives details of the property which can be identified on Ogilby and Morgan’s map of 1676 (Latham 2012, 1; Ogilby & Morgan 1676). There were two rooms on the ground floor consisting of a shop at the front with stairs to the first floor and a kitchen behind with a large fireplace on the south eastern wall. The first floor consisted of two chambers and a garret. There was also a 51ft garden to the rear of the tenement. By 1808 it had been converted into the Kings Arms public house.

Judging by his will, Isaack became quite prosperous and was a well-regarded member of the community, leaving a number of gifts to the workers and poor of the district. He was also probably the Isaac Syms who held the office of the Houndsditch precinct scavenger (official in charge of collecting tax on goods sold by foreign merchants) in 1606 and 1614, parish collector in 1618 and constable in 1619, as recorded in the parish records.

St Botolph’s parish records also give some details of Isaack’s immediate family. Mary Spilman (née Symmes), wife of Thomas Spilman, was noted as sister to Isaack when she was buried in September 1611, and she was recorded as living in
Houndsditch. Similarly, the 1620 burial record of Jane Roberts, wife of Henry Roberts, a clockmaker, indicates that she was being maintained by her brother Isaack Symmes of Houndsditch. She was buried in the St Botolph’s Aldgate churchyard (at the south-east end of Houndsditch) alongside her mother’s grave and was soon joined by Isaack himself, and his wife Emma, who were buried on the 18th and 24th November 1622 respectively, this short interval suggesting that they fell victim to one of the epidemics that beset London in the 1620s. It is also recorded (Latham 2012, 11) that Isaack’s death was marked with a knell from the great bell of St Botolph’s church.

Whilst little is known of Isaack Symmes’ business life as a goldsmith, clockmaker and watchmaker, it is known (inf John Davis, British Sundial Society) that he took the following apprentices:

1604 Jonas Howe (probably Isaack’s step-son)
1610 Samuel Linaker (admitted to the Clockmakers Company on its incorporation in 1631; a sundial by him was sold by Charles Miller Auctions in October 2011 for £120; died 1649; Loomes 2006, 485)
1615 Onesiphorus Helden (a member of the Goldsmiths Company in 1630; a petitioner for, and admitted to, the Clockmakers Company in 1631, and a warden in 1648; died 1656: ibid, 365)
1622 Simon Hackett (admitted to the Clockmakers Company in 1632; died 1664: ibid, 334)

Simon Hackett was turned over to Samuel Linaker in the first year of his apprenticeship following the death of Isaack.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century, there was a growing number of watchmakers in the City of London, and while many of them were members of the Worshipful Company of Blacksmiths, a small number joined the Goldsmiths’ Company. Isaack Symmes, who trained as a goldsmith, was one of them. Rather strangely, many master and apprentice instrument makers, as well as some clockmakers, found a craft home in the Grocers’ Company. In 1622, the last year of his life, Isaack was one of the sixteen signatories to the first ‘Petition of the London Clockmakers’ (Clockmakers, online) which appealed to James I to allow the formation of a Clockmakers’ Company. Here he is listed as a clockmaker and householder in London alongside others as one of the established City makers. The intention was that this new City livery company would keep out Huguenot clock and watch makers by preventing them from taking part in the horological trade in the City of London and for a radius of ten miles around. This was perhaps somewhat unpatriotic, since it has been said that Isaack was himself of French origin (Loomes 2003, 126-7). The appeal was unsuccessful and the Worshipful Company of Clockmakers was not granted its charter until 1631.

Isaack Symmes’ Will
Isaack Symmes’ last will (The National Archives, PROB 11-140-445) is dated 15th November 1622, three days before his burial. His extensive bequests indicate that he was a prosperous man and generous to his family, those he worked with and the poor of the community. It also gives a little more information on his business activities:

I give all my godchildren that are living ten shillings apiece. I give Mr. Bicrast’s children amongst them all ten shillings. To John James and his wife six shillings. To John Hinde fifteen shillings. To [ ... ] Cooke the porter six shillings eight pence and his children twelve pence apiece. I give Isaac Ponder the son of Daniel Ponder that is gone beyond the seas seven pounds. I give to the poor of the parish ten pounds. I give all my servants that dwell with me now twenty shillings apiece. I give Elizabeth Sommer twenty shillings. I give Mr Knolles and his wife between them five shillings. I give Mr Smith the surgeon and his wife between them five shillings. I give Mr Hilles maids that now dwell with him twenty pence apiece. I give to all Wm Simmes’ children six shillings eight pence apiece to be divided amongst them by the discretion of their father. I give Mr Coes and his wife between them five shillings. I give John Johnson the clockmaker if he be living ten shillings. I give Mr Lorde’s wife, my countrywoman six shillings eight pence. I give the knife maker in Blackfriars and to his wife that maketh the clocklines thirteen shillings four pence. I forgive John Surmeys which that which he owes me either by bill or bond or any other reckoning. I forgive Harry Kenixe that which he owes me either by bill or bond or any other reckoning. I forgive Robert Rodired watchmaker that which he owes me either upon bill or bond or any other reckoning. I forgive the porter that hired my shop at Westminster for one year’s rent that he oweth me. I forgive the tooth pick maker at Charing Cross for one year’s rent that he oweth me. I forgive my wife’s son Robert Howe all that he oweth me and I give him thirty shillings so as he seal his mother or he which shall be executor a general release. I give to Daniell Braband and his wife to either of them eleven shillings. I give to his daughter Sara a pair of flaxen ordinary sheets. I give to my daughter Em Purser my best child-bed sheets and two of the best cushions and to her daughter Jane a wainscot chair and a scarf fringed with silver and to her husband my gold seal ring and a good watch or a good chamber clock for his house which he will make choice of. I give to Taber a Waterman at the Old Swan and to all the Old Swan men and Taber to be steward amongst them ten shillings to be spent in bread or beer and every man to have his share and if Taber be dead the next Old Swan man and he to have 1 shilling clear. To Maggat
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A Waterman and to the rest of the Watermen at the Blackfriars Stairs to be spent amongst them all in bread and beer five shillings and Maggat to be steward and to have for his pains clear twelve pence. To the ancient Watermen at Westminster that dwell there to be spent in bread or beer five shillings. Mr. Barrell, Mr. Flood and Mr. Thomson I give them twenty shillings for the use of the poor to give everyone a penny out of that twenty shillings so far as it will go. I give them all three twelve pence apiece to buy them a pair of gloves in remembrance of me, desiring them to do it faithfully. If they refuse, I entreat the churchwardens to do it. I give to Mistress Waller six shillings eight pence for to spend it upon herself and all the ancient women of that side shopkeepers in Westminster Hall in what they will. If she will not take that pains, entreat any of the next of the ancients. I give to the spectacle maker my tenant at Westminster three shillings four pence. I give to Evans the Welshman if he buy living six shillings eight pence. I give to Father Terry and His wife between them five shillings. I give Nan How the daughter of Robert How my wife’s grandchild twenty shillings. I give to my wife’s godchild the [trummer] Peters that makes buttons six shillings eight pence. All the rest and residue of my goods and chattels except a silver cover watch to Mr Warrine, I give to Em my loving wife and I make my wife executor and if she refuse Mr Warrine the scrivener and if she holds it then Mr Warrine to be the overseer and I give him for his pains a silver cover watch.

It is interesting to note his generous gifts to the watermen whom he knew well and who presumably carried him on his regular trips by boat on the River Thames between Blackfriars and Westminster. In fact, Westminster is mentioned three times again in this will: the shopkeepers in Westminster Hall, his tenant the spectacle maker at Westminster, and his tenant ‘the porter that hired my shop at Westminster’. ‘I forgive the tooth pick maker at Charing Cross for one year’s rent that he oweth me’ indicates another of his properties in the Westminster area. Isaack’s business in Westminster was almost certainly how Sir William Bulstrode, Member of Parliament for Rutland, came to commission Isaack to make the sundial for Ridlington Church.

Some of Isaack’s other horological business contacts are also represented in his will, including John Johnson the clockmaker to whom he left ten shillings, the wife of the knife maker in Blackfriars ‘that maketh the clocklines’ and Robert Rodired, watchmaker, whom Isaack forgave ‘that which he owes me’.

The will also confirms Isaack’s business as a watch and clock maker and retailer. His son-in-law, Samuel Purser, was to choose either ‘a good watch or a good chamber clock’, and Mr Warren, the executor, was to receive a ‘silver cover watch’, suggesting that there were sufficient items to choose from, rather than just one or two special clocks and watches. The reference to ‘a good chamber clock’ is interesting. Now known as balance wheel lantern clocks, they were first made in London about 1600, had a crude balance wheel escapement and needed winding every eight hours, but very few of these clocks have survived in original condition. Isaack Symmes is one of the few known workers in the clock trade at this time, and it is possible that he is the ‘IS’ who supplied brass lantern clock castings to the trade which had these initials (inf Brian Loomes). However, there is no reference to any workshop equipment or tools of his trade. These may have been amongst the ‘goods and chattels’ he left to Emma, his wife, but they are not specifically itemised in her will (The National Archives, PROB 11-140-472) of 20th November 1622. Samuel Purser was Emma’s principal beneficiary, and he may have been the ultimate recipient. Em Purser, wife of this Samuel Purser and described in Isaack’s will as ‘my daughter’ was, in fact, his stepdaughter whose father was Henry Howe, Emma Symmes’ first husband.

Other Sundials by Isaack Symmes

Apart from the Ridlington dial, five other sundials signed by Isaack Symmes are known to have survived. The first (fig. 7) is in the Museum of the History of Science at Oxford (Museum of the History of Science). It is 180mm square and signed ‘Isaack Simmes Gouldsmith and Clockmaker’. It is dated 1735, but this is engraved over the

Fig. 7. The Symmes sundial at the Museum of the History of Science, Oxford (Museum of the History of Science).
original date and the initials R + I added. It also has lines of declination to indicate the entry of the sun through the year into each zodiac sign, and these are identified in elaborate script from the Tropic of Capricorn to the Tropic of Cancer. However, these lines have now been shown to be somewhat incorrect, particularly at their extremities (Lowne & Davis 2007, 131). The marker is the shadow cast by a notch and small hole cut in the gnomon. Declination lines have appeared on English horizontal dials since the very earliest days of dial making, although they rather went out of favour on London-made dials after about 1630. It is unlikely that the lines were derived from calculations. At this date they were probably drawn by some graphical method or from tables.

At the centre of the North side of the dial, obscuring the 12 o’clock position, is a lunar volvelle. Using this device, readings by moonlight can be converted into solar time. It consists of two concentric discs which can be independently rotated, surrounded by two fixed scales which are concentric with the discs. The inner disc has symbols indicating phases of the moon, from New Moon to Full Moon (waxing moon) to New Moon (waning moon). The declination line carries the ages of the moon, from 1 to 29½ days. The inner of the two concentric scales shows points of the compass, and the outer scale shows hours as on a 24-hour clock, but marked as 1 to 12 twice. There is an index with a straight edge on the periphery of the phases of the moon disc which extends to the hours scale. In operation, the edge of this index is turned to the relevant number on the age of the moon disc. If this is unknown, it can be established approximately from the symbols on the phases of the moon disc. Both discs are then turned to the compass direction of the moon. The index then points to the approximate solar time. This sundial certainly demonstrates Isaack Symmes’ wider understanding of sundials at the time and his skill as a dial maker.

The second and largest dial is 310 mm square and is in the Science Museum (acc no 1976-414). It is signed ‘Isaack Symmes Gouldsmyth & Clockmaker at London’ and ‘Anno 1609’. At the four corners are later fixing holes, the corners of the dial having been clipped to remove the original holes. This dial also has lines of declination of the Sun throughout the year, from the Tropic of Capricorn to the Tropic of Cancer. Each line has the Zodiac marked in name and sign. Like the Oxford dial, these lines have now been shown to be somewhat incorrect (Lowne & Davis 2007, 131), particularly at their extremities. The declination at any particular date is indicated by the position of the shadow of a spur set in the edge of the gnomon. This dial also has a lunar volvelle and includes the coat of arms of the Leigh family of Stoneleigh, Warwickshire.

The remaining dials are of less complicated design, not dissimilar to the Ridlington dial. The third sundial is approximately 161 by 162mm and is just signed ‘Isaack Symmes’ and ‘1610’ without location. It is in a private collection.

The fourth sundial is 153mm square and is just signed ‘Isaack Symmes’ without date or location. It was purchased at auction by Brian Loomes (Loomes 2003, 126-7) and is now in the Worshipful Company of Clockmakers’ collection at the Science Museum, London. It has an inappropriate replacement gnomon (fig. 8).

The fifth sundial by Isaack Symmes is just 124mm square and again only carries his signature (inf John Davis, British Sundial Society). It is very similar in design to the fourth dial, but has an original ornate gnomon. It is also privately owned.

Clocks and Watches by Isaack Symmes
Although two of his sundials state that he is a clockmaker and he left either a good watch or a good chamber clock’ to his son-in-law, Samuel Purser, in his will, none of Isaack Symmes’ clocks are known to have survived. However, he is best known as a watchmaker and five of his watches have survived, all exhibiting fine craftsmanship, very fine engraving and gilded brass plates, as might be expected from someone who trained as a goldsmith.

Notes and Queries (ser 4, vol 9 (1872), 15) records that a watch by Isaack Symmes was sold by Christie’s for six guineas during their auction in 1843 of the clocks and watches of Prince Augustus Frederick, Duke of Sussex (1773-1843), sixth son of George III. It was described in the sale catalogue as: 

Fig. 8. The Symmes sundial now in the Worshipful Company of Clockmaker’s collection in the Science Museum, London (Brian Loomes)
A highly interesting and curious hexagonal watch, the property of the last Abbot of Glastonbury. It bears the maker's name, Isaac Symmes. A MS note traces it back to the time of the Dissolution of the abbey; also the abbot's seal.

The last Abbot of Glastonbury was Richard Whiting (1461-1539). He presided over Glastonbury Abbey at the time of the Dissolution of the Monasteries (1536-1541) under King Henry VIII. The king had him executed after his conviction for treason for remaining loyal to Rome. An engraving of the watch (fig. 9) and its story was published in *History of the Abbey of Glaston* by Rev Richard Warner (Warner 1826, lxxiv and Plate XVII):

*These relics are in the possession of the Rev. John Bowen, of Portland-place, Bath, vicar of Mudford, Somerset, perpetual curate of Godney, near Glastonbury, minister of Margaret chapel, Bath, and a magistrate and deputy lieutenant for the same county; who most obligingly and readily allowed a drawing to be made of them, for the use of this work. The proofs of the genuineness of these articles, and the account of their descent to the present time, are as follows. In the year 1783, Mr. Bowen, being then vicar of Bishop's Lydeard, Somersetshire, purchased of Mr. Howe, a watchmaker in that parish, the articles in question. Mr. Howe had bought them, sometime before, at a sale by auction of the goods of the Rev. Mr. Paine deceased, who had lived to the advanced age of one hundred years. In the family of this gentleman a tradition was preserved, that the watch and seal had been successively worn by himself, his father, and grandfather, all the time they were at Oxford, of which University they had all been members; and that they had been purchased, by an ancestor of the grandfather, at the sale of Abbot Whiting's personal property, after his execution, and the dissolution of the monastery. Mr. Bowen considered himself particularly fortunate in becoming the possessor of such curious relics, as it enabled him to present them to Mrs. Bowen, who was descended, in a right line, from Mr. John Jeanes, who married Elizabeth, one of the two sisters of Abbot Whiting, about the beginning of the sixteenth century.*

This story is repeated in *Curiosities of Clocks and Watches from the Earliest Times*, an early collectors' handbook (Wood 1886, 234) and referred to in *Old Clocks and Watches and their Makers* (Britten 1911, 160). The engraving on the rear cover of the watch states:

*Repair'd by order of the Rev'd J Bowen of Bath 18. Nov. 1801. Who married Eliz, 4th Dr of Wm Jeanes of Shroton Dorset, Esq, who was linearly descended from Jn Jeanes, of East Pennard, who married Eliz Sister of Rd Whiting the last Abbot of Glastonbury*

However, this watch (figs. 9 & 10), although dated 1536, has since been identified as being an 'antiquarian fraud' dating to the eighteenth century. When it again came up for auction at Bonhams, New York, in June 2013 (Lot 77, Fine Watches and Wristwatches) the details confirmed that it was indeed a watch by Issac Symmes of circa 1620, but the engraving commemorating the Abbot of Glastonbury was added after its acquisition in 1783 by Reverend John Bowen of Bath, whose wife, Elizabeth, claimed descent from the unfortunate Richard Whiting. Bonhams’ description of the watch was as follows:
A remarkable silver and gilt early English verge watch of circa 1620, engraved with the spurious date 1536. Octagonal gilt gut fusee movement with engraved border, tapered baluster pillars, four-wheel train, ratchet and pawl mainspring set up, floral pierced pinned cock, two arm steel balance, the gilt dial chased and engraved with cockatrices flanking the similarly chased and engraved roman chapter disc, blued steel baluster hand, moulded gilt case band, the silver lids chased and engraved with panels of figures and foliage. 32mm by 47mm excluding pendant.

It sold in 2013 for US$ 30,000 (£20,559 in 2013) including premium.

A second watch by Isaack Symmes is in the horological collections of the British Museum (acc no 1894,0720.1; Thompson 1987, 499-505; 2014, 26-7) and is described as a very fine example of the watchmaker’s art of the early years of the seventeenth century. It is a verge watch (fig. 11) with alarm and passing strike, and is signed ‘Isaack Simmes’ in a scroll. The British Museum acquired it in 1894 from the Rev R C Manning for £20 0s 0d.

The circular movement of this watch has gilded brass plates and four baluster pillars. The back plate has a finely engraved foliate border and an engraved design around the edge of the aperture for the verge. The watch (going) train is powered by a mainspring housed in a barrel which has a gilded brass body. Connected to the barrel by a gut line is a fusee, a device for evening-out the torque produced by the mainspring, on the great wheel arbor. From the fusee onwards, the watch train has gilded brass wheels, each having three spokes. The train terminates with a verge escapement. The movement is unusual in having one-at-the-hour striking, in which a simple mechanism causes a hammer to strike the bell just once each hour.

The gilded brass dial has an engraved foliate border with a chapter ring engraved with roman numerals to mark the hours. At the centre of the dial is an alarm setting disc engraved with a radiating geometric pattern and numbers 1 to 12. At 3, 6, 9 and 12 around the disc are holes to allow it to be turned with a point for alarm setting. The blued steel hand is probably a later replacement.

The 60mm diameter case has a foliate border pierced to allow the sound of the bell to escape. Both the back and cover are engraved with biblical scenes, the back depicting Elijah and the Prophets of Baal (1 Kings 18, vv 17-46), and the cover portraying The Sacrifice of Isaac (Genesis 22, vv 1-19). Perhaps Isaack is here reflecting on his own mortality. Both of these fine engravings are badly rubbed and in places barely visible. Biblical scenes were quite popular as decoration on both English and French watches during this period. The back and cover also have engraved foliate borders depicting rabbits and mice. On the inside of the case cover is a coat of arms which was engraved before the gilding was applied, making it contemporary with the construction of the watch. The arms, in a well-executed shield, are those of the Weld family, quartered with those of the Greswold, Fitzhugh and Button families, and used by John Weld and his wife Dorothy, née Greswold. The watch probably belonged to their son, also named John, a contemporary of Isaack Symmes. This John was later knighted and became Town Clerk of London and High Sheriff of Shropshire. Isaack certainly had some important customers, confirming his status as an eminent
watch and instrument maker of his time.

Another watch (fig. 12) in the British Museum’s collections (acc no 1958.1201.2243) is signed ‘Isaake Symmes fecit’ and was purchased through Christie’s in 1958 following the disposal of the Courtenay Ilbert collection. The 52mm diameter gilded brass case is pierced and engraved with scrolling foliate designs around the band and on the back. The band design incorporates birds, a snail and a butterfly, and the back includes two birds. Inside the back is a bell for striking at the hours, but most of the strike train is missing. The gilded brass dial is hinged to the case and it has an engraved border of gadroon decoration. The engraved chapter ring has roman numerals to mark the hours and a circle of touch-pins for reading the time in the dark. In the middle of the dial is a finely engraved depiction of The Washing of the Disciples’ Feet (John 13, vv 4-17). The steel hand is original, but is severely pitted through rusting. The going train consists of three gilt-brass wheels but only the crown wheel of the verge escapement survives.

A fourth watch by Isaack Symmes, signed ‘Isaak Symm at Aldgate’, was given by J Pierpont Morgan to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, in 1917 (acc no 17.190.1474). There is no detailed description of this watch, but as can be seen from fig. 13, it is in an octagonal engraved silver case which is 57mm high by 29mm wide. The fusee movement has gilded brass plates and a verge escapement. The silvered dial has an engraved river scene and a blued steel single hand. This watch is included in the Catalogue of the Collection of Watches, the Property of J Pierpont Morgan, compiled by G C Williamson, London, circa 1912. This important and rare catalogue was sold recently by Christie’s, New York, for $81,250.

A sale of watches at Sotheby’s, New York, on 13th to 15th October 1981, included a fifth Symmes watch. It was lot number 648 and the estimate was $5000-6000, but the price realised at the auction is not known. It is in an oval silver case, length 56mm, and signed ‘Isaac Symmes at Aldgate’. The verge movement has a three-wheel gilded brass going train and the gilded movement plate is engraved around border. The gilded dial is engraved with rabbits in various crouching positions surrounding a scalloped silver chapter ring with roman numerals and a single blued steel hand. This is the second of Isaack Symmes’ surviving watches depicting rabbits (see above). The outer silver case is engraved with a scrolling design to the bezels and the inner case is engraved with a laurel wreath design. A further watch signed by Isaack Symmes was said to be in the Taunton Museum, Somerset, but the current curator has no knowledge of it.

Sir William Bulstrode
Sir William Bulstrode, who presented the sundial made by Isaack Symmes in 1614 to Ridlington Church, was descended from Edward Bulstrode, who held lands in Buckinghamshire and Middlesex under Henry VII (Thrush & Ferris 2010). His father was Edmond, one of Edward’s younger sons. The family arms (Sable, a stag’s head cabossed, wounded through the nose with a broad arrow Argent, entre his attire a cross formée fitchée Or) are found among the quarterings of those of Brudenell of Ayston, Deene and Raunds, Northamptonshire. They are depicted in the south-west window in the south aisle at Ayston church (fig. 14).

Fig. 14. The Bulstrode coat of arms at Ayston church, Rutland (author).

Nothing is known about the first thirty years of Sir William Bulstrode’s life. He may have spent some time in Spain, as an inventory of his goods in 1599 listed two books in Spanish and one in Portuguese. He probably acquired a military grounding as a volunteer during the Armada campaign. He commanded a company of Warwickshire militia pressed to meet the expected Spanish invasion of 1597, and in the following year he served as muster-master of the Leicestershire militia. In 1599 he joined the 2nd Earl of Essex in Ireland as captain of a company of Rutland conscripts and was one of the many officers knighted by the Earl on 6th August 1599.

In the elections to the first Stuart Parliament in 1604 the two knights of the shire for Rutland, who were to represent the county at Westminster, were Sir James Harington, the brother of Sir John Harington who had been elevated to the Lords as Baron Harington of Exton by James I at his Coronation in 1603 and appointed governor to Princess Elizabeth, and Sir William Bulstrode, who had acquired a freehold interest in Rutland when he married the un-named widow of one of the verderers of Leighfield Forest about 1590.

Sir William Bulstrode, who also held office as sheriff of Rutland from November 1604 to February 1606, was returned as one of the two knights of the shire for Rutland in six of the seven Parliaments between 1604 and 1629 (Wikipedia, List of Parliaments; List of MPs). Sir William missed the start of the second session of his first Parliament in November 1605, as he was then serving out his term as sheriff of Rutland. His replacement as sheriff, Basil Feilding, was appointed on 2nd February 1606, whereupon Sir William quickly resumed his place at Westminster.

Knights of the Shire for Rutland in the Parliaments of James I (1603-1625):
First:
19th March 1604 to 9th February 1611 in five Sessions: Sir James Harington and Sir William Bulstrode
Second (The ‘Addled Parliament’):
5th April 1614 to 7th June 1614 in one Session: Sir Guy Palmes and Basil Feilding
Third:
16th January 1621 to 8th February 1622 in two Sessions: Sir Guy Palmes and Sir William Bulstrode
Fourth (The ‘Happy Parliament’):
12th February 1624 to 27 March 1625 in one Session: Sir William Bulstrode and Sir Guy Palmes

Knights of the Shire for Rutland in the Parliaments of Charles I (1625-1649):
First (The ‘Useless Parliament’):
17th May 1625 to 12th August 1625 in two Sessions: Sir William Bulstrode and Sir Guy Palmes
Second:
6th February 1626 to 15th June 1626 in one Session: Sir William Bulstrode and Sir Francis Bodenham
Third:
17th March 1628 to 10th March 1629 in two Sessions: Sir William Bulstrode and Sir Guy Palmes

An important local association may lie in a relationship by marriage between Sir William Bulstrode and the Haringtons of Exton and Ridlington. Sir William’s great-grandfather, Francis Bulstrode, was the brother of Cicely, whose daughter Anne by her second husband Robert Kelway was the wife of Sir John Harington. Sir John contracted a fever in Worms of which he died in August 1713 at the age of 73. Lord Harington’s young brother, Sir James Harington, created first baronet of Ridlington in 1611, died in March 1613-14 and his second and only surviving son, John, died of smallpox in February 1613-14 aged 22, whereupon the barony of Exton became extinct (for the history of the Haringtons at this time, see Howlett 2010). Only nine days before his death, Sir John had negotiated the sale of the lordship of Exton,
including the manor of Ridlington, to Sir Baptist Hicks. Sir William Bulstrode’s relationship with the family may perhaps have involved him in the negotiations that will have followed this three-fold bereavement. Was it simply a coincidence that Sir William Bulstrode had occasion to donate the sundial to Ridlington Church in this year?

On 29th June 1629 Sir William Bulstrode ‘of Ridlington Park Lodge and Uppingham’, and by then a widower aged 66, married his third wife at the church of St Ann, Blackfriars, London. She was Ann Bannister aged 58, the widow of Henry Bannister, a goldsmith of London and Hackney, Middlesex. Is it another coincidence that Sir William married the widow of a goldsmith? This marriage brought him interest in lands in Hackney said to be worth £400 a year, and £6,000 in goods. After Ann’s death on 4th January 1634, William moved from Blackfriars to Coventry, and he had disposed of his Rutland property by 1641. Although Coventry was a parliamentary stronghold his only involvements in the Civil War appear to be his inclusion on the commission for the Midland Association in February 1643 and on the assessment commission for Warwickshire in 1645.

Sir William Bulstrode died early in 1646. In his brief will of 26th November 1645 (The National Archives, PROB 11-195-196), he bequeathed his ‘book of Gerard’s Herbal’ to a relative, a suit of clothes to his manservant and the remainder of his goods to his relative (nephew?) Edward, son of Edward Bulstrode, who secured administration of his estate on 11th February 1646.
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Belton (Rutland) and the Blount family

Bridge Wells-Furby

The Rutland manor of Belton was held by the Blount family from the late thirteenth century until 1557. How it came to the Blouts has been obscure but further research has offered a solution and also clarified its changing role within the wider estate. It is highly probable that it first came to the family by the marriage of William (I) Blount to Isabel Beauchamp, sister of the first Beauchamp earl of Warwick, a marriage which raised the family’s social profile and set the scene for their later prominence. Over the fourteenth century Belton was of varying importance within the family’s estate as it waxed and waned but it is clear that it retained a significance to the Blount family identity which bore little relation to its financial value.

The Blounts of Belton in Rutland were a family from which sprang at least two lines of long distinction and yet the origins of the family’s connection with the county are unclear and some published accounts are inaccurate. The purpose of this paper is to present an alternative account. Two early members of the family were summoned to parliament as peers in the first half of the fourteenth century, Thomas Lord Blount (d1328) and his nephew William Lord Blount (d1337). Both died without issue and it was William’s nephews John (d1425) and Walter (d1403) who were the progenitors of the two eminent lines. Walter was the founder of the family which was prominent in the fifteenth century and until 1606 as Lords Mountjoy. Walter’s elder brother John was the ancestor of an even longer line of Blounts, later baronets, of Sodington and Kinlet (Worcs). The account given of Walter’s predecessors in The Complete Peerage appears to be entirely accurate but follows only Walter’s line (GEC ix, 329-47). The accounts of Thomas Lord Blount (d1328) and William Lord Blount (d1337) and the Victoria County History entry for Belton contain inaccuracies (GEC ii, 195-6; VCH Rutland ii, 28-9).

The Blount family originally came from Hanslope in Buckinghamshire where they were tenants of the Mauduit family from at least 1242. It was William (I) Blount (d1280-88) who established the connection with Rutland by acquiring the manor of Belton and a property in Cottesmore and Greetham, and he did so by his marriage. His wife Isabel held Belton certainly, and Cottesmore probably, in her own right but her identity is something of a mystery. She was certainly the widow of Henry Lovet (d1253-61) of Hampton Lovett, Elmley Lovett, and Tymberlake (Worcs). She was probably a daughter of William Beauchamp (d1269) and his wife Isabel Mauduit, and a sister of William Beauchamp (d1298) who inherited the earldom of Warwick from their uncle William Mauduit. It is her probable identity as a Beauchamp which may explain why she held Belton and Cottesmore and brought them to the Blouts.

Isabel Blount
Isabel’s first husband, Henry Lovet, had died before 1260-1, while still a minor, leaving a young son John who was probably born in 1253-4 (TNA Just. 1/1026, m.17d). Isabel and William were married by Easter 1268 (TNA Just. 1/721 m.1) and by him she had at least four more sons, William (II), Peter, Walter, and Thomas. William was still alive c1280 but dead by 15th September 1288 (BL Add Charter 55540). She was still living in February 1323 when she was probably in her eighties if she had been thirteen or fourteen when John Lovett was born. The tradition that she was a daughter of William Beauchamp (d1269) is probably correct because the circumstantial evidence is strong.

William Beauchamp certainly had a daughter Isabel to whom he left a silver cup in his will of January 1269 and William Blount witnessed a Beauchamp family charter, a grant by the elder William to the younger and his wife Maud, some time between 1261 and 1269 (Nicolas 1826, i, 51; Mason 1980, no 41). Isabel’s first husband Henry Lovet was a tenant of the Beauchamps at Hampton Lovet and may have been married to Isabel because his marriage belonged to her father. Her Blount sons were close to Earl William of Warwick, his brother Walter, and his son Earl Guy. In addition to these factors, further evidence of her identity may be found in her possession of Belton and Cottesmore.

Cottesmore
Cottesmore is the simpler to discuss. In 1305 a half-fee in Cottesmore held of the earldom of Warwick was shared by Isabel Blount, Adam de Yarmouth, and Agnes de Muscegros (Feudal Aids iv, 204). Much of the earldom’s manor of Cottesmore, with
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Greetham, had been subinfeudated by former earls to the Montfort family. The Yarmouth and Musce-gros portions can certainly be traced back to the Montforts but Isabel's holding is more problematic (VCH Rutland ii, 121-3). A clue to the origin of Isabel's holding may be found in a lawsuit brought in 1427. According to this, the large freehold of lands in Cottesmore and Greetham called Bruses had been granted by William Mauduit, earl of Warwick (d1268) to Bernard II Brus (d1301) of Exton and his wife Alice de Beauchamp (Wrottesley 1905, 330). Although this statement was made some 160 years after Mauduit's death, it was presumably supported by charter evidence and it is highly significant for the Blounts. If Mauduit granted land in Cottesmore and Greetham to one Beauchamp niece, it becomes at least possible that he had also granted land in Cottesmore and Greetham to another Beauchamp niece, i.e. Isabel Blount. William Mauduit succeeded to the earldom of Warwick in 1263 and died in 1268 but it is not necessarily the case that the grant to the Bruses, or to Isabel Beauchamp if this was so, was made between these dates because the Mauduits had had interests in Rutland, and specifically in Cottesmore, long before 1263.7

Belton

The manor of Belton is rather more complicated. It was held by William and Isabel Blount, in Isabel's right, by Easter 1268 when Geoffrey le Venour acknowledged that he held a carucate of land there of them both (TNA Just. 1/721 m.1).8 It is clear from later records that the Venour portion amounted to half the original manor and while the Venours held their portion of the Blounts as half a knight's fee, the Blounts held the whole as one knight's fee of the lordship of Oakham Lordshold. This lordship was forfeited by the Norman Ferrières family in 1204 but in 1207 was granted to Isabel de Ferrières, wife of Roger Mortimer of Wigmore, for life with reversion to the Crown (GEC x, 273; see Clough 1981 for a summary of its descent). Roger Mortimer died in 1214 and Isabel then married Peter FitzHerbert (d1235) and lived on until 1252.

Belton itself had been forfeited by the Norman Reginald de Freney (Fraxneto) and had reverted to the overlord Isabel de Ferrières. In 1232 Isabel and Fitzherbert were instructed to restore it to Freney's son Henry but by 1237 Hugh de Mortimer was holding a moiety of the manor (CPR 1225-32, 478; Liber Feodorum i, 619). According to a slightly later return, probably of 1244, Henry de Freney had sold to Hugh one hundred solidates of land, i.e. land worth one hundred shillings (£5) a year (Liber Feodorum ii, 1151). Hugh also acquired separately two virgates of land in Belton by a fine of 1240 (Wells-Furby 2013, no 55). This Hugh was not Isabel's eldest son, Hugh Mortimer of Wigmore, as he had died without issue in 1227, and the identity of this Hugh of Belton remains unclear (GEC ix, 275).9 He may possibly have been another, younger, son as it was not uncommon for two children to be given the same name. According to the return probably of 1244, the one hundred solidates sold by Henry de Freney to Hugh were then held by 'Isabella uxor eius' and this 'Isabel wife of Hugh' is immediately identified as the same Isabel then holding Oakham, i.e. the widowed Isabel de Ferrières (Liber Feodorum ii, 1151).10 This is certainly inaccurate because, although Hugh's property in Belton had reverted to Isabel de Ferrières by this date, Hugh's widow was Alice.

The evidence for this is that by 18th March 1244 Isabel de Ferrières was being sued by Hugh's widow Alice for dower in Belton and Lechlade (Glos.), another Ferrières manor (CCR 1242-7, 239). Alice was required to give an undertaking that, if she recovered dower, it should revert to the Crown in the same way as the rest of Isabel's Ferrières lands were due to revert. This is curious as the order for the restoration of Belton to Henry de Freney had made no mention of the reversion, and Alice would have had no power to dispose otherwise of a dower interest which was hers for life only.

When Isabel died in 1252 her lands duly reverted to the Crown, and Oakham and Lechlade were then granted to Henry III's brother Richard of Cornwall (CCR 1251-3, 82; CChR i, 392; Clough 1981, 25). No reference to Belton has been found between 1244, when it was in the hands of Isabel de Ferrières, and 1268 when it was held by Isabel Blount, but William Beauchamp, probably Isabel Blount's father, was a grandson of Isabel de Ferrières (Mason ODNB). The manor may have been granted by Isabel de Ferrières to her daughter or grandson and thus passed to Isabel Blount. A special connection between Isabel de Ferrières and her grandson William Beauchamp is implied by the fact that he was one of her executors, and she was a beneficiary of a chantry established by him (Nicolas 1826, i, 59; Luard 1869, iv, 400, 418; Mason 1980, nos 43, 78). While tenuous, this possibility at least has the merit of explaining how the manor came to the Blounts and why it was held in Isabel's right.

In summary, although there is no incontrovertible evidence of Isabel's parentage, it is likely that she was a daughter of William Beauchamp and Isabel Mauduit and that, as such, she may have had Belton through her father and his grandmother, and Cottesmore from her uncle William Mauduit. Although there are other possible explanations, for the purposes of this paper it will be assumed that this is correct.
The Blounts and John Lovet

William Blount’s marriage to Isabel was of crucial importance to the future of his family in various ways. First, the accident that her brother inherited the earldom of Warwick ensured that her sons had some eminent kinsfolk and greatly raised the social profile of the Blounts. Secondly, she brought him not only her own lands in Rutland but also her dower interest in the Lovet lands of her first husband, thus greatly amplifying his own modest estate. These landed gains were, in the first instance, only temporary ones as her dower lands would revert to the Lovet estate on her death and the heir to her own lands was her eldest son John Lovet but, thirdly, they were converted into permanent benefits. The interests of John Lovet appear to have been completely subordinated to those of her Blount sons in an unusual family relationship.

In the first place, Belton was settled in 1271 on William and Isabel and their issue, with remainder to Walter Blount, who may have been William’s brother, and his heirs. As Belton was Isabel’s own property this settlement completely violated the feudal rules of succession and not only diverted the succession from her heir John Lovet but also envisaged the possibility that it might pass away from her blood altogether. There is no evidence of a similar settlement of Cottesmore. It passed to her eldest Blount son, William (II), and his issue but, if it was held in her right, this would have occurred naturally as Lovet died without issue before her so William Blount would have succeeded as her natural heir.

John Lovet may have been an invalid. Although heir to an estate of three Worcestershire manors, substantial even allowing for his mother’s dower portion, he makes no appearance in the public records. There is no evidence that he married and he certainly had no child to inherit. He probably reached full age in 1275 when he obtained seisin of the two-thirds of Elmley Lovett of which his father had died seized. William Blount was holding part of Hampton in c1280 (Willis-Bund & Amphlett 1893, 22), which may have been Isabel’s dower portion, and before William’s death John granted his manor of Tymberlake to Isabel for her life (Croke 1823, ii, 778-9). William may have died before 4th April 1280 and was certainly dead by 15th September 1288 when Isabel, ‘lady of Tymberlake’, was again a widow (BL Add Charter 55540; GEC ix, 330). Isabel granted her life interest in Tymberlake to her son Peter Blount, and this Peter was also holding by 1303 the advowson of Hampton Lovett, and therefore probably a portion of the manor, possibly by John’s grant. John certainly granted rents and land to his half-brother Walter and was godfather to Walter’s son John (Croke 1823, ii, 375,
779). Lovet died without issue between 12th March and 7th September 1316 (CCR 1313-18, 277; BL Egerton Charter 601). After his death, Peter granted Tymberlake to his brother Walter in fee, having obtained quitclams from John’s heirs (Croke 1823, ii, 130-31). He also granted his portion of Hampton Lovett, which he still held in March 1316, to his elder brother William (II) by August 1317 (Worcs RO 705:349/12946/475203; CCR 1313-18, 277).

Given the advantages which accrued to the Blounts by William’s marriage to Isabel, it is worth considering how it may have come about. The most obvious connection is that she was a niece of William Mauduit, William’s overlord at Hanslope. Mauduit is known to have taken a friendly interest in one Beauchamp niece, Alice de Brus, by his grant of lands in Cottesmore and may also have made the same gesture towards Isabel. He may have helped to arrange her second marriage. In this context, the violent and confused politics of England in the first half of the 1260s is of some interest because a William Blount and his brother Walter were followers of the Gloucestershire lord John Giffard and in the spring of 1264 Giffard and Mauduit were on opposite sides. Giffard, then on the ‘baronial’ side, had taken Warwick Castle and had captured the royalist Earl William Mauduit and his wife. Giffard then changed sides and was in the king’s army at the battle of Evesham on 4th August 1265, obtaining a pardon for himself and his followers for his prior activities in the following October (CPR 1258-66, 460; GEC v, 640, xii pt 2, 368).

If William Blount had been with Giffard when he took Warwick Castle, then it is unlikely that Earl William would have assisted Blount’s marriage to his niece, although the marriage may have taken place before that date and this was simply an example of the way families were divided during the civil war. On the other hand, there are two reasons why the Blounts may not have been involved in the capture of Earl William. First, if the William Blount was our William of Belton then they were not necessarily with Giffard at that time. The connection is made only in the latter part of 1265 because, William and Walter having been accused of stealing goods from the house of William de Hayes at Quinton (Northants) on 11th August 1265, their defence was the pardon which had been issued to Giffard and his followers (Hunter 1834, 185).

The second is that the Giffard followers William and Walter may have belonged to a different family altogether. Part of the difficulty with tracing the early history of the family is that the name Blount derived from the earlier form le Blund (sometimes le Blunt) which means fair-haired. As it was a nickname it was both common and held by individuals who were unrelated by kinship. Another possibility raised by The Complete Peerage is that our William was the William who was a son of John le Blund and in 1275 inherited land in Doverdale (Worcs) from his aunt Amicia le Blund, John and Amicia being the children of Walter le Blund (GEC ix, 330). This seems improbable, although the Worcestershire connection is suggestive, because the connection of the Blounts of Belton with the Blounts of Hanslope is secure. The property in Hanslope was held by Peter le Blount in 1242-3 and by William le Blount in 1279 (VCH Bucks iv, 356; Mason 1980, nos 272, 275, 280; Illingworth 1818, i, 344).

The widowed Isabel and her Blount sons

Although it was William’s marriage which set the scene for the family’s future eminence, it was his sons who first made a mark. By 1295 Isabel had passed Belton to the eldest, William (II), who by that time also held Hanslope, as his father’s heir. This is apparent because in this year, when William was campaigning in Wales with his uncle Earl William Beauchamp, he held lands in Rutland and Buckinghamshire and had respite from the subsidy in respect of them (Edwards 1935, 147). According to an inquisition, Peter Blount was holding the Hanslope lands in 1302-3 (Feudal Aids i, 106). This may have been an error, perhaps harking back to an earlier inquisition, but it is possible that Peter was then holding them as part of a family arrangement. William was holding them again, or still, in January 1316 (CIPM v, no 615 (p402)).

Isabel retained the Cottesmore property in her own hands. The inquisition of 1305 shows William holding Belton and Isabel holding Cottesmore (Feudal Aids iv, 204, 206; Chinnery et al 1988, 26, 36), and this division is also reflected in the 1296-7 accounts of the earldom of Cornwall. Cottesmore lay in Alstoe hundred and Belton in Martinsley hundred and in this year Isabel Blount paid a 2s fine to the hundreds of Alstoe and East and William Blount paid a 10s fine to the hundreds of Martinsley and Wrangdyke (Midgley 1942, 165, 169). Isabel had also held land in Hanslope at farm which she had surrendered, or of which the lease had expired, by March 1296 when the land was acquired by her brother Earl William, who had succeeded to the Mauduit manor (BL Add MS 28024 f24d).

Peter, who was a clergyman, was closely associated with Earl Guy who presented him to the church of Hanslope by May 1306 even before he was ordained, and appointed him to be chamberlain of the exchequer and one of his executors (Willis-Bund 1907-29, 152; Burt 2009, 175; Barfield 1997, 123). He was alive in September 1316, when he made over Tymberlake to his brother Walter, but
dead by 17th May 1318 when his executors were dealing with his estate. William and Walter were also associated with the Beauchamp earls although not as closely as Peter. Both served with Earl William in Wales in 1295, and William was granted an annuity of £10 from Hanslope by that earl which he surrendered to Earl Guy in 1302 (BL Add MS 28024 f45d). Neither William nor Walter occurs as frequent charter witnesses for either of the earls, although this does not necessarily mean they were not close (Burt 2009, passim). In 1298 William, Walter, and Thomas served in Scotland with Walter Beauchamp (d1303), Earl William’s younger brother and then steward of the royal household (Gough 1888, 31, 183-5). William and Thomas fought in Earl Guy’s following at the Dunstable tournament in 1309 and in 1313 William and Walter had pardons for the death of the king’s favourite Piers Gaveston, an affair in which Warwick had a leading role (Coll Top & Gen iv, 65; CPR 1313-17, 23). On the other hand, in 1306 William was campaigning with Henry of Lancaster, in 1319 he was tourneying with William de la Zouche of Ashby, and in 1322 he was again campaigning with Henry of Lancaster and witnessed his brother Thomas’s grant to Lancaster at Grosmont in November 1322 (CDRS v, no 2602; BL Egerton MS 2850d; Palgrave 1827, vol 2, Div I, 595; TNA DL 27/195).

Walter established himself in Worcestershire. He was granted land here by his half-brother John Lovet and this enabled him to marry Joan, sister of the Worcestershire landholder William de Sodington, which he had done by 28th January 1294. Walter was fortunate in that Joan’s brother William died childless c1301 and she therefore inherited a purparty of his estate with her two sisters. From this inheritance they obtained the manor of Sodington (Worcs) and other property in Gloucestershire, Wiltshire, and Hampshire which they did not retain (Croke 1823, ii, 129-30; TNA CP 25/1/205/15 no 57). In 1301 and 1302 Walter and Joan were acquiring land at Alton, in Rock (Worcs), and by this time Walter is identified as being ‘of Le Rok’ (BL Add Charters 55538, 55543, 55544). He was knight of the shire for Worcestershire in 1318 and 1321 (Palgrave 1827-34, vol 2, Div II, 194, 242), and still alive in February 1322 but probably dead by 6th February 1323 and certainly by May 1324 (CCR 1318-23, 419; BL Egerton Charter 605; Palgrave 1827-34, vol 2, Div II, 647).

Thomas does not seem to have obtained any land from his family but made his way in the service of Henry of Lancaster, younger son of Edward I’s brother Edmund earl of Lancaster and younger brother Thomas earl of Lancaster. He also joined the royal household and it was he who, on account of a rich marriage made in 1325, was summoned to parliament between 1326 and his death in 1328.

The Blounts of Belton
William II was almost certainly born in or before the early 1270s because he was already a knight when campaigning in 1295. He lived to a great age and died in 1344. Evidently he inherited the longevity of the matriarch Isabel who was still alive in 1323 when in her eighties. He maintained his vigour because he was tourneying in 1333 at the Dunstable tournament, serving with the young Thomas earl of Warwick (Coll Top & Gen iv, 394). He was probably at least sixty then and possibly even older. This was not entirely unprecedented as Nicholas de Segrave took part in a tournament in 1319 when he was probably nearly sixty (BL Egerton MS 2850d).

For the greater part of his life William was a leading member of the small county community of Rutland but towards the end of it the focus shifted away from Rutland towards Worcestershire. He held Belton and Hanslope from 1295 or before, and acquired a portion of Hampton Lovett (Worcs), with the advowson, from his brother Peter in 1316-17. He was knight of the shire for Rutland in 1301, 1307, and 1313 and was appointed to commissions of array in 1322 and 1323 and to the commission of the peace in 1320, 1323, and 1329. Subsequently he was appointed to the Worcestershire commission of the peace in 1335 and to various other commissions in that county between 1335 and 1341. He is identified in some of these commissions as ‘the uncle’ to distinguish him from his nephew William (of Sodington).

He came under suspicion during the rising of 1321–2 by leading courtiers against the king’s favourites the Despensers because on 2nd January 1322 order was given for the seizure of his lands in Worcestershire, then at the centre of the rising. They were restored on 14th February, along with the lands of others who had been similarly misjudged, and on the same day he was appointed to raise troops for the king from Henry of Lancaster’s lordship of Kidwelly. He was ‘lord of Hampton Lovett’ by August 1317, he had a grant of free warren there in 1327, and in 1328 and 1332 he presented to the church. He and his son and heir Sir John made several substantial acquisitions in the parish of Hampton Lovett between 1331 and 1342, including the manor of Thicken Appletree.

Belton and Cottesmore are unfortunately far less well-served by the records than Hampton Lovett. It is possible that William and John were making similar acquisitions in Rutland but the evidence has not survived. Belton was not neglected as William was granted a fair there in 1330 and 1332 (CChR
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1327-41, 178, 270, 272), and evidence of two leases survive, one from 1320 when William, ‘lord of Belton’, leased a half-virgate in a life tenancy, and one from 1336 of a messuage (Croke 1823, ii, 795).

According to an inquisition of 1340 into the value of the lordship of Oakham Lordshold, William Blount held lands in Belton as half a fee which were valued at 100s (£5) and Theobald Venour held land in the same place of the same value by the same service (CIM ii, no 1703). This was not strictly true as the Venour property was held of the Blount property, as had been acknowledged in 1268 by Geoffrey le Venour and as was more accurately recorded in the 1305 inquisition when Peter le Venour held it. The inquisition made in 1300 on the death of Edmund earl of Cornwall recorded that Blount held one fee at Belton which was valued at £10, and the 1305 inquisition gave the same value to the whole fee (CIPM iii, 604 (p474); CCR 1296-1302, 437; Chinnery et al 1988, 26). These valuations are not to be taken too literally as they were rarely updated. As at Belton, the fees at Pickworth and Clipsham are assigned the same value, £25 and £20 respectively, in 1300, 1305, and 1340. The value assigned to Belton probably derives from the record made around 1244 that Hugh Mortimer had acquired a hundred solidates from Henry de Freney. The Blounts held half the fee so the whole was said to be worth £10 a year. The Venour moiety had presumably been granted by Freney so the tenure passed with the other moiety which Freney sold to Mortimer.

The record of the lay subsidy of 1295/6 gives a small insight into Belton at that time (TNA E 179/165/1 mm. 6). This was granted in mid-November 1295 and collected during January and February 1296. The tax was charged as a proportion of the value of a person’s ‘movables’, i.e. their livestock, farm implements and vehicles, and personal belongings such as bedding and clothes. Items exempted from the subsidy of 1296 were the armour, riding-horses, jewels, and clothing of knights, gentlemen, and their wives, and their vessels of gold, silver, and brass (Willard 1913). Persons having ‘taxable’ property under a certain amount were exempted altogether and in 1296 the figure was eleven shillings. The twelve taxpayers in Belton paid a total of 37s 3¾d. The two highest taxpayers, by a large margin, were William Blount and Peter Venour at 8s 9¾d and 8s 0¾d respectively, i.e. together they paid nearly half the total. Blount’s figure implies that he was taxed on movable property with a total value of £4 16s 11¾d which is not a great deal. Among the others were Blount’s serjeant Robert, a manorial supervisor, who paid 1s 11¾d. There were no Blount taxpayers in Cotteesmore or Greetham (TNA E 179/165/1 mm. 7, 8). This may have been because all their property there was rented out and therefore they had no ‘demesne’ land which they cultivated themselves and therefore no ‘movables’ upon which they could be taxed. No Brus paid towards the tax in these vills either, although Bernard de Brus paid 46s. under Exton (TNA E 179/165/1 m. 8). Clearly the Brus manorial operation in Exton was far larger than the Blount one in Belton.

William was still alive on 13th February 1344 but probably dead by 20th October 1344 when his son and heir Sir John was appointed to a commission in Worcestershire (Worcs RO 705:349/12946/475218; CPR 1343-5, 415). Sir John, an adult and knighted by 1330, had been in the service of William la Zouche (d1337) who had married Earl Guy Beauchamp’s widow Alice Tony (d1324). John was going overseas with Zouche in 1332 as escort to the Princess Eleanor, and was granted by him an annuity of 20 marks from the manor of Nuthbourne (Sussex) (CCR 1330-4, 278; CIPM viii, no 112). John married Elizabeth, daughter of Sir Simon Furneaux (d1358) of Somerset by his wife Alice, daughter and coheir of Sir Henry de Umfraville. In the event, she was the heir of both her parents but whether this was anticipated at the time of the marriage is unknown. John’s father William granted lands in Hanslope to John and Elizabeth, probably on their marriage (Croke 1823, i, 122-3 & ii, 795). This grant was found by Croke, the family historian, among Dugdale’s papers but the date is given as the fortieth year of Edward III, i.e. 1366. This date is certainly incorrect and the original may have been the fourth or the fourteenth of Edward III, i.e. 1330 or 1340 which are more likely. In 1345 Hampton Lovett and Thicken Appletree were settled on Sir John and his wife Elizabeth with remainder to their son William (Croke 1823, ii, 803). They presumably alienated the Hanslope property as by 1346 it was held by James Hoddel (Feudal Aids i, 131). As well as their son William, they had a daughter Alice.

John was appointed to two more commissions in Worcestershire in October 1348 and May 1349 (CCR 1348-50, 239, 321), and was still alive in February 1353 but this is the last that is heard of him (Worcs RO 705:349/12946/475232). In 1350 the family looked strong. They had been acquiring land in Hampton Lovett, there was a young son to continue the line, and the future prospect of Elizabeth’s inheritance would greatly enhance their standing. She inherited lands in Somerset, Devon, Wiltshire, and south Wales, of which the Furneaux lands alone were valued at £150 a year in 1421 (CIPM x, no 501; TNA CP25/1/290/57 no 265; Clark 1868, 38-40), and Belton was in line to
become a small part of a great estate. This outlook did not come to pass.

Elizabeth and Alice Blount

John probably did not live to enjoy Elizabeth’s inheritance. Her marital status is not given in her father’s inquisition post mortem of March 1359, but by this time Elizabeth had married again to Matthew de Clevedon and divorced him (CIPM x, no 501; CPR 1358-61, 191).31 She long outlived her son William, who was knighted and married to one Maud but of whom little else is known. He was heir to an extensive estate but most of it was held by his mother, either as her own inheritance or in jointure as she held Hampton Lovett. He probably inherited Belton and Cottesmore and his mother may have surrendered Hampton Lovett to him, but he was almost certainly dead by November 1370 when these properties had passed to his sister Alice (TNA CP25/1/288/49 no 714; Worcs RO 705:349/12946/475236). From this date the Blounts of Belton were extinct in the male line and, although the line was not fully extinguished until the death of Alice in 1414, until then the story is of these two surviving women.

Elizabeth was dealing with the lordship of Penmark in Glamorgan, part of her Umfraville inheritance, in 1362 and 1370, as Elizabeth Blount, or as widow of Sir John Blount (Clark 1868, 38-40). In 1385 she established a chantry in Athelney Abbey (Somerset), and she was still alive in July 1394, although the date of her death is unknown (Croke 1823, ii, 123-4; TNA CP25/1/290/57 no 265).32

Alice was in possession of Belton and Hampton Lovett by November 1370 and then also the heir apparent to her mother’s great inheritance. She was first married to Sir Richard Stafford the younger. He was the son and heir apparent of Sir Richard Stafford of Clifton Camville, a younge colleague of the elder Stafford in the service of the Black Prince but is chiefly famous as one of the group of ‘Lollard knights’.33 In February 1385 licence was given for his manor of Barnwell (Northants.) to be settled on Alice and Richard (CPR 1381-5, 532; TNA SC 8/222/11069), and in July 1393 her paternal lands of Belton, Cottesmore, and Greetham, along with Hampton Lovett and Thicken Appletree, were settled by a fine on Richard and Alice and their issue, with various remainders which will be discussed shortly (TNA CP25/1/289/56 no 250; Worcs RO 705:349/12946/511499). Stury died in 1395 and she did not marry again.

It is curious that, although she was married to Stury for at least twenty years, and he was an influential person at the court of Richard II, it was her short-lived marriage to Richard Stafford which appears to have been more important in terms of her identity. In 1385, when she had been married to Stury for at least ten years, she is called ‘Alice Stafford’ in her mother’s chantry foundation (Croke 1823, ii, 123-4). In 1402 she was using a seal which made no reference to her marriage to Stury as the shield of arms was Blount impaling Stafford of Clifton and the legend was ‘Alice Stafford’ (Ellis 1978, 61). In legal documents of 1375 and later, however, she is identified as wife or widow of Sir Richard Stury.34 Shortly before her death, she founded a chantry at Hampton Lovett for the souls of her parents and her two husbands (VCH Worcs, iii, 158, 265; TNA CP 25/1/260/26 no 33; CPR 1408-13, 353, 450). On her death in 1414 the line was finally extinguished (CIPM xx, 188).35 Her mother’s Furneaux and Umfraville lands passed to the numerous cousins who were the heirs at law.36 The heir to her maternal inheritance was her cousin John Blount of the junior, Sodington, line but they had already passed elsewhere.

The Blounts of Sodington

The progenitor of this line was Walter, the younger son of William (I) Blount and Isabel Beauchamp. He had been succeeded by his eldest son William who married a wealthy heiress and was summoned to parliament from 1330 but died without issue in 1337 (CIPM viii, 115). His heir was his brother John who died in 1356 (CIPM x, 431), leaving three sons, Richard, who died without issue soon afterwards, John (d1425), and Walter (d1403).

It was this John who was Alice Blount’s heir at law but his younger brother Walter was far more eminent. He had an adventurous and successful career with John of Gaunt and was to die in 1403 defending the life of Gaunt’s son Henry IV at Shrewsbury.37 It was Walter who responded to the imminent demise of the senior Blount line of Belton. The settlement made by the fine of 1393 stipulated that, failing issue of Alice and Stury, the manor of Belton and 220 acres of land, fifty acres of meadow, and 4s of rent in Cottesmore and Greetham and the Worcestershire manors of Hampton Lovett and Thicken Appletree, with various appurtenances
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Table 3. Conjectural pedigree of the Blounts of Belton and their descendants.

were to pass to her mother Elizabeth for her life, and then to Sir Walter Blount for his life and his son John and his male issue, with remainders to the male issue of Walter and finally to the right heirs of Alice, i.e. Walter’s elder brother John and his issue (TNA CP25/1/289/56 no 250; Worcs RO 705:349/12946/ 511499). Although by this fine the property would remain with Alice until her death, it is clear that a different arrangement was made because Walter Blount had possession of Belton, and possibly the other lands, by 1399. Belton was among the manors which he had granted to feoffees during the reign of Richard II (Croke 1823, ii, 795; Wrottesley 1905, 438).

Walter’s feoffees granted Belton, among other lands, to his widow Sanchia in 1413 and on her death soon after it passed to their son John. John had a remarkable military career in France and was a Knight of the Garter but was killed at the siege of Rouen in 1418. He was succeeded by the third brother, Thomas (d1456), whose son Walter was created Lord Mountjoy in 1465.\(^{28}\) Belton remained with the family for another century until it was sold in 1557 by James Lord Mountjoy to Thomas Haselwood (VCH Rutland ii, 29).

********

The Blount family therefore had a varying relationship with the manor of Belton and its associated holding at Cottesmore and Greetham. The acquisition of the Rutland property, together with the marriage to Isabel Beauchamp, lifted them out of the ranks of the undistinguished into the ranks of manorial lords. When the second William Blount was campaigning in 1295 it was as ‘lord of Belton’ and the original Blount property in Hanslope had been relegated to a secondary position. The acquisition of the Worcestershire manor of his half-brother John Lovett in 1316-17 provided another focus and from 1330 this became the more important. Belton, in its turn, was apparently relegated to a secondary position. With the acquisition of the extensive inheritance of Elizabeth Furneaux, Belton became merely a small and distant element in a much wider estate but it retained an individual importance because of the way the original Rutland and Worcestershire lands were separated from Elizabeth’s inheritance from at least 1370 until after 1394. They were then held by the heiress Alice and her position brought her marriages to two eminent men. It is particularly interesting that her distant cousins, the Blounts of Sodddington with whom she shared a great-grandfather, were both aware of their relationship and interested in the original Blount patrimony in Rutland and Worcestershire. Pre-empting the inheritance on her inevitable childless death, Walter obtained these properties from Alice so once again there was a Blount lord of Belton before 1399. It was not to recover its position as the principal focus of the family because Walter Blount acquired a much more extensive estate during his service with John of Gaunt but, nevertheless, the acquisition reveals the strength of the family attachment to the place.

For footnotes, see page 262.
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Footnotes

1 For this see below, p256
2 For the Lovett estate, see VCH Wors, iii, 107-8, 154, & iv, 239; CPR 1279-88, 319.
3 Isabel’s identity as a daughter of William Beauchamp is discussed in GEC ix, 329, note.
4 Henry Lovet inherited as a minor and, as the Lovets held no land in chief, the right to the marriage of a minor heir belonged to the overlord who had priority of enfeoffment, i.e. whose ancestors had first enfeoffed the tenant’s ancestors. Unfortunately, this point cannot be established.
5 See below, pp256-7. There is also a tradition which links Isabel’s son John Lovet with the Beauchamps, that Walter Hackett granted the manor of Broughton Hackett (Worcs) to Walter Beauchamp and John Lovet. The date, 1299, is certainly wrong as Walter was the former holder in 1297-8: VCH Wors, iv, 44.
6 Pace the VCH, Isabel shared the half-feefold held of Warwick, not the other half of the manor, i.e. the half which was not granted to Warwick in 1090: Chinmery et al 1988, 36. The VCH account is in error in stating that this Cottesmore holding was held of Oakham.
7 Earl William’s father William had been dealing in lands in Cottesmore, perhaps in the right of his wife Alice, sister of the earlier Henry earl of Warwick, in 1253 and 1257: Wells-Furby 2013, nos 76, 85. For his father Robert’s dealings elsewhere in the county, see Wells-Furby 2013, nos 1, 30, 31, 33, 34.
8 In 1305 Peter le Venour held the half-feefold of William (II) Blount: Chinmery et al 1988, 26.
9 This Hugh (d1227) left a widow Eleanor or Annor.
10 The editors of the Liber Feodorum suggested that uxor is probably a clerical error for mater.
11 Wells-Furby 2013, no 108. Belton was here described as a messuage, a mill, nineteen virgates of land, and rents of fourteen pence and one pound of pepper. For the relationship of William and Walter Blount, see below, p256.
12 TNA Just 1/1026, m.17d. When Henry Lovet died, his mother was still alive holding her dower portion.
13 He presented Master Thurstan de Hanslope to the church in 1303, and Ralph Blount, possibly his brother, in 1306: Willis-Bund 1907-29, 43, 149. Ralph was still parson in February 1323 when he witnessed the Tymberlake charter, but resigned the living in 1328: BL Egerton Charter 605; Haines 1979, nos 37, 586, 648.
14 The deed is undated. Peter had had quitclaims of the manor from Cecilia Lovett and from Alice Lovett; Alice’s quitclaim, as cousin and heir of the recently deceased John, to Peter is dated 7 September 1316 and on 30 September William (II) Blount quitclaimed it to Walter: BL Egerton Charters 601, 602. In February 1323, probably after Walter’s death, his younger sons John and Walter confirmed the manor to Isabel, their grandmother, for her life and one year after: BL Egerton Charters 605.
15 The date is given as ‘the Tuesday after the battle of Evesham’.
16 There was possibly another Peter, a knight: CPR 1313-18, 77-8; CPR 1307-13, 328 & 1313-17, 499.
17 His executors were owed certain sums by Sir Thomas, Sir William, ‘Sir’ Ralph, and Master Robert le Blount: BL Egerton Charter 604. A sum was also owed by ‘Master Thurstan’. He was probably Master Thurstan de Hanslope whom Peter had presented to Hampton Lovett in 1303, who had resigned it in favour of Ralph Blount in 1306, and who succeeded Peter as parson of Hanslope: Willis-Bund 1907-29, 43, 149; VCH Worcs, iii, 361.
18 In respect of their service, William had respite of the subsidy in respect of his lands in Rutland and Buckinghamshire and Walter for his in Worcestershire: Edwards 1935, 147.
19 They were then acquiring land at Worsley, in Abberley (Worcs), which was held of John Lovett: BL Add Charter 55541. John released to Walter the rent of 4s. owed by this property: Croke 1823, ii, 779.
20 For the Sodington inheritance, see VCH Wors, iii, 69 & iv, 267, 286-7.
21 For Thomas, see Wells-Furby forthcoming.
22 Segrave was an adult by 1282: CCR 1279-88, 188.
23 CPR 1317-21, 461, 1321-14, 124, 213, 268, 369, 1327-30, 430; Palgrave 1827-34, vol 1, 98, 187, vol 2 Div 1, 111.
26 Worcs RO 705/349/12946/475203; Croke 1823, ii, 122; CChR 1327-41, p. 11.
27 Worcs RO 705/349/12946/475203, 475238, 475231, 475240, 475235, 475243, 489901, 475211-4, 475203, 475241; CCR 1333-7, 297.
28 This distinction is very clear from the accounts of the earldom of Cornwall for the manorial year 1296-7 when another subsidy, this time of a twelfth, was levied, because it is only on manors where there was a demesne that contributions to the subsidy are recorded: Midgley 1942, 1945, passim.
29 Zouche then married the younger Despenser’s widow Eleanor de Clare: GEC xii pt 2, 957-60.
30 The partition of these lands is printed in Coll Top & Gen i, 245-6.
31 Simon had died on 23 November 1358.
32 Among the deceased beneficiaries of the chantry were Sir William Blount and his wife Maud.
33 For Stury see Kightly ODNB. He had risen from humble origins in the royal household to become a chamber knight by 1365 and a favourite of Edward III. He was attacked in the Good Parliament of 1376 but not formally impeached. He remained a chamber knight and a trusted diplomat and councillor of Richard II until his death: Given-Wilson 1986, 148-9.
34 In addition to other documents cited, see, for instance, Worcestershire RO 705/349/12946/494174, 475255. She is also specifically named as the sister and heir of William in respect to Thicken Appletree: Croke 1823, ii, 125.
35 Only the Northamptonshire return of her inquisition post mortem survives.
36 The partition of her Furneaux lands was made in 1421: Coll Top & Gen i, 245-6.
37 For John and Walter, see The History of Parliament 1386-1422, 2, 255-7, 262-5. For Walter see additionally Walker 1990, passim.
38 For Thomas and his descendants see GEC ix, 333-48.
A Social Study of Vale of Catmose Villages in the Eighteenth Century

M J HINMAN

This study compares and contrasts five Vale of Catmose villages during the eighteenth century. Of these, Burley, Cottesmore (including the hamlet of Barrow) and Market Overton lie on the western edge of the limestone plateau which dips eastwards away from the Vale, whereas Ashwell and Teigh lie downhill from them in the Vale.

Introduction

As with the English Midlands as a whole, delimiting the Vale of Catmose is not as straightforward as it first appears. Southwards, it might be argued that the Vale extends beyond Egleton as far as the River Gwash north of Manton where Rutland’s ridge-and-valley landscape begins. Northwards, similarly, Edmondthorpe in Leicestershire stands on an eminence from which, west of that village above Cord Hill, one may look down southwards upon the Vale. Eastwards, the limestone scarp which culminates at Burley is the obvious boundary as far as it goes, but south of that the Vale’s north-south trend merges into the west-east of the Gwash and its tributaries towards Hambleton and the Manton ridge. Oakham and Barleythorpe lie within the Vale, but westwards Langham’s relationship to it is geographically more subtle. The land does not rise appreciably between Barleythorpe and Langham, but to the latter’s north-west stands a salient of land that drops into the Vale south of Ashwell. Whissendine is on a hill above the Vale, but the road known as Edmondthorpe Mere, which runs westwards just north of Teigh, goes downhill to avoid Cord Hill. However, Ashwell and Teigh indisputably lie within the Vale and have neighbours up the well-defined escarpment in Market Overton, Barrow, Cottesmore and Burley.

Barrow hamlet was administered along with Cottesmore, though sometimes mentioned distinctly in the records, as happened often with the parish registers, which survive for Ashwell, Burley, Cottesmore-with-Barrow, Market Overton and Teigh. By the beginning of the eighteenth century, Ashwell and Burley were already enclosed parishes; Teigh was enclosed around 1700 but Cottesmore and Market Overton only partially so until the early nineteenth century (Ryder 2011, 62-7). Burley had a resident manorial lord, Cottesmore’s and Teigh’s lived in neighbouring parishes, Market Overton’s at Tickencote; however, late in the eighteenth century the lordship of Ashwell moved through marriage from Oakham to the North Riding of Yorkshire (VCH Rutland II, 116-53 passim).

Population

The only apparently complete population figures for these parishes during the century under review appear as late as 1795 (Gentleman’s Magazine for 1795 (ii, 650)). They show the following totals, to which percentages have been added.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashwell</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burley</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottesmore</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Overton</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teigh</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,391</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottesmore + Barrow</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 1665 hearth tax returns (Bourne & Goode 1991, 28-33 passim) provide the nearest comparable pre-eighteenth century figures. If one multiplies the number of hearths recorded therein by 4.3 to obtain the likeliest figure (Arkell 1982, 51-7) for the population then, the inhabitants might have totalled:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashwell</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burley</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottesmore</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Overton</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teigh</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>911</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottesmore + Barrow</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this study, the parish register or bishop’s transcript totals for baptisms, marriages and burials have been totalled by alternate decades, that is to say for 1710-19, 1730-39, 1750-59, 1770-79 and 1790-99 (ROLLR DE1921, 1922, 1923, 3855, 4393).

Although the population increased overall, on the whole the figures for baptisms in the following table...
suggest that Ashwell’s and Teigh’s shares of the population declined. However, such results depend primarily on how assiduous the incumbent or parish clerk was in recording events, and the high 1710s figure for Teigh raises the supposition that a vacancy in a neighbouring parish meant that rites were therefore being displaced to Teigh. The wholesale 1730s reduction is interesting because it would still obtain even if the Teigh figure for the 1710s was halved. Possibly a succession of extreme weather conditions during the 1730s affected the harvest and therefore people’s general wellbeing (Kington 2010, 295–7), as might a late-1720s series of epidemics (Flood & McKloskey 1981, 25). The overall increase is roughly in line with recent estimates for England generally (ibid., 22) and the 1790s percentages are not dissimilar from those for the villages’ 1795 populations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>A %</th>
<th>B %</th>
<th>C %</th>
<th>MO %</th>
<th>T %</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1710s</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730s</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750s</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770s</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790s</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baptism totals for the five parishes.
(A = Ashwell, B = Burley, C = Cottesmore & Barrow, MO = Market Overton, T = Teigh).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>A %</th>
<th>B %</th>
<th>C %</th>
<th>MO %</th>
<th>T %</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1710s</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730s</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750s</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770s</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790s</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Burial totals for the five parishes.

As far as parish registers and bishops’ transcripts are concerned, migration into a parish may be pursued through the use of marriage registers. The anomalous village in this case is Burley, where, in the 1710s and 1750s, in over three quarters of the weddings which took place both partners came from outside the county; the furthest noted have been bridegrooms from Thornhaugh (Northamptonshire) and Metheringham (Lincolnshire). At Ashwell, bridegrooms included a Furley from March (Cambridgeshire), a Penistone from Anstey (Leicestershire) and a Nangle from what was described as just ‘Lincolnshire’ during the 1730s, and a Rose from Grimston (Leicestershire) in the 1750s. The Penistone settled in Ashwell, as did a Bloodworth from North Luffenham in the 1730s. At Cottesmore during the 1710s a Northborough (Northamptonshire) man married a local Laxton and a Leeson from Seaton remained in the parish. Having reached north Rutland, the Penistone, Bloodworth and Leeson families increased and multiplied. Other bridegrooms who married at Cottesmore were from the Northamptonshire villages of Walcote (1750s), Southwick (1770s) and Lilbourne (1770s), but it was a ‘gentlewoman’ who married somebody from Chilham Castle, Kent, in 1792, so (as with Burley’s ‘social’ marriages) she has not been included in this study’s calculations. One Market Overton bridegroom hailed from Wisbech (Cambridgeshire, 1710s) and another from Hinckley (Leicestershire, 1750s), whereas a daughter of the rectory who belonged to the manorial family married a Loughborough man in 1774 (so is excluded from the statistics on the grounds of status and family transience). An Asprey from Stamford (Lincolnshire) settled in Market Overton and fathered a girl who married a man from the same village. Whence originated the foot guardsman who married a Teigh female in 1795 is not recorded, but a bride from Leicester married a village man during the 1750s. All others resided at fifteen miles or less from the place where they married. Omitting presumed gentry and servants, the marriage totals are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>A %</th>
<th>B %</th>
<th>C %</th>
<th>MO</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1710s</td>
<td>177%</td>
<td>147%</td>
<td>177%</td>
<td>216%</td>
<td>140%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730s</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>133%</td>
<td>147%</td>
<td>143%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750s</td>
<td>208%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>191%</td>
<td>167%</td>
<td>174%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770s</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>143%</td>
<td>207%</td>
<td>144%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790s</td>
<td>175%</td>
<td>218%</td>
<td>143%</td>
<td>188%</td>
<td>227%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baptisms as a percentage of burials.

The excess of baptisms over burials was higher in those parishes where only a minority of the land had been enclosed, but the whole data-set is too small to draw other conclusions from it. The burial figures omit individuals who were returned to their respective parishes from elsewhere (they total seven, all from within a ten-mile radius) and a ‘traveller’. Three ‘Anabaptists’ whose presence the incumbent noted have been excluded from the 1710s Cottesmore total for baptisms, and one would expect there to be a few further nonconformists, but the historian of Rutland nonconformity has not identified Baptist survival or revival in those parishes during that period, nor the certain presence of other sects (Collett 2011).

Vale of Catmose villages
rish registers' boulder clay which led to the particular small numbers at Teigh, the Overton and a Teigh Draycott (1772) and a surname got married were those of a Market
Scotland or further afield and bishops' transcripts are English, not from Wales, freedom of social movement in the noble family's
that Burley's ratio of females to males at Burley might suggest any place of origin during the 1730s. The higher number of non-gentry individuals included in the above table who did not come from the parish where the marriage took place is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1710s</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>MO</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1730s</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750s</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770s</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790s</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 1770s record for Teigh is incomplete, and one couple from that village were then married at Burley. The number of non-gentry individuals included in the above table who did not come from the parish where the marriage took place is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1710s</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>MO</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1730s</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750s</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770s</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790s</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>16 + 6</td>
<td>18 + 25</td>
<td>31 + 5</td>
<td>18 + 5</td>
<td>9 + 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Market Overton register does not indicate any place of origin during the 1730s. The higher ratio of females to males at Burley might suggest that Burley-on-the-Hill manservants enjoyed greater freedom of social movement in the noble family's train than did village men.

All the surnames shown in the parish registers and bishops’ transcripts are English, not from Wales, Scotland or further afield (Reaney & Wilson 1991). The only instances where people with the same surname got married were those of a Market Overton and a Teigh Draycott (1772) and a Northborough and a Cottesmore Laxton (1719).

Noting the above-mentioned deficiencies in the data and the particularly small numbers at Teigh, the percentage of spouses from outside the village where the wedding took place is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1710s</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>MO</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1730s</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750s</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770s</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790s</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dividing baptism totals by the number of marriages during the same period may be used to indicate fertility. Ignoring the erratic 1710s entries for Market Overton and Teigh, the overall decline for Ashwell and Teigh reappears. Possibly colder winters during the last quarter of the century (Kington 2010, 310-30) made for poorer crop-yields on the Vale villages’ boulder clay which led to poorer diet and a reduction in fertility. The rates are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1710s</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>MO</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1730s</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750s</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770s</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790s</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination of the dominance and persistence of a family within a given parish may be traced by noting when there was more than one occurrence of a surname, as shown below. The dominance in a given parish of a small group of surnames where more than one child with that name was baptised during a given decade is remarkably consistent overall, and it is the ‘open’ village of Market Overton without a resident dominant landlord that scores highest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ashwell</th>
<th>Burley</th>
<th>Cottesmore</th>
<th>Market Overton</th>
<th>Teigh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710s</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730s</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750s</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770s</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790s</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dominance of surnames, where (a) indicates the total number of baptisms (above) or burials (below), (b) multiple instances of a surname in (a), and (c) the percentage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ashwell</th>
<th>Burley</th>
<th>Cottesmore</th>
<th>Market Overton</th>
<th>Teigh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710s</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730s</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750s</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770s</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790s</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three years are missing for Ashwell during the 1710s. The Cottesmore totals omit a Cook from Greetham (1719) and a Stubley from Oakham (1790) who had presumably been returned to their native parishes for burial. The Market Overton totals exclude one person from Thistleton during the 1750s and one from Whissendine in the 1790s. Again there is, overall, a remarkable consistency across the parishes except for Burley, which might be explained by the deaths of many ‘incomer’ relations and servants of the Finch family at the big house who lacked pre-existing local links.

Certain families appear in every decade examined. Sixteen families feature across four of the chosen decades in their respective parishes. Of course some surnames might only have appeared in the decades not covered, and some appear, disappear and reappear over the century. Surnames that are prominent only earlier are: at Burley: Topper and Wilkinson; at Cottesmore: Simms and Stubley; and at Teigh: Banton. Families that are found from the 1730s onwards and flourish are: at Ashwell: Chamberlain, Dunmore, Hinman and Webster; at Burley: Chamberlain and Glen; at Cottesmore: Abbey, Berridge, Chamberlain and Speed; at Market Overton: Christian, Garfoot, Nott and Pridmore; and at Teigh: Banton, Nixon and Simms.

Some families flourished in just one parish but the surnames of others recur across parishes, whether for instance an individual was baptised in one parish but buried in another, or one branch of a family transferred parishes, leaving the rest in the original place. Which said, omitting common English surnames that appear in the registers for more than one of these villages (Taylor at Ashwell and Cottesmore, Smith at Cottesmore and Market Overton, Clarke at Cottesmore and Market Overton, Walker at Market Overton and Burley, Green at Market Overton, and Baker at Burley, Market Overton and Teigh) the following are common across parishes: the parish where the surname recurs across all five chosen decades is given first, followed by the other places.

- Berridge: Cottesmore (5 decades), Burley (2 decades), Market Overton (2 decades), Ashwell (1 decade)
- Brownsword: Market Overton (5)
- Christian: Cottesmore (5), Market Overton (4), Teigh (1)
- Crookhorn: Teigh (5)
- Fisher: Market Overton (5)
- Hinman: Teigh (5), Ashwell (3), Market Overton (1)
- Jackson: Cottesmore (5), Ashwell (4)
- Kettle: Market Overton (5), Cottesmore (4)
- Kew: Market Overton (5)
- Leeson: Cottesmore (5), Market Overton (2)
- Mantle: Market Overton (5), Cottesmore (1)
- Penistone: Ashwell (5)
- Rayson: Burley (5)
- Scott: Market Overton (5), Cottesmore (1)
- Sisson: Cottesmore (5), Market Overton (1)
- Sneath: Cottesmore (5)
- Tidd: Burley (5), Cottesmore (1), Market Overton (1)
- Toon: Cottesmore (5), Market Overton (2), Teigh (2), Ashwell (1), Burley (1)
- Watkin: Cottesmore (5), Market Overton (3), Teigh (1)
- Wilbourn: Ashwell (5), Market Overton (4)
- Woodward: Market Overton (5)
- Wright: Teigh (5), Ashwell (1), Market Overton (1)

Of course people will have established themselves at different dates, both in parishes here studied and in adjacent ones beyond this article’s area, but the Berridges and Leesons did move outwards from Cottesmore later in the period, as did the Tidds from Burley which otherwise is a comparatively introverted parish. Less fecund families also shifted – for example, the Nixons from Burley to Teigh and the Coles the other way.

This statistical analysis has largely included within its Cottesmore figures the hamlet of Barrow which during the eighteenth century did not have its own chapel. Although the clergy or clerks did not differentiate Barrow in the 1730s, and often failed to do so during the 1750s, they did so at other times to the extent that it accounts for 19% of all baptisms but an erratically high proportion of the smaller number of burials differentiated within the parish. Despite the sample’s smallness and the register-writers’ not always differentiating Barrow from Cottesmore, one can say that certain families were based in the hamlet, namely the Clarke, Kettles, Leesons and Sissons. As discussed below, title deeds examined (ROLLR DE5122) also defined the Sissons as based at Barrow.

**Landholding**

Without identifying them as such, parish registers will give the names of the labouring poor, but not many other records do so. Broadly defined, tenurial records may show them as cottagers but the yeoman class of tenant farmers predominates. Apart from leases for smallholdings, deeds will likewise feature the farmers generally and graziers. For instance, one may trace in a certain deed collection (ROLLR DE5122) the rise of the Sisson family of Barrow. In 1706 Thomas Sisson bought a cottage with land. In 1727 the yeomen John Stubley of Cottesmore and William Berridge senior of Barrow were the trustees for the marriage settlement of William Sisson who purchased 53 acres in this hamlet three years later. That William Sisson or a namesake leased two acres at Barrow from the Hospital of St John and St Anne, Oakham, in 1763. In c1730 William Sisson was the Earl of Gainsborough’s tenant for 47 acres 3 roods 6 perches of the already-enclosed land and 41 acres in the open fields in Barrow but also owned 37a 1r 1p of enclosed...
and 58a 3r 15p of open land; hence he farmed 184a 3r 22p, or one-fifth, of the hamlet’s cultivable 920a 2r 6p. Sisson was the only significant resident freeholder; the rest lived at Belvoir Castle (John Doubleday), Cottesmore and Market Overton except for the owner of one acre. However, in c1730 William Berridge and John Berridge were tenants of 101a 1r 35p and 95 acres respectively, George Darker of 103a 2r 24p, and William Freeman tenanted two farms which together covered 229a 2r 1p. Together, Sisson, the Berridges, Darker and Freeman farmed 715a 2r 2p, i.e. 78% of the cultivable 920a 2r 6p within a hamlet of 1031 acres (VCH Rutland I, 231) and 85% of the leaseholds (619a 1r 26p of 715a 2r 2p). Of the remaining Gainsborough tenants, a cowkeeper held 12a 1r 36p, two smallholders a total of 47a 1r 40p and the Market Overton farmer William Scott 21a 2r 0p. The Gainsborough estate’s c1759 survey book (ROLLR DE3214/4572) shows a William Sisson, George Darker and William Berridge holding the same lands as shown on the c1730 estate map (ROLLR DE3214/4571); at Market Overton John Berridge held what the 1730s namesake had done and more, whilst Catherine Berridge had obtained Freeman’s lease. Bearer of a surname that enters the Cottesmore parish registers after the 1730s, John Abbey had by 1759 bought John Doubleday’s 26a 1r 16p and another acre; however, his main property comprised Cottesmore leaseholds that amounted to 132a 0r 23p.

Whereas Gainsborough’s leaseholds overall accounted for 83% of Barrow’s cultivable land, in Cottesmore itself they were over 99%, for only 8a 0r 27p of such land did not belong to the earl, so there was no scope for a Sisson to carve out a viable independent farm. A pattern of yeoman farmers similar to that at Barrow did, however, prevail, for John Christian senior held 139a 2r 39p, John Christian junior 146a 0r 6p, Thomas Christian 76a 3r 37p as two widow Abbeys’ holdings in Cottesmore what had been Arthur Hardy’s in 1730. Widow Jackson held what had been Thomas Jackson’s and Samuel Nix’s. Robert Speed was still around, whereas William Berridge had assumed John Stubley’s tenancy. Four of the six cottagers’ holdings remained with the same families 29 years later. 46a 3r 25p leased in c1730 to a Robert Sisson, whose village was not shown but who might well have been the man of that name who is shown as living at Exton according to his 1733 will, was held in 1759 by John Berridge of Exton. Thus the Gainsboroughs pursued a conservative policy of preferring to re-let to existing tenants or their relatives and to keep farms as intact as practicable. Rents in 1759 were around £1 16s to £3 per acre for land alone, £3 2s to £3 17s for a farmhouse plus land. Cottesmore’s substantial smallholders were paying £2 per acre for their land; the survey also notes four cottages newly built upon the waste.

On to the 1799 valuation (ROLLR DE3214/4526) of the Gainsborough estate, and the Abbey family that had appeared in the parish registers from the 1730s and obtained by 1759 the lease of 80a 3r 35p was shown as retaining that Cottesmore estate. They had also acquired 26a 2r 0p in Barrow, besides 162a 2r 37p as two widow Abbeys’ holdings in Cottesmore. In 1799 Sarah Darker held exactly the same amount at Barrow as George Darker had done forty years previously – a note on the 1759 survey shows that he died in 1761. The Christian family’s 243a 2r 37p at Cottesmore in c1730 had increased to 374a 3r 37p by 1799, and the Berridges’ 46a 3r 25p had become 300a 3r 35p, whereas John Hardy’s 161a 2r 35p in 1799 differed only slightly from his 163a 3r 2p of 1759. William Sisson’s leasehold estate at Barrow was exactly the same size in 1799 as it had been seventy years before. By 1799, Anthony Berridge had succeeded to the 229a 2r 4p at Barrow that had been Catherine Berridge’s in 1759 but other Berridge leasehold land in the hamlet only amounted to 126a 1r 30p instead of 220a 1r 35p. A Robert
Speed’s 1799 holding in Cottesmore was almost exactly the same as a namesake’s in c1730. The Jackson family’s tenancies had increased from 92a 3r 0p in c1730 to 217a 0r 4p in 1759 and remained the same in 1799. Excluding the Reverend William Brereton, in 1799 six people again had smallholdings of eighteen to 30 acres; there were 45 tenants at Cottesmore (as opposed to 47 in c1730) and eleven at Barrow (previously the figure had been twenty, but that had included four Cottesmore individuals who rented an acre or less in the hamlet). Of course some families might have moved out or been able to buy freeholds but, whilst there appeared to be a policy of re-letting to existing families, there had been some consolidation of holdings.

Over at Ashwell, out of a parish that in 1782 was reckoned to cover 1738a 2r 19 (NYRO ZDS IV.1.1.7), in that year Lord Downe owned 1388a 0r 1p compared with his predecessor William Burton’s 1332a 2r 0p in 1766, i.e. 77% and 74% respectively. In 1766 (NYRO ZDS IV.2.8.1) the principal tenants were Ann and Augustine Chamberlain (138 acres), William Chamberlain (146 acres) and William Chamberlain senior (119 acres). Only sixteen years later much had changed, for William Webster tenanted 130a 2r 26p, Thomas Webster 117a 0r 26p, Joseph Dunmore 101a 1r 25p, John Dunmore 116a 1r 30p and Robert Mouldsworth 141a 1r 48p. Mouldsworth had increased his holdings from 44 acres in 1766 and two Dunmores had held in aggregate 109a 2r 0p in 1766, whilst William Chamberlain was down to 74a 0r 31p by 1782. The parish registers mention from the 1750s the Webster family who held 227a 3r 14p in 1782. The registers do not mention the name Sheilds, but one so named appears in the 1781 rental holding what had been William Chamberlain’s tenure in 1766 and Elizabeth Chamberlain’s meanwhile. The substantial tenure-change must be linked with William Burton’s heiress and daughter Laura’s bringing the manor upon her marriage in 1763 to John D awny (Viscount Downe). Although William Burton died in London in 1781 (GM 51 (1781), 94), the family had been local, and he was buried at Ashwell (DE1921/1) whereas the D awnay estates were based in the North Riding of Yorkshire, so perhaps an absentee landlord could be more thoroughgoing in changing his tenants than could a Gainsborough who lived in the next village to his Cottesmore leaseholders. Comparison of the 1781 rental with others up to 1800 shows that the Webster family steadily enlarged its Ashwell holding until it was paying almost twice as much in rent (however, that and a Dunmore family increase might be due to a rent-rise between 1781 and 1792). The number of tenants declined from 24 in 1766 to 23 in 1781 and to nineteen in 1800, so holdings were being consolidated as at Cottesmore. There were also a number of cottagers – eight consistently from 1766 to 1795 but eleven in 1800. The additions were a Chamberlain, a Burns nell (a name not found at Ashwell, though at Teigh during the 1730s) and a Faulks (the surname of the 1790s Cottesmore Anabaptists; the name only appears otherwise in parish registers at Ashwell and Market Overton in the 1790s). The 1766 rental notes previous rents, which were then reduced on average by one-fortieth: presumably this was caused by a run of wet years during the 1760s (Kington 1988, 72-6).

From the adjacent Leicestershire parish of Stapleford, the Sherards were Teigh’s manorial lords, and had the Honourable Robert Sherard as rector from 1743 to 1787. They had eighteen tenants at Teigh in 1773 and secured rent money from Christopher Wright, Richard Elston and Francis Hinman. First appearing in the registers during the 1660s, the Hinmans were a permanent feature of Teigh until well after our period, the largest individual landholders from 1705 to 1725, collectively dominant to 1766 and runners-up thereafter (Redlich 1926, 126-7: ROLLR DG40/50, 4440). They were overtaken by the Wrights, significant since 1708. The Parby family built up a holding during the earlier part of the eighteenth century but disappeared after the 1740s, to be replaced by the Elstons.

Based at Tickencote, the family of Wingfield provided one member who was the manorial lord when Market Overton was enclosed (ROLLR EN/MA/R20/1) in 1807, at which time John Wingfield occupied 388a 2r 25p of newly-enclosed land compared with 237a 3r 1p for the Reverend John and Elizabeth Hopkinson. Of the ‘locals’, William Sisson received most (121a 3r 33p), followed by Ann Scott (104a 1r 3p) and John Christian (51a 1r 6p). Those names recur between Market Overton and its neighbours Barrow and Cottesmore, which were also enclosed in 1807. At that time Gerard Noel Noel of the Gainsborough family took half of the land newly enclosed at Barrow, leaving Sisson with 65a 2r 5p, Christian with 27a 1r 2p and Francis Abbey with 30a 2r 5p. Burley had been enclosed by c1670 (Ryder 2006, 62) and was owned almost exclusively by the Finches, who alone paid land tax in that parish in 1807 (ROLLR DE3124/11977).

By way of contrast with Burley, Market Overton was an ‘open’ village in the sense that others than the manorial lord were significant freeholders. Ahead of enclosure, William Sisson’s old and new enclosures were valued at £70 1s 10d and the Reverend John Hopkinson’s (no mention of Elizabeth Hopkinson) at £148 2s 8d, but Mr Nicks’s (an established family) at £381 2s 7d, Doctor Hardy’s at
£177 15s 2d, Mr Berridge’s at £147 8s and Mr Costall’s (a family later significant in the village) at £130 15s. Market Overton appears to have been a more evenly-spread place than Burley socially. As an example, 81 acres which the heiresses of the late Reverend John Green of Market Overton sold to William Scott (of Market Overton, esquire) in 1725 for £875 were re-sold five years later for £940 to William Godwin (of Market Overton, gentleman), returned to Scott by Godwin’s brother Nicholas and sold on to Charles Lewis (of Stanford, Nottinghamshire, esquire) for £1,200. William Sisson purchased the same estate for nearly £650 in 1757 and it formed the basis for the settlement when his daughter married the Market Overton grazier John Hinman in 1773. In 1801 that couple’s spinster daughters Mary and Sarah released their interest to their brother John who was soon to become a cleric himself as curate of first Market Overton and then Cottesmore.

Using the county’s 1712 land tax assessment (Clough 2005, 23-51 passim), and following Turner & Mills (1986, 189-96), one may construct the following table, where (a) = the number of taxpayers, (b) = the mean value of tax paid, (c) = the total tax, (d) = the acreage (as per 1881 census (VCH Rutland I, 231)) and (e) = the mean acreage per freeholder (i.e. (d) divided by (a)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashwell</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>£31 1s</td>
<td>£217 18s</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>£3 17s</td>
<td>£61 12s</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>£126</td>
<td>£252 0s 8d</td>
<td>3051</td>
<td>1526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottesmore</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>£4 1s 7d</td>
<td>£112 12s</td>
<td>2504</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Overton</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>£3 13s 10d</td>
<td>£120</td>
<td>1806</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teigh</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>£4 13s</td>
<td>£125 12s</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exton</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>£3 4s 5d</td>
<td>£188 6s 8d</td>
<td>4072</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that, despite the Noels’ having their seat at Exton, that village included other taxpayers than the head of that family, the Earl of Gainsborough, whereas at Burley there was only one besides the Earl of Winchelsea. The taxpayers included tenants who were paying on behalf of their landlords (Turner & Mills 1986, ibid), so the Noels at Exton had more to do to influence their village than did the Finches at Burley.

Social Aspects and Local Politics

Families at a similar social level to each other were prepared to act as one another’s trustees or mortgagees. For instance, the Market Overton grazier Matthew Nicks mortgaged a close to the Barrow grazier William Sisson in 1773, but they assigned it to a Melton Mowbray (Leicestershire) grazier four years later. In 1757 William Scott senior, his wife and namesake son (of Market Overton) confirmed 111 acres and four messuages at Market Overton, together with 61 acres at Barrow, to Matthew Nicks, then shown as a gentleman (ROLLR DE 3214/1535). Whilst William Nicks was described in 1796 as a gentleman, a younger Matthew Nicks was shown as having to make his way in the world as a grazier when the two of them then mortgaged most of the same property to the Leighfield grazier John Cole (DE 5122/203). However, epithets may be misleading – the same younger Matthew Nicks appears in the 1803 Market Overton enclosure valuation as ‘Mr’ on the grounds of what his property is worth, as do a Berridge and a Costall; William Sisson is not a ‘Mr’, but then his property in that village was worth less than that of the others. Only a minority of people held significant amounts in more than one settlement – according to poll books for the elections of 1713, 1722 and 1761 (ROLLR DG7/Rut.2.1IV/1; ROLLR DE3214/11972; NRO T.B.872.3), just three men did so in both Cottesmore and Market Overton in 1713, one in those villages in 1722 (and one at Teigh and Market Overton, and another at Cottesmore and Barrow). Around half of the freeholder electors owned property in parishes where they did not live, as shown below, where the total number of electors is followed by non-resident numbers in parentheses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1713</th>
<th>1722</th>
<th>1761</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashwell</td>
<td>6 (4)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>4 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow</td>
<td>2 (0)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burley</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td>2 (0)</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottesmore</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Overton</td>
<td>18 (8)</td>
<td>13 (7)</td>
<td>16 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teigh</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30 (13)</td>
<td>20 (9)</td>
<td>25 (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, in 1722 four of the non-residents lived in an adjacent settlement, as did five in 1761. The furthest-flung non-residents lived within twenty miles in 1722 but ten of them more than twice that distance in 1761.

The poll books for the same three general elections have also been examined in order to ascertain magnate influence upon local voters. In 1713 Daniel Finch of Burley and Bennet, Lord Sherard of Stapleford were returned to parliament with 253 and 241 votes respectively from residents across Rutland compared with 187 votes for the third candidate, Richard Halford, who had only become an MP in 1711 through Daniel Finch’s expulsion from parliament upon petition following the 1710 election (Mitchell 1995, 210). If non-Rutland residents who were entitled to vote because they owned property in the county are included, the figures are 312, 301 and 240, which gives each candidate almost exactly the
same share of the vote. Each elector could cast two votes but might restrict himself to one. In 1713 this is seen best at Market Overton where, of fourteen men who voted, four (including the vicar) only did so for Halford, who moreover picked up two votes whose owners also plumped for Sherard in one case and Finch in the other. The two Cottesmore voters each chose Sherard and the Earl of Gainsborough’s candidate Halford. Of the three Barrow men, two voted for Sherard and Halford, one only for Sherard, which suggests that the two great families of the district (Gainsborough and Winchilsea) had not come to an agreement to support each other’s candidates on that occasion. With Sherard as the manorial lord, the two Teigh voters naturally chose him (as an Irish peer, he could sit in the British House of Commons). One Teigh man voted for Finch, as of course did all four at Burley (three of them voted for Sherard as well). The four Ashwell voters simply voted for Finch. Altogether, in the parishes under review, seventeen individuals are shown to have voted for Finch, eighteen for Sherard and eleven for Halford. With 48 taxpayers in 1712 and fourteen resident voters in 1713, Market Overton displayed its comparative independence through having more larger landowners who therefore were entitled to vote.

In 1722 Daniel Finch retained his seat but Thomas Mackworth of Normanton defeated Philip Sherard (VCH Rutland I, 205). The overall total number of votes cast was: Finch – 276; Mackworth – 268; Sherard – 261, so a close contest with all candidates local men. That time the Rev Henry Timperon of Market Overton voted for the two victors. However, of individuals who owned property or lived in this article’s villages, only ten chose the slightly more distant Mackworth but fourteen preferred Finch of Burley and twelve Sherard of Stapleford. All but two of Sherard’s supporters were associated with Market Overton or Teigh (the parishes closest to Stapleford), while Mackworth’s show a bias towards Cottesmore and Barrow; Finch’s supporters show a bias against those places, as if Mackworth were the Noels’ protégé. In 1761 Thomas Noel and Thomas Chambers Cecil (of the Earl of Exeter’s family, which owned much land in eastern Rutland) were returned but not the Finch candidate Charles Tryon whose family was based at Bulwick across the Northamptonshire border. The overall figures in 1761 were: Cecil – 323; Noel – 267; Tryon – 233. The figures for this article’s villages were: Cecil – 24; Noel – 27; Tryon – 16. Besides the Finch influence at Burley, perhaps Tryon drew most of his support from Market Overton because one of the Wingfield manorial family who was the vicar there favoured him. The Sherard who was vicar of Teigh supported Noel and Tryon, as did the four other voters who lived there. Elsewhere, the default preference was for Noel and Cecil.

Until Victoria’s reign, a general election had to be held when a new monarch acceded. It might be coincidental that the Earl of Winchilsea could write (ROLLR DE3214/11435) within a month of George II’s death to Robert Christian of Market Overton that he had found a place in the excise for the latter’s son, yet at the subsequent 1761 election Mr Christian did not vote for the Finch family candidate. It would be difficult to take seriously the result implied by correspondence (ROLLR DE3214/11962/2-3) which relates to lobbying in the Noel family’s interest in 1741 when, across the county, 388 voters presumed to vote for a Noel but only 95 votes were to be given to the other candidates (at least the three Burley voters said that they would support the local Finch family). In 1741 Winchilsea did not need to provide any money in Burley to ensure that the locals would vote for his man and the Noel candidate, whilst only 5s in Cottesmore with Barrow (with a nearly-resident lord but also more freeholders) was the going rate, whereas 10s 6d was required in Market Overton (with an instruction to his agent to ‘Wait on Mr Wingfield the parson’), an amount needed to keep the average-sized Rutland villages on board. Teigh was not worth bothering about then because a member of its manorial Sherard family was standing against Finch and Noel, and Ashwell was omitted.

The yeoman class whose members have been identified in this study sometimes came into contact with their social superiors in more official ways, for instance as charity trustees. For example, half the rents from the Crown inn at Stamford were used to purchase for the Cottesmore parish poor red herrings at Uppingham’s Martinmas (November 11th) fair, along with bread at the Oakham market which followed it, the other half being devoted to buying wood or coals ‘as convenient’ for the poor (ROLLR DE3241/3-5: NRO X5520). In 1704 two yeomen enfeoffed the Earl of Gainsborough, two more Noels, the vicar of Cottesmore, one of the Burtons from Ashwell’s manorial family and three yeomen. One of the new 1704 feoffees was a Stubley; an Oakham Stubley and a Noel were by 1779 the only survivors from a 1743 feoffment but acted along with the deceaseds’ descendants (a Jackson and a Hardy from Cottesmore and the current William Sisson of Barrow) when they leased the inn to Brownlow, Earl of Exeter. However, a cottage and a few acres at Barrow which serviced Byrche’s Charity for the benefit of the poor there and at Cottesmore, Market Overton and Greetham did not require such august trustees (Parkin 1996, 287-96: ROLL DE5063/10, 11). Of the seven appointed in 1715, two were clergymen and three others were members of the local farming families. A
gentleman Sisson from Greetham joined William Sisson of Barrow in 1735, along with a Barrow Berridge and a Cottesmore Christian. In 1768 William Scott of Market Overton joined his namesake father, along with another Market Overton Nicks, a Barrow Berridge and a Market Overton Christian. The three newcomers in 1780 were a Nicks, a Berridge and Richard Speede from Cottesmore. None of the later enfeoffments featured a clergyman or a member of the nobility.

Yeoman farmers were the backbone of the parish and manorial system, filling such positions as churchwarden, overseer and headborough or its equivalents. For instance, at Teigh, 1758-1800, one Hinman or another was a churchwarden for thirteen years, Elstons for ten and Wrights for eight. The Bunting family moved into the parish during the 1770s, three children were baptised and George Bunting served as churchwarden intermittently thenceforward, running a 106-acre farm (Redlich 1926, 127-8), in the same league as the Himmans et al. Constables at Teigh early in the eighteenth century tended to be smallholders drawn from established families like the Edgsons, Kemps and Robertses. At Cottesmore in the 1740s (ROLLR DE3214/2), constables came rather from the most established and substantial families like the Christians and Stubleys, but were not above holding less prestigious manorial roles like ale-taster. However, Daniel Wylde, who served continuously as the pinner who rounded up stray cattle and put them in the village pinfold, bears a surname that does not appear in the registers for the decades examined. Early in the century, manorial offices were shared around at Ashwell (NYRO ZDS III.18.1.1-3). At both Ashwell and Cottesmore, the ‘homage’ or manorial jury was chosen from among the more substantial tenants. The churchwardens or overseers of the poor who, along with the incumbent, in 1761 received the local land tax money (ROLLR DE3214/5696) belonged to the usual families of significant individuals (Timpson and Ruff at Burley, Mapley and Christian at Cottesmore, Berridge at Barrow, Nicks at Market Overton). However, when the clergy assigned tithes to the laity, the latter ranged from a manorial lord (an earlier William Burton at Ashwell, 1701: NYRO ZDS.I.9.11.1) and the Earl of Gainsborough’s son-in-law (Burley, 1772: ROLLR DE3214/1535) to the principal farmers (as at Cottesmore in 1708 (ROLLR DE6258/1) and Barrow in 1727 (ROLLR DE6258/7)).

As well as wealth and family, wills indicate which of these men could at least sign their names. Of nineteen individuals whose surviving original wills were proved at the diocesan level (NRO), twelve signed their names whereas seven made their mark with a cross. Those defined as yeomen tended not to sign their names earlier in the century, but no other trend is visible, and one must be aware of such an example as the two Barrow George Barkers of whom the senior (a husbandman) signed his name in 1719 eleven months before his will was sworn in court, whereas the younger (described as a yeoman, perhaps a sign of higher status) made his mark on his 1766 will only six months before it was sworn, for he might already have been infirm. Thomas Christian of Cottesmore made his mark only five weeks before the 1742 will was sworn, yet his namesake son was still capable of signing his in 1756 just 22 days before the executors swore it. Taking into account those wills, along with references found at ROLLR (DE3214/863; DE6258/5, 21, 22, 26), people almost exclusively made their bequests ostensibly in the villages where they had lived, although in 1703 Robert Berridge was living in Exton and another Thomas Christian had moved to Hathern (Leicestershire) seventy years later, both with property in Cottesmore. The Christian who went to Stathern owned Market Overton and Barrow property, which reflected the family’s spread within Rutland. Although a member of an Ashwell family, the grazer Joshua Dunmore only mentioned in his will land at Manton, Oakham and Edith Weston. On the other hand, Rebecca Davie of Oakham bequeathed Ashwell land which during the nineteenth century became part of the Dawny estate (NYRO ZDS.1.9.11.4). Other property held in a different village from a testator’s abode lay at Thistleton, Langham, Wing, Greetham, Knossington (Leicestershire) and Stretton. Despite the family’s frequent appearances in the parish registers and bequests to family members, the Thomas Christian of Cottesmore who died in 1756 named a local yeoman (John Stubley) and the Dissenting minister at Oakham and Uppingham (John Cooper) as his executors. The Barrow yeoman John Hardy nominated as sole executor in 1749 the huntsman John Abbey rather than any of his own many nephews and nieces. The other testators named family members. The above-mentioned Thomas Christian and John Hardy gave bequests to servants. The most substantial inventories were those for the goods of John Christian senior (of Market Overton, yeoman; 1721) at £406 13s 2d (which included 188 sheep and 77 lambs, some on his Langham land), Thomas Christian senior (of Cottesmore, yeoman; 1742) at £285 16s, and John Christian (of Cottesmore; 1776) at £556 13s 4d net (£644 with tithe-arrears; he had 161 sheep, fifteen cattle, eleven horses and eight pigs). The largest one-off monetary sums bequeathed were £1,700 by William Sisson (of Barrow, gentleman; 1767) and £700 by Matthew Nicks (of Market Overton, gentleman; 1768).

A whipper-in for the Cottesmore hunt (Clayton 1993, 208), John Abbey was a substantial figure in
Vale of Catmose villages

village life who by 1759 had acquired land previously let to the Hardy family, having not appeared as a Gainsborough tenant in c1730. Thomas Gamble settled in Cottesmore during the 1730s and became the Noels’ tenant at the windmill. Members of well-established Vale families like the Hutchingses, Kettles, Leesons and Watkins appear in Noel estate papers as cottagers rather than as substantial tenants. At Ashwell, the Freemans survived the century modestly, from appearances in the 1703 court roll via the parish registers to the 1800 rental, as did the Wilbourns at the level latterly of cottager. The Burtons and Coxes persist in the Teigh registers and accounts; the former provided a constable and lodging-house keepers during the 1720s, the latter included a mole-catcher. One Cottesmore cottager acted as the Gainsboroughs’ woodman there during the 1750s, others included carpenters and a mason (all degrees of tenant bought the timber) (ROLLR DE3214/5572/1, 5591, 5602/2). Local workmen were used when the Noels rented Cottesmore Hall to their family connexions (ROLLR DE3214/5554).

Conclusion
Facts and figures about villages are bound to be generally small-scale, but certain trends may be deduced from this study. There is a slight extraversion in that more marriage-partners and voters hailed from outside Rutland and its immediate environs later in the eighteenth century than had been the case earlier. Cottesmore and Market Overton manorial lords consolidated their holdings but there were no new enclosures except at the very beginning and end of the period concerned. Families rose such that a yeoman’s son might be called a gentleman, but they also declined as regards the amount of land held. Yet some families, although namesakes might be found elsewhere, often stayed in the same parish over the century and flourished in numbers if not necessarily in wealth. A manorial lord’s degree of proximity was a major influence, whether he was living in the parish as at Burley, next door as at Cottesmore or Teigh or a little further away as at Ashwell or Market Overton. Bad weather appears to have affected rentals and possibly fertility. Correspondence (ROLLR DG7 Bundle 29/4) reveals the indignation expressed in 1741 by the Earl of Gainsborough when the Earl of Winchelsea did not support the former’s brother’s parliamentary candi dature, but what their social inferiors thought of one another can only be imagined from evidence that is itself neutral, as in the references to Anabaptists and the choice of a Dissenting minister as an executor in a very Anglican district. Inter-village rivalry there might well have been, as with the still-current rhyme which ends ‘Proud Market Overton and poor old Teigh’ but, as it is, we can only guess for instance at what the hilltop villagers thought of their neighbours in the plain and vice versa.
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A Neolithic jadeitite axehead fragment from Martinsthorpe, Rutland

The blade end of an axehead of Alpine jadeitite was discovered by Stewart Carter in 2015, as a chance find, on the surface of ploughsoil on the Manton to Brooke Ridge overlooking Martinsthorpe, Rutland (approx. NGR SK 867044). The location is a low ridge above the valleys of the River Gwash to the north and the River Chater to the south, around 100m above sea level. No other artefact was found in the vicinity and it is assumed that the axehead had been brought to the surface by ploughing. The object was acquired by Rutland County Museum (accession number OAKRM: 2015.20).

Description
The fragment (fig. 1) probably represents around half of the original length of the axehead; it measures 59mm long (rounded to the nearest mm), 55mm at its widest point, just above the blade, and 17mm in its maximum thickness; its weight is 102gm. Its estimated original length is c110 mm; as such, within the canon of Alpine axehead manufacture, it constitutes a medium-length specimen. In plan, one side is slightly convex while the other is fairly straight, and the blade is minimally convex. In profile, the body is fairly slender and the blade is symmetrical, indicating that the object had indeed been an axehead rather than an adze-head. In cross-section it is truncated-elliptical, the sides of the axehead gently squared off to form narrow flat facets with a maximum surviving width of 5mm. The surfaces had been carefully smoothed and there are traces of a glassy polish on each of the broad faces; originally the whole of the surface may well have received this degree of polish. There are traces of ancient damage to the blade in the form of one fairly sizeable flake scar around 12mm long and three smaller scars. The fracture surface across the body of the axehead is diagonal and, on one side, stepped; on the other side there is a large and deep flake scar, around 20 x 13 mm, running down the body from the point of fracture. This flake scar and the main fracture surface have a somewhat fresher, less weathered appearance than the flake scars at the blade. While this might suggest that the breakage had occurred

Fig. 1. The axehead fragment (photo: Alison Sheridan).
more recently than the damage to the blade, nevertheless it happened long enough ago for iron staining to appear on the fracture surface; moreover, the pattern of breakage is consistent with that seen on many Alpine axeheads that had been deliberately broken in prehistory. There could have been differential weathering according to the object’s position when originally deposited: if the fragment had been ‘planted’ vertically in the ground, blade end upwards, the fracture surface would have been subjected to less weathering than the blade.

The colour, in the axehead’s patinated condition, is a variegated light green and pale yellow with medium green veining; there is also some post-depositional iron-staining on the surface (including the fracture surface), mostly occurring as narrow lines.

Raw material and typological identification
The rock is hard and tough, its fracture surface undulating according to the rock’s crystalline structure. Initial assessment by Tim Clough identified this as a possible candidate for Alpine jadeiteite, and so he notified the first-named author, as the UK Co-Ordinator for the international, French-led Projet JADE – a major research project led by Pierre Pétrequin which has undertaken a systematic study of Neolithic objects made from Alpine rock across Europe (Pétrequin et al 2012a; Sheridan et al 2011). The axehead was taken to Orgnac l’Aven (Ardèche, France) in June 2016 for initial examination by Pierre Pétrequin, followed by non-destructive compositional analysis by Michel Errera. The technique used was spectroradiometry, and the analysis enabled the composition of the axehead to be compared with that of over 5000 specimens in the Projet JADE reference dataset, the information having been obtained from analysis of Alpine axeheads across Europe, of raw material samples and of pieces of working debris.

The initial macroscopic examination, accompanied by inspection of enlarged photographs, revealed specific features that aided the sourcing of the rock: the presence of long, pale green, laterally-impregnated fissures; the non-orthogonal orientation of the filled fissures; a breccic structure; the presence of several very small garnets with either a sunken centre or else a mid-green crown (probably of omphacitite); the presence of several rectangular pseudomorphs of lawsonite with a mid-green edge; and ancient garnets with a mid-green filling of jadeitite or omphacitite. These characteristics are specific to the family of garnetiferous jadeitites found on the south of the Mont Viso massif in the western Alps in northern Italy, and excellent comparanda for the axehead are to be found among the Projet JADE raw material reference collection for this area. The jadeitite used for its manufacture had been taken from primary or secondary deposits in the Porco valley, or else from the upper Bulé valley or the moraine of Paesana (although it is less abundant in the last two locations).

The results of the spectroradiometric analysis (spectra no. Orgnac_2016_001 & Orgnac_2016_002) wholly confirm those of the visual examination. The closest analytical results indicate that these spectra belong to spectrofacies_321 (endmember_152) whose origin is very likely to be the Oncino area of the Mont Viso massif (i.e. the valleys of Porco, Rasciassa or Bulé: Errera et al 2012).

Typologically, according to the pan-Europe classification system developed by Projet JADE (Pétrequin et al 2012b), the axehead can be attributed to the Chelles type, as discussed below.

Discussion
The confirmation that this axehead had indeed originated in the western part of the Alps in north Italy – and had thus travelled some 1346 km (836 miles) as the crow flies during the course of its (possibly long) life – is significant, as this is the first such discovery in Rutland and only the 120th (or so) Alpine axehead to have been found in Britain and Ireland. The findspot lies outside the areas where Alpine axeheads tend to cluster (Sheridan & Pailler 2011). Furthermore, it is only the second example of a Chelles-type axehead known from Britain, the other formerly having being part of Lord McAlpine’s collection, with a vague location given as ‘Oxford’; indeed, there is no guarantee that this specimen had not actually been found outside Britain.

Chelles-type axeheads – which have a gently pointed butt – are believed to represent a reworked form of another type of axehead (or rather, adzehead): the Bégude type. The reworking, which consisted of thinning, reshaping and repolishing, would mostly have occurred at some distance from the original place of manufacture. Chelles-type axeheads are particularly numerous in the Morbihan area of southern Brittany but are also known from the Paris Basin and elsewhere (fig. 2). Their earliest documented appearance is among the Alpine axeheads produced in northern Italy around 4500 BC. Their production increased during the second half of the fifth millennium and the beginning of the fourth; the latest examples date to c3500 BC. Given the absence of any dateable contextual information for the Martinsthorpe axehead, it is thus difficult to pin down a date for its manufacture, or to assess how old it was when it arrived in England, although it should be noted that its shape, with the long, narrow lateral facets, is closer to the examples found
in Brittany and the Paris Basin than to those found in Italy. It had clearly been re-ground to give it a more regular shape over the course of its lifetime of circulation.

To judge from what we can say about the other Alpine axeheads found in Britain and Ireland (Sheridan et al 2011; Sheridan & Pailler 2012), the most plausible interpretation for its appearance is that it had been brought over, as a treasured heirloom and probably a sacred possession, by immigrant farmers, coming from northern France between c4100 and c3800 BC (Sheridan 2010; Sheridan & Pailler 2012). By analogy with the example found beside the Sweet Track timber trackway in the Somerset Levels, and the broken and burnt fragment found in an early type of chamber tomb at Cairnholly 1 in the Stewartry of Kirkcudbright, southern Scotland, it may well have been deposited during the early fourth millennium, not very long after the arrival of the farmers; the Sweet Track was built in 3807/3806 BC and used for around a dozen years, so this brackets the date of the Alpine axehead deposition there very closely (Sheridan et al 2011; Sheridan & Pailler 2012).

The fact that the Martinsthorpe axehead fragment has been found as a stray find in the landscape, and not as a grave good or as part of a demonstrable Neolithic settlement (although this remains to be checked through fieldwalking), is characteristic of

Fig. 2. Distribution of Chelles-type axeheads as of July 2016; the Martinsthorpe fragment is shown as a star. Note that the dot to the SW of Martinsthorpe relates to the example from the McAlpine collection, for which a British provenance is not wholly secure (map: Projet JADE (Estelle Gauthier)).
finds of Alpine axeheads, both in Britain and elsewhere. These objects seem to have been placed at significant points in the landscape, as a way of returning them to the world of the gods and ancestors. Indeed, many – including the Sweet Track example – had been deposited in watery contexts. Some, as noted above, had been deliberately broken and/or burnt before deposition, and the fracture pattern on the Martinsthorpe example is consistent with the pattern of breakage seen elsewhere although, as noted above, more recent breakage cannot be ruled out. While the chips to the blade could conceivably have resulted from its use to chop wood, this axehead – like many other Alpine axeheads – would not have been a utilitarian, everyday axehead but instead a highly precious object, treasured by its many owners during its long and no doubt eventful journey from Mont Viso.

Finally, what of the other stone axeheads that have been found in Rutland? As noted by previous commentators (Cummins & Moore 1973; Moore 1979; Clough & Cummins 1988a), they are notable for their sparseness, with only seven recorded examples being listed by Cummins & Moore in 1973 – and indeed that list included one axe-hammer of probable post-Neolithic date. By 1988, seven axeheads and the axe-hammer had been examined petrologically; of these, five were found to be of volcanic tuff from Great Langdale in the Lake District (Group VI) (Clough & Cummins 1988b, 199). There have been few subsequent finds. Moore (1979) commented that the paucity of finds in Rutland is probably due to the high proportion of land kept under pasture, rather than to any sparseness of Neolithic activity in the county.
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Artefacts recorded with the Portable Antiquities Scheme in Rutland

WENDY SCOTT

The Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS) was created as a mechanism to record publicly found archaeological artefacts and as a pilot scheme to run alongside the then new Treasure Act 1996. This replaced the medieval law of Treasure Trove which had operated hitherto under the aegis of Coroners’ courts. The administration of the Treasure Act remains the responsibility of HM Coroners, who may still hold inquests into new finds, and is supported by a network of county Finds Liaison Officers (FLOs) who act as de facto Coroners’ Officers. After a successful trial in four counties, the PAS went nationwide in 2003, with the result that the scheme has now operated in Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland for thirteen years.

![Fig. 1. Medieval finger ring from Belton, Rutland (photo: Leicestershire County Council).](image)

FLOs are best placed to spot potential Treasure finds, and most Treasure cases are now routinely processed by us. We also compile most of the Treasure reports which are required to legally confirm an object’s age and composition, with the British Museum curators signing them off (for more information about the Treasure process, see [www.finds.org.uk/treasure](http://www.finds.org.uk/treasure)). A small team at the British Museum deals with Treasure administration and arranges valuations via the Treasure Valuation Committee. This is an independent group formed of archaeologists, antiquities dealers and detectorists, and ensures that valuations represent the current market value of the objects, which makes up the finder’s ‘reward’ where the outcome of a Treasure inquest is such that an award is made. Where an item found in Rutland is declared Treasure, the Rutland County Museum may have an opportunity to acquire it, as in the case of a medieval gold finger ring from Belton (LEIC-F14C55, fig. 1; RCM 2015.8).

Every find we record is added to our on-line database at [www.finds.org.uk/database](http://www.finds.org.uk/database), which now houses over 1.2 million object records. These are routinely used in academic research and also provide a useful source for finds identification for FLOs and finders alike. Each object has a unique reference number with letter prefixes based on the FLO who created them. These are noted here for some interesting finds from Rutland, and entering them into the search field on our website will take you directly to the appropriate records. In an attempt to protect data and to secure the co-operation of detecting organisations, findspots on the public website are restricted to a four-figure grid reference (equivalent to a 1km square). However, more detailed locations are available to researchers and we now routinely get very detailed locations from finders.

Because of the nature of the finds, largely made by metal detectorists, findspots are biased towards areas where landowners allow access. Nevertheless they can provide very useful data, and detecting has resulted in previously unknown sites being discovered. Rutland is not heavily detected, unlike neighbouring Lincolnshire, and only around 50 people have recorded finds from the county. The majority are local and largely belong to detecting societies based in Leicestershire, but some come from as far as Cumbria and Lancashire to search the area.

In total 1,831 objects in 1,313 records have been recorded from the county. A small number of these are records utilising illustrations of objects made by colleagues in the County Museums Service before the creation of the PAS, which were digitised as part of a student placement. In addition eight records of historical Roman coin hoards have been added by the ongoing Iron Age and Roman Coin Hoard project (IARCH prefix), based at the University of Leicester and the British Museum. Unusually objects from the medieval period are most common in Rutland with 440 records, with Roman artefacts, usually the most common by a large margin, only numbering 358.

The spread of artefacts is fairly even across the
county, but there is a distinct ‘hotspot’ in the Brooke area. This is not due to the presence of a major archaeological site, but to the determined searching and recovery of all artefact types by one independent detectorist. He has recovered a total of 544 objects from the county with 313 coming from his ‘permissions’ in the Brooke area.

Coins make up the largest object type recovered, with 471 individual finds. Here Roman coins are the most common, as would be expected, with 217 Medieval coins coming in second place with 130 and post-medieval third with 87. However this figure does not include a large post-medieval hoard from Leighfield found in 2007, LEIC-BDA7F1, which contains 239 silver coins dating from the reigns of Elizabeth I to James II. The find was made by the above-mentioned detectorist, and because of his thoroughness, noting the soil conditions, retrieving sherds of pottery including Staffordshire slipware and other debris, we have been able to establish that the hoard was buried beneath a rubbish midden deposited in a ditch. Originally we thought it was a Civil War hoard, but the presence of coins of James II means it was later than this and probably just a savings hoard, buried near the house of the owner, who for some reason failed to retrieve it.

Artefacts recorded from the county range in date from the Mesolithic, with 50 flint tools centred on the Brooke area, to the modern, such as LEIC-829955, a 5 centime coin dating to the reign of Napoleon III, minted in 1855.

Highlights include two Bronze Age sword fragments, LEIC-90D6B3, from Whissendine and LEIC-665EA1 from Brooke, useful additions to the published corpus of Bronze Age metalwork from the county (Clough 1979). A stunning Iron Age ‘La Tène’ brooch, LIN-Df44F5, was reportedly found in Rutland, but as it was reported by its owner after purchasing it, we only have the dealer’s word for this and it cannot be verified. We have also recorded a Roman silver finger ring from Belton, LEIC-53B787, and fragments of kiln bar from Leighfield, LEIC-56EBE4 and LEIC-B19972, have identified a previously unknown pottery production site.

Early medieval objects include an 11th century cloisonné enamelled brooch, LEIC-65A9C2 (fig. 2), and a 9th century silver strap end with fine Trewhiddle style animal decoration, LEIC-53D3E4, both from Belton. The latter was acquired by the Rutland County Museum and is illustrated in RR 34 (2014), 189 (fig. 1). A rare Scandinavian ‘Valkyrie’ brooch, LEIC-C58A13, was recorded by the Museums Service in 1994, and this has been added so it is available to researchers and the public alike; sadly we have no findspot for this. There are also a few other unusual objects dating from the Viking period, including a strap fitting, LEIC-5ACA6A, from Belton, of a type only otherwise recorded from East Anglia, dating from the 11th century. An openwork strap end of the same date, LEIC-B46A41, in the form of a distinct Urnes style beast and thus also indicating Scandinavian con-nections, was found in Ridlington (fig. 3). The presence of these items reminds us that although Rutland differs from surrounding counties in displaying an almost complete absence of Scandinavian place-names cultural objects are mobile and can potentially appear anywhere. It also helps to demonstrate the importance and effectiveness of the PAS in recording new finds which may have a bearing on our understanding of the past.
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I – Archaeological Fieldwork during 2015

Short reports, arranged in alphabetical order by parish

Note: Where appropriate, archives are expected to be deposited with Rutland County Museum under the accession number shown.

Ayton, Church of St. Mary the Virgin (SK 86030098)
Archaeological inspection and recording was carried out on behalf of Belfry Ltd at the Church of St Mary the Virgin by ULAS in three phases between October 2014 and May 2015 during restoration and drainage works on the church. As well as miscellaneous human bone fragments, the remains of 25 articulated skeletons were identified and recorded. Many of these were close to the existing church walls and a number of them had been truncated by its foundations. The original 12th century building was extended and modified in the following centuries and it seems likely that these burials are associated with the earlier, smaller church building. Finds of a few sherds of medieval pottery and a medieval buckle suggest a 12th–14th century date range for the burials. A number of grave stones were also recorded prior to their removal for health and safety reasons during the groundworks. RCM 2014.62.

Chater Valley, Rutland (SK 89000600, SK 89000100, SK 99990600, SK 99990100)
As part of a Masters in Archaeology programme at the University of Leicester a research project to identify if there was evidence that in the early medieval period the process of land colonisation in the Chater valley was influenced by a former lake was submitted. During the course of various fieldwork projects it became apparent that some of the settlements in the Chater valley have footpaths, trackways and ancient hedgerows which cease abruptly at around 85m above sea level, and decaying former river banks protrude at high elevations where water once reached. There are early medieval cemeteries which are located within geological anomalies at high elevations overlooking the valley, along with various isolated earthworks which have not been explained in context with the surrounding area. Place names are distinct and out of the ordinary for the area and cannot be accounted for in their normal toponymical context.

The research of the area to date has focused on using the landscape as it is today to interpret various features; it is suggested that if the emphasis of research is changed to a ‘fluidscape’ then there may be an alternative explanation of landscape colonisation in the medieval period.

Oakham, Oakham Castle, Cutts Close (SK 86200895)
Archaeological supervision and recording was undertaken by ULAS during the excavation of two inspection pits, one in Cutts Close, and the other within the bailey of Oakham Castle (SM 17018, List Entry No. 1010702) in November 2014. Both inspection pits fall within the Scheduled area for Oakham Castle. Within the bailey clear stratigraphy showed the build-up of several layers and in Cutts Close a small portion of the original inner bailey bank was exposed. RCM 2014.69.

Oakham, Oakham Castle (SK 86200895)
The first phase of a continuing series of archaeological interventions was undertaken by ULAS throughout November 2015 during restoration work at Oakham Castle. This initial work focused on the widening of the pathway around the W side of the Hall, the footprint of a new toilet block (partially under the footprint of the newly demolished boiler house) and a slot through the N rampart to evaluate the level of survival of the rampart wall, which had been recently cleared of foliage.

Following removal of flagstones from around the circuit of the current access path prior to its widening, evaluation slots were excavated at regular intervals to determine the nature of any archaeology present. The results mostly revealed topsoil and soil layers of made-up ground, consisting mainly of a yellowish brown silty clay with an abundance of ironstone. Medieval and post-medieval pottery was found throughout the slots. In the NW corner, where the path turned, a significant pile of Collyweston slate and ironstone was revealed lying like a rubble wall, which was cut through by a post-hole.

Excavation of the footprint for the new toilet block revealed different phases of surfaces and yard areas cut by two linear features in Y-shaped formation, probably part of a drainage system of unknown date.

Removal of earth build-up from the rampart wall revealed...
structural evidence of the castle curtain wall. The external face of the curtain wall survived fairly well with up to at least seventeen courses exposed and was constructed of roughly-hewn ironstone blocks of differing sizes and shapes, roughly coursed and earth bonded. The extant wall was approximately 1.80m wide but it is unknown whether this was the original width due to the internal face being re-faced with displaced stone and concrete, possibly as a blocking measure to prevent the core material from collapsing. The depth and extent of the wall is unknown. There is a curious gap or void in the lower SE courses in the wall section exposed, possibly deliberate for drainage or most likely from animal disturbance which has later been patched up with displaced stone.

A Time Team excavation at the castle in 2013 found sections of two walls (or different phases), possibly the remains of a solar block which once lay W of the Great Hall (Mepham & Good 2015). A second phase of work involved the extension of this trench eastwards in order to link the Time Team discoveries to the results of the latest project. Following removal of a large amount of rubble a small section of wall was discovered that was associated with the later structure discovered by Time Team which had been partially disturbed by a modern gas pipe. Different layers either side of this wall suggested that the wall was associated with a building rather than marking a boundary. Make-up layers for flooring were also discovered, further reflecting the results of the Time Team evaluation. RCM 2014.69.

Good, O, & Mepham, L, *Time Team’s investigations at Oakham Castle, RR 33 (2013), 131-4.*


Leon Hunt

Oakham, Uppingham Road (SK 860080)

ULAS completed archaeological investigations on land W of Uppingham Road in advance of development (first reported in *RR 33* (2013), 135.). The work revealed further Iron Age and Roman field systems, roundhouses, and more of a double pit alignment. RCM 2012.12.

Gavin Speed

Ridlington, land around Lees Barn (SK 845024)

An Upper Palaeolithic blade with a ‘faceted butt’, plus other heavily patinated blades probably of the same period, was identified by Lynden Cooper, ULAS, from nearly 450 struck flints found during a field-walking survey S of Ridlington village by the RLHRS Archaeological Team in November 2015. Five Roman pottery sherds, 9 early medieval and 21 late medieval pottery sherds were also found, pointing to this area being part of the common fields for the villagers and not within the Royal Forest. RLHRS Archaeological Team unpublished archive report R130.

Elaine Jones

Ridlington Park Farm (SK 831018)

The field-walking survey by the RLHRS Archaeological Team within the medieval park continued from the 2014 season (see *RR 35* (2015), 226). An Early Neolithic ‘laurel leaf’ and a leaf-shaped arrowhead were amongst 268 struck flints found on ‘Spot Close’ and ‘Home Close’. Flint from Brandon in Norfolk was identified by Mark Powers, scholar and doctoral research student, University College Dublin. It was thought that soil marks on a 1947 RAF aerial photograph might suggest a Neolithic long barrow rather than a previously recorded ring ditch.

Pottery was scarce and dated no earlier than the post-medieval earthenware (‘EAI’, c1500-c1750). The absence of any earlier medieval sherds points to the hunting park and Royal Forest precluding farming or settlement with any accompanying waste disposal on the land. RLHRS Archaeological Team unpublished archive report R128.

Elaine Jones

Ryhall, Ryhall Substation and Cable Route (TF 04711123)

Trent & Peak Archaeology undertook the excavation of 30 evaluation trenches on a 4 hectare electricity substation site for Jacobs UK/National Grid and identified a probable area of Bronze/Iron Age unenclosed settlement, with pottery rich features and worked flint.

Subsequently, Leicestershire CC requested that two areas (together just over a hectare in size) be excavated around trenches where key features had been identified. This revealed two areas of unenclosed Late Bronze Age settlement characterised by pit clusters (pottery rich) adjacent to ephemeral groups of post holes, but no ditched boundaries. A particularly interesting aspect of the site was the existence of a number of fire-pits or crude ovens where *in situ* burning apparently occurred, perhaps suggesting some specialised production function for this site.

Following positive trench evaluation results and a geoarchaeological assessment, two areas of strip, map and sample excavations were also carried out N of the sub-station on the 2km long cable route linking the new electricity sub-station to the soon-to-be-electrified East Coast mainline railway near the settlement of Essendine. This final phase of excavation produced the most significant results. To the S, on high land nearest the earlier sub-station excavations, further Late Bronze Age to Early Iron Age settlement remains in the form of scattered pits and occasional ditches were revealed. Dated by significant quantities of pottery, these features appear to represent the northern extent of a reasonably extensive area of unenclosed prehistoric occupation.

To the N, located between two palaeochannels, a total of 424 worked flints were recovered from two distinct scatters identified at the northern end of site. There was a remarkably low percentage of tools represented within the assemblage. Much of it comprised flint debitage, demon-strating low-quality knapping techniques, with frequent mis-hits, re-use of previously discarded pieces and few examples of typically earlier platform preparation or blade production, suggesting a later prehistoric (probably Bronze Age/Iron Age) date. However, the presence of occasional Mesolithic microliths (including an isosceles triangle, a truncated point and a probable piercing or boring tool) also indicates that we are actually looking at evidence for knapping in the wider area over a longer period of time, with worked flints transported from point of manufacture to their present finds spots via natural processes, as opposed to scatters that represent discrete *in situ* knapping events.

Gareth Davies

Winwell, 17-20 Main Street (TF 00560635)

A trial trench evaluation commissioned by Hereward Homes was undertaken by WA in order to provide information on the archaeological impact of proposed development at the site, which lies within the historic core of the village, immediately E of the medieval parish church of All Saints. Earthworks of probable medieval date lie to the S of the site and medieval...
deposits were identified to the N during archaeological monitoring of another development. The earliest deposits identified during the evaluation consisted of pits containing pottery dating to the 15th and 16th centuries. Stone rubble within the pit fills may represent builders waste or the residues of stone robbing elsewhere in the area.

Dale Trimble

Uppingham, Leicester Road (SK 85770008)
An evaluation by MOLA Northampton recorded a pit alignment and a ditch dating to the middle to late Iron Age, remnant furrows of medieval ridge and furrow cultivation, and a post-medieval to modern field boundary ditch. RCM 2015.11.

Gemma Hewitt

II – Historic Building Recording during 2014

Lyddington Manor Project

Buildings in the villages of Caldecott, Lyddington, Thorpe by Water and Stoke Dry have been investigated as part of Lyddington Manor History Society’s ‘Historic Buildings and People of a Rutland Manor’ project funded by the Heritage Lottery Fund (www.hlf.org.uk), including dendrochronology by Nottingham Tree-ring Dating Laboratory. The number of buildings surveyed to date in the four villages (including brief surveys, not reported here) now stands at 71.

Nick Hill & Robert Owens

Lyddington, Barn in Little Park (SP 870880)
This stone barn is located around 50m NE of the Bede House, within the precinct of the former Bishop’s Palace. Tree-ring dating has shown that it was constructed in 1726-51, probably for the use of a local tenant farmer, Thomas Pretty, who leased it from the Burghley Estate. The barn is well built with four bays and a roof of Collyweston slate. A lease of 1757 refers to it as the ‘slate barn’, indicating that it was always roofed in Collyweston, not thatched like most farm buildings of the period.

The principal interest of the barn, however, lies in the timbers of its roof structure, re-used from a much earlier building. These timbers originally formed a major aisled barn, of which several aisle posts, as well as various rafters, survive. Tree-ring dating indicates that this building was constructed in 1347-72, presumably as part of the palace of the Bishops of Lincoln. The original barn would have been a very large, multi-bay structure, no doubt forming the principal farm building of the palace precinct. It is unclear whether the original walls were built of stone (like most local medieval buildings) or of timber. Although a number of barns of this type and date survive nationally, no other examples are known in Rutland or Leicestershire.

Lyddington, 2 Church Lane (SP 875969)
This is a small house of two-roomed plan built (as shown by tree-ring dating) in c1773. It is of neat, double-fronted symmetrical form, with a central doorway and staircase. The main front is a very sophisticated design of fine quality ashlar stone, and may have been built as a showpiece for the local quarry-master. The house contained a kitchen, a parlour and two bedrooms, one of them heated. It retains its original main roof structure of A-frame oak trusses. To the rear there is a moulded ironstone doorway of late 17th century date, which was probably re-used from an earlier house on the same plot. In the mid-19th century the house was occupied by William Clarke, who had a mason’s shop in one of the outbuildings.

Lyddington, Marquess of Exeter, 52 Main Street (SP 874974)
A fine example of a three-room, cross-passage plan form, dating from the first half of the 17th century. The central room, with a large inglenook fireplace, was the hall, its hearth backing onto the cross-passage. Beyond the hall was the parlour, originally without a fireplace. On the other side of the passage was a service room, probably for brewing or baking use, rather than the main kitchen. The quality of construction is quite high, with good-sized ironstone blocks, a fine four-centred arch front doorway, and lofty arch-braced roof trusses. A rear wing was added in the later 17th century for additional service space. Despite a fire in 1994, the fine oak first floor structures survive largely intact, as do the three main roof trusses, though charred; the rest of the roof has been replaced.

Lyddington, Stoneville Farm Barn, 62 Main Street (SP 874974)
This fine barn, tree-ring dated to 1660-65, is an excep-tional survival in the area. The original barn probably had four bays, of which the two south bays survive, with parts of the main doorway in the third bay. The walls were of high quality masonry, with finely detailed buttresses to either side of the front and rear doors. The roof has A-frame trusses of rather arcaic appearance, with curved arch-braces to the double collars. In the listing description of 1985, the barn is described as late 15th to early 16th century, but close study of the fabric, combined with tree-ring dating, proves that it is in fact of much later date. The barn is set back from the road and had a farm-yard in front. At one side of the farmyard there seem to have been two small cottages from the mid-17th century onwards, so the main farmhouse of the barn’s owner must have been elsewhere. The barn was converted into a house in the later 20th century, with the loss of the northern end.

Lyddington, The Lilacs, 101 Main Street (SP 873975)
This good quality, double-fronted house has previously been thought to date from the mid to late 18th century, but documentary evidence and tree-ring dating indicate that it dates principally from c1814. An ‘ancient Messuage House’ was taken down by Robert Clarke, a stone mason of Lyddington, soon after he took over the copyhold ownership in 1814. Robert retained only the N gable wall of the earlier house, though the new house seems to have been constructed on the same footprint. The new house has a well-developed plan form, with parlour and kitchen set either side of a staircase entry hall. Many features of the early 19th century house survive, including the front door, some sash windows, a fine staircase and a transitional roof structure (incorporating re-used timbers dated to 1727-39, from the earlier house). The fine masonry of the front elevation is presumably Robert Clarke’s own work, with details of rather old-fashioned design. Robert also replaced the walling to the front garden, where the ashlar stonework with ramped copings formed a more up-to-date feature.

Lyddington, 6 & 7 The Green (SP 875797)
These two properties form an L-shaped range, which probably originated as two separate houses in the 17th century, though it seems to have been occupied as a single unit from the late 18th
century. No 6 was originally a good quality house of two-room, lobby-entry plan form, dating from c1620-60. It still preserves good stone mullion win-dows and a fine doorway, but the upper part of the front gable, a fine stone dormer and the original chimneystack were lost during the 1950s, when the present hipped roof was fitted. An exceptional survival is the original oak-boarded front door, of unique central-folding design. Inside, the parlour has a fine stone moulded fireplace and the hall retains evidence of its inglenook. The A-frame roof structure is a replacement, tree-ring dated to 1755. No 7 has a few traces of earlier fabric, but was much altered in the 18th century, becoming a double-fronted two-room house.

Thorpe by Water, Rosebery Cottage, 2 Main Street (SP 893965)
A good example of a two-room house, principally built in 1654 for John Manton who paid tax for two hearths here in 1665. The construction date is given by a date-stone, and confirmed by tree-ring dating. A very thick front wall and the line of an earlier S gable indicate that there was an earlier stone house, probably of c1600, on the same foot-print. The re-faced front wall has two good stone mullioned windows of 1654, and there was probably another to the rear, before alterations. To the S side was a kitchen, with a large inglenook fireplace and a bake oven which protrudes externally (an unusual feature for the area). An original finely carved oak spice cupboard door survives to the inglenook. The S gable retains its original chimneystack, though the original parlour fireplace and stack to the north gable have been lost. Despite much alteration in 1984, the interior preserves the main first-floor spine beams and key parts of the roof structure, with A-frame trusses.

Other historic building surveys undertaken in 2015

South Luffenham, Durham Ox (SK 93380195)
A measured survey and documentary research was carried out by HI at The Durham Ox in South Luffenham. The project revealed that (pace Clough & Ovens 2015, 224) the building began as a thatched open medieval hall that had been extensively remodelled internally with some external walls being rebuilt, probably due to weakness in the structure. The earliest date of the building is likely to be early 15th century, based on the regional similarity of the cruck frame to comparable buildings locally. The property has been recorded under various names as an inn from the 18th century; it was also where the manorial court was held before being used solely as a domestic dwelling from 1967.


Carole Bancroft-Turner & Debbie Frearson

III – Other Reports for 2014

Note: Records under 100 years old containing personal information may be subject to access restrictions.

Please contact the appropriate Record Office for further information or advice on specific items or collections.

Lincolnshire Archives
Lincolnshire Archives, St Rumbold Street, Lincoln, LN2 5AB.
Tel: (01522) 782040. Fax: (01522) 530047.
Website: www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/archives.
E-mail: lincolnshire.archives@lincolnshire.gov.uk.
Please check opening hours and search room reader ticket and booking systems before making a journey.

Northamptonshire Record Office
Northamptonshire Record Office, Wootton Hall Park, Northampton, NN4 8BQ.
Tel: (01604) 362513.
Website: www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/heritage.
E-mail: archivist@northamptonshire.gov.uk.

No new Rutland-related material was acquired by Lincolnshire Archives during 2015.

No report received for 2015-16.

Record Office for Leicestershire, Leicester & Rutland
Record Office for Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland, Long Street, Wigston Magna LE18 2AH.
Tel: (0116) 257 1080. Fax: (0116) 257 1120.
Website: www.leics.gov.uk/recordoffice.

Record Office use is changing. We now reach over two million users per annum in a wider variety of ways. Although numbers of visitors to the searchroom are falling, as online resources grow and more items are added to the online catalogue, we are reaching a global audience in ways archivists of the past could only dream of. Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland parish registers, wills and electoral rolls are expected to become available online in 2017 and users of Facebook and Twitter receive regular ‘fixes’ from the archive. Over eighteen thousand people followed our May live, ‘real-time’ twitter feed on the local aspect of the Battle of Jutland.

In 2015-16 the number of visitors researching Rutland subjects was 968, some 14% of the total, and 1,433 Rutland documents were produced to researchers, some 8% of the total. Written, email and telephone enquiries relating to Rutland numbered 622, again 8% of the total. Five Rutland
communities and 148 individuals were contacted via the Record Office’s community work, with many others reached via traditional and social media.

There were eleven deposits of Rutland material during the year. These followed the usual pattern in being varied in origin, quantity and subject matter. Life in the county was well represented with material from estates and trade, churches and clubs and societies. Most were catalogued almost on arrival and the resulting lists may be consulted on the online catalogue. Conservation took place on 34 Rutland items, and 1,018 Rutland entries were added to the online catalogue.

An exhibition and a number of special events were organised to commemorate the anniversaries of Magna Carta, Agincourt, Sheriffmuir and Waterloo, not to mention significant engagements in 1915 during the First World War and the centenary of the Easter Rising in Dublin.

We are delighted to report that the service was shortlisted for the Archives and Records Association Record-keeping Service of the Year award, in our case for outstanding outreach events and activities.

Jenny Moran & Robin P. Jenkins, Senior Archivists

Rutland Accessions 2015

DE8935: Deeds to property in North Luffenham, 1884.
DE8951: Architectural drawings for the re-ordering of the chancel at Ayston parish church, 1936.
DE8959: Thesis on the church monuments at Exton.
DE8986: Local photographs (topographical).
DE8992: Records of R. Clark, builder, of Lyddington.
DE9091: Leicestershire & Rutland Royal British Legion records.
DE9118: Uppingham charity records.
DE9119: Ryhall, Ketton and Collyweston Rural Sanitary Authority records.
DE9122: Stocken Hall Estate accounts (purchase).

Belton History Society

Website: beltoninrutland.co.uk

The Society currently has 22 members and regularly meets at various venues and members’ homes within the village. During the past year we made two very enjoyable trips, an evening cruise on the river Nene to visit the site of Fotheringhay castle, and to the Spalding Gentleman’s Society.

Perhaps the highlight of the year was the publication of the Society’s Journal no 6 which contained articles on a wide variety of subjects. The latter included open fields, archaeology, village inns, the Great Air Race, Lambley Lodge, more information about how war affected Belton in the 20th century together with many other pieces about village life in the past. Various subjects are currently being researched with a view to publishing articles in a future journal.

Numerous documents relating to the history of Belton have been photographed and transcribed. All available census returns have been completed and checked but work continues on the parish registers, wills, probate inventories and many other relevant records. Transcribed documents will eventually be made available online.

The Society has dug several archaeological test pits around the village and these together with a larger excavation created considerable general interest as well as yielding some interesting finds.

Ian Broughton, Chairman

Contact: secretary@beltonhistorysociety.org.uk

Langham Village History Group

Website & contact: www.langhaminrutland.org.uk

The year began on a sad note with the death of our oldest member, Bill Nourish. Bill’s memories of his Langham childhood during the 1920s and 30s were both useful and amusing. His anecdotes featured in two of our booklets and in the Langham News, and he had an extensive knowledge of Rutland farming practices over eight decades.

 Whilst continuing to research our village from 1750 to 1850, including transcription of more parish records and other documents, members have looked into such subjects as the history of Langham Lodge, families of note with Langham connections, and Langham’s mills and millers.

Several members were involved in providing information to the Langham Neighbourhood Plan Group, including an article on the village’s past for inclusion in the final document.

We were able to fulfil a request from the Imperial War Museum at Duxford for information about American aircrew stationed at RAF Cottesmore during WWII which was uploaded on to the American Air Museum website.

Our own website has continued to bring in queries (and compliments) from across the world. A request for information from a campanologist and former Rutland resident resulted in the name of one of Langham’s fallen of WWI, John Thomas Casterton, being added to the memorial in St Paul’s Cathedral honouring campanologists lost in the conflict.

Our one speaker of the year was Ray Hill of Burley on the Hill with his WWI presentation. The memorial table in Langham church, to which we add a remembrance card on the anniversary of each man’s death, has generated interest in the village and beyond.

The undoubted highlight of the year was a visit to Westminster Abbey to honour Simon de Langham, born here in 1310 when much of the village was owned by the Abbey. Simon left his native village and became monk, Prior and Abbot of Westminster Abbey where he was responsible for much of the early re-building. He rose to further prominence, becoming Bishop of Ely and Chan-cellor of All England, Archbishop of Canterbury and finally a Cardinal at Avignon. He died in 1376 and though originally buried in Avignon his body was returned to Westminster in 1379.

Our visit comprised a tour of the Abbey and its library followed by tea with the Dean, Dr John Hall, in his drawing room. Having told us more of the Abbey’s history and plans for its future development, the Dean accompanied us to Simon’s tomb in St Benedict’s Chapel for a short act of commemoration. The day ended with Evensong and the privilege of being seated in the ‘quire’.

Brenda Tew, a former Langham resident and honorary member of the History Group, spent many years research-ing the life of Simon de Langham but ill health prevented her from accompanying us. It is our hope to have a cele-bration of Simon’s life here in Langham at some future date.

Having been invited to stage an exhibition at Rutland County Museum in 2016, as part of the Lord Lieutenant’s Commemoration of WWI, we began our researches, as the year ended, into ‘Life in Langham 1914-1919’.

Gill Frisby
Lyddington Manor History Society
Website: www.lyddingtonhistory.org.uk

This is the last time I shall be reporting on our progress on two fronts, that of the Society and that of the Heritage Lottery Fund sponsored project ‘Historic Buildings and People of a Rutland Manor’. The project was successfully completed on 30th November 2015. Seven hundred and fifty copies of our book entitled Buildings and People of a Rutland Manor were printed in January, and the book was launched on 27th February. The launch was opened by Andrew Brown as High Sheriff of Rutland, and Dr Chris Thornton, mentor of the project, then outlined the contributions of the five authors and the work that had been undertaken by society members. David Stocker, representing the Heritage Lottery Fund, and Jon Culverhouse, representing the Burghley House Preservation Trust, both spoke of their delight at being able to help us in our successful completion of such a major contribution to local history in Rutland. Reviews and comments received so far have been overwhelmingly favourable.

The grant from the Heritage Lottery Fund enabled us to provide a guided walk round the village. Our archive of scans of the documents at Burghley House is now available to the general public in compressed PDF format via our website. Four of these have also requested a guided walk round the village. Our collection of ephemera, social history collection and textile collections. Work continues with volunteers from the Oakham Decorative & Fine Art Society with re-enactments, plays, or readings.

The book ended with a few suggestions for future investigations and I know some of you are keen to use our archive in their research. Further access to the archive at Burghley House for historical research is possible if people are prepared to help scan additional documents. I have received numerous enquiries from people wanting to trace their families, and there may be sufficient interest to form a group willing to put such information together. There is much to think about, and it will need a strong team of people to make things happen. In particular we need some replacement committee members. I encourage you to get involved, make suggestions and help plan the future of our Society.

To conclude, the Committee joins me in thanking everyone who has helped to make the project a success. It has been a great privilege to serve as Chairman of this Society for the past six years.

R M Canadine

Contact: info@lyddingtonhistory.org.uk

members of the public may order copies of them.

Membership of the Society has increased slightly this year, and now stands at a healthy 73 as opposed to 67 at the end of last year. We have been pleased to welcome a total of 15 new members, several of whom are residents of the Manor, balancing out the loss of 9 who did not renew. Our meetings continue to cover a very wide range and I am very grateful to the many busy people who have given of their time to inform, educate and entertain us.

The big question now is, ‘What do we do next?’ There are many options, one of which is to join with Dr Thornton in publishing the history of the Bede House and the medieval history of the Manor. This could help in preparing a new guide book for the Bede House. Changes at English Heritage are heralding a change in perspective and a wish to involve more local people. I understand that proposals are to be put forward for the founding of a group to support the Bede House. Activities envisaged include guiding visitors, preparing displays and organising local events, eg re-enactments, plays, or readings.

The Exton Gun is also now on display after some conservation has been carried out to stabilise the main carriage.

Collections
Work continues with volunteers from the Oakham Decorative & Fine Art Society with re-packaging and cataloguing the ephemera, social history collection and textile collections.

A small team of volunteers, interns from Lincoln Conservation Unit and Museum staff have all spent many hours recording, cleaning and photographing the collection of Horseshoes from Oakham Castle. The Poultry Hall was closed
to the public to allow this work to be carried out. The horseshoes are now back at the Castle and all information gathered will be added to a database system.

**Acquisitions**

Notable acquisitions to the Museum have been:

- Patchwork bedspread dating from 1850s made by ‘Grandmother Sharpe of Ridlington’ (2015.19).
- Leicestershire Yeomanry cross belt. The belt relates to a full regimental uniform we already had in the collection, which had been worn by three generations of the Kimball family. Also a Leicestershire Yeomanry spur (2015.14-1-2).
- Early Medieval gold finger ring with garnet gemstone: a Treasure item whose purchase was kindly funded by the Friends of the Museum (2015.8). See above, p277, fig. 1.

**Education and Learning**

Due to major upheaval over the autumn period with the installation of a new boiler and heating system for the museum, visitor numbers for school groups is down on last year’s. The museum however still welcomed over 1,000 pupils and their teachers for school sessions.

The family holiday workshops remain popular, with a total of 1,787 participants during the year.

The Museum successfully obtained funding from Arts Council England for a programme of paid museum internships in 2015. This allowed us to offer three one-year internships (at 27 hours per week), two based at Rutland County Museum, with occasional work at Rocks by Rail, the living ironstone museum at Cottesmore, the third at Mansfield Museum.

The intern started work in October 2015, and have since been working on various educational programmes, exhibitions and collections work. They are receiving mentoring, training and support to help further their heritage careers.

**Oakham Castle**

The first major stage of the Restoration Project concluded on Bank Holiday Monday 30th May 2016, with the Grand Re-Opening of the Great Hall of Oakham Castle, accompanied by the presentation of a horseshoe by the 6th Earl of Gainsborough. Over 5,000 members of the public thronged the Castle grounds, and enjoyed a day of Norman re-enactments, including coin striking, falconry, archery and weaving. Knights on horseback paraded through the town, and guided tours of the site enabled visitors to unlock some of the Castle’s secrets.

The Castle had been closed to members of the public since September 2015 to undergo extensive restoration work, made possible thanks to a £2.16m grant from the Heritage Lottery Fund.

As well as the careful restoration of the Great Hall and its collection of 230 commemorative horseshoes, the works have revealed Oakham Castle’s original defensive wall for the first time in decades, with large sections now clearly visible from Cutts Close and Burley Road. Work is continuing on the consolidation and repair of the walls, and is likely to last until at least September 2016.

A new path and timber stairway has been constructed to give direct access to the castle from Burley Road car park, while a viewing platform has been created on top of the Motte to provide a perfect vantage point over the town and castle grounds. These areas will be opened once the construction works have ended.

Throughout the project, work has been supervised by the University of Leicester Archaeological Service. The plans for community archaeology in the coming three years are approaching fruition, with receipt of the necessary Scheduled Monument Consent imminent. The opportunity to be part of the team exploring the history of the site is expected to be very popular.

**Visitor Figures**

From April 2014 to March 2015 Oakham Castle received 11,714 visitors (despite being closed from September 2015) while the Museum welcomed 20,087 visitors (2014-15: 18,502) and 960 pupils attended for educational sessions.

**Rutland County Libraries Local Studies Service**

Rutland Library Service continues to offer a Local Studies Collection and children’s local studies collection at all branch libraries and Rutland County Museum. The service experiences a steady demand in terms of local studies & family history enquiries from within the UK and abroad. We continue to experience difficulty in receiving notification of new publications from local authors where they exist. We purchased 18 separate titles this year. Local Studies Volunteering continues to be strong, with volunteers involved in background research for the Castle Project.

**Partnership work with the Record Office for Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland**

The Service continues to work closely with the Record Office particularly with the scanning of Rutland newspapers.

Robert Clayton
chapels of Rutland took place on Saturday 12th September 2015. The event raised £22,426, which is the highest total we have ever achieved. It represents some £0.46 donation from every resident in Rutland, and is a very remarkable result. Half of this sum was returned to the individual Rutland churches nominated by the participants and half was added to RH cpt Funds for the future support of all Rutland Churches. A three-man team of cyclists, Ben Findlay, Geoff Beatham and Ryan Henry, visited 58 churches on the day and were presented with the Davenport-Handley Cup. Jamie Bennett visited 56 churches and John Williams of Manton walked to 19. All were congratulated by Dr Laurence Howard, Lord Lieutenant of Rutland, in his capacity as President of RH cpt, at a presentation ceremony at Barnsdale Lodge Hotel in February 2016.

During the past financial year the Trust has awarded grants totalling £38,000 to Morcott, Exton, Oakham Quaker Meeting House, Lyddington, Caldecott and Ashwell. We are pleased to learn that Wardley Church was vested with The Churches Conservation Trust in April 2016 and conservation work is expected to follow in due course. Ayston Church was vested with the CTC a few years ago and has now undergone an extensive conservation programme, the completion of which was celebrated in a launch in May 2015. This church is now open to the public. Our Trust is very grateful for the work of the Churches Conservation Trust in our county.

We have to report, with much sadness, the death in December 2015 of Sir Clifford Boulton, a former Chairman of our Trust. Sir Clifford served as Chairman from 2004 until his retirement in 2012 and he is warmly remembered for his devoted and kindly leadership of the Trust. The Trust funds grew significantly during Sir Clifford’s tenure, mainly due to the legacy granted by the Estate of Kenneth Alan Scott, and in response to this development Sir Clifford inaugurated the Finance Sub-Committee to focus their attention on the management of our funds. Sir Clifford’s family donated the collection at his funeral to our Trust funds, for which we are most grateful.

As and when their Church Quinquennial Reports are issued we are encouraging the parochial church councils to contact us for financial help, if they need it, so that they may complete the recommended work promptly, thus avoiding any unnecessary deterioration to their church fabric.

The Trustees wish to take this opportunity of thanking all of our supporters, sponsors and donors for all their contributions during the past year. During the coming year, as in the past, we confidently look forward to receiving the continuing favour of our benefactors, and to providing all necessary support to our beautiful Rutland churches.

Clifford Bacon, Honorary Secretary

Rutland history and archaeology in 2015

Rutland County Museum, Catmose Street, Oakham, Rutland, LE15 6HW.

This is my second year in the Chair, and I am again grateful for the expert efforts of the Executive Committee in ensuring the smooth running of the Society. The main aim of the society is ‘the advancement of the education of the public in all aspects of the history of the ancient county of Rutland and its immediate area’. Our Constitution outlines key areas of engagement to further this aim and my report focuses on our fulfilment of this in 2015-16.

We actively encourage the preservation of all types of local records, antiquities and objects of historical interest. The presence on the committee of Rutland County Council’s Head of Culture Robert Clayton helps to ensure the safe custody of these when they come to our notice, through this direct line of communication.

Our remit to promote research and publish the results has been achieved through the publication of Rutland Record 35 with articles on Preston Manor House; A Witch Bottle from Exton; Population Trends in Rutland, 1851-1911; A note on some of Rutland’s lost public houses; and Rutland History and Archaeology in 2014. In addition we have produced our Honorary Editor Tim Clough’s Occasional Publication 12: Oakham Lordshold in 1787, a project which started after a crumpled docu-ment found in a cupboard at Burley on the Hill turned out to be a very fine map of the manor of Oakham Lordshold, drawn by William Cullingworth in 1787. We also published a Newsletter, edited by Robert Ovens; this provides a means of engaging members and the public with short research projects, book reviews and other information not included in the Rutland Record.

The Society recently represented a number of national and local interested parties in approaching the owners of the Noel archive to ask that an embargo on copying be relaxed to enable researchers more flexibility in working with the archive.

To encourage the local availability of historical resources our web presence is ever increasing, managed by Mike Frisby.

Website: www.rutlandhistory.org.
Email: enquiries@rutlandhistory.org.

This year alone we have had ten new releases of documentation and extra links to local history groups such as Cottermore History and Archaeology Group and Market Overton to name but two.

We are continuing to reduce the Society’s excess publication stock under the management of Paul Reeve, and we have introduced a selection for sale at our lectures. There have been price reductions on earlier printed works, and where Rutland Record and other publications are out of print these are being made freely available on our website. Committee members are also focusing on clearing the Society’s office to ensure our considerable records can be made more convenient for research by both the public and members.

The work of our volunteers is targeted at reaching both the academic and non-academic with our public lectures, meetings and events organised by myself, Carole Bancroft-Turner and Robert Ovens. We have been diverse in our timescales and topics from the prehistoric to the Boer War; all of our lectures are extremely well attended and receive publicity through a variety of media. We also attended events such as the John Clare Society’s open day at Helpston, in order to sell our literature and promote membership. In April our Bryan Matthews lecture was given by Twigs Way on Lancelot Brown, the timing of which could not have been more convenient with the tercentenary of his birth.

Our active archaeology team ensure that we are surveying Rutland, field by field, under the aegis of Elaine Jones. This season the fields of Ridlington have enhanced our knowledge of the area, with particular reference to prehistoric activity.

We are encouraging the preservation and conservation of buildings by co-ordinating our George Phillips and Tony Traylen awards; it is a pity there were not enough applicants for awards to be made for 2015-16, but this is a minor issue and we hope to resume this prestigious event in 2016-17.

The Society monitors Rutland planning applications, and
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where appropriate we advise and assist the authorities within our resources to ensure that the preservation and conservation of buildings and the landscape is to the best standard available; Elizabeth Bryan’s past experience as the Buildings and Conservation officer at RCC has proved invaluable in this realm. We made representations to the Forestry Commission on behalf of members who were concerned that Clipsham Yew Hedge had been partially destroyed and was lacking maintenance; by entering into a dialogue we can ensure that we monitor progress.

Committee members not directly mentioned above who also provide a valuable service to the Society are; Audrey Buxton, David Carlin, Hilary Crowden, Michael Himman, Jill Kimber, Ian Ryder and Lin Ryder.

I think it is fair to say we are one of the most active and public engaging societies in the region, and although it may seem to be labouring the point, this can only be achieved through the professionalism and commitment of the volunteers on the Committee.

Debbie Frearson, Chairman

Website

Greater use of Information Technology continues to help the Society be more effective in its administration and finances. Its new membership data management system, configured with help from the Treasurer, is ensuring timely collection of subscriptions. Members agreeing to allow use of their email addresses will allow Society newsletters to be sent electronically, saving considerably on printing and postage costs. This may also provide the opportunity for more regular updates and reminders of presentations and other events.

People looking to join the Society are now able to do this online, and we have enabled members to pay their annual subscription online using a credit or debit card via www.genfair.co.uk.

The Society’s web site continues to be a heavily used resource, accessed by our membership, worldwide education establishments, and many hundreds of individuals each week.

Uppingham Local History Study Group

Website & contact: www.uppinghamhistory.org.uk.

Meetings are held on the first Monday of the month at Taylor House common room in Johnson Road, Uppingham. Dr Vivian Anthony continues to lead the group and organises a varied programme of speakers. Visitors are always welcome.

In February 2015 our speaker was Valerie Hughes on Uppingham in the 18th century – Valerie’s final meeting before her move to Shropshire. The group will miss her thorough research and work on the website. At the beginning of the 18th century Uppingham was a thriving market town. The enclosure of common grazing and arable land under 1770 and 1799 Enclosure Acts changed the balance in favour of larger land owners. The tenant farms were within the town boundary, but through the century new prosperity and mortgage led to new building with impressive Georgian frontages we still see on the High Street today. Workers were drawn towards cities as agricultural practices changed. The canal system, and much later the railway, helped to strengthen Oakham’s position in the county. The development of the turnpike road system was beneficial to Uppingham: the north/south turnpike road from Nottingham to Kettering via Oakham and Preston was established in 1753/4 but it by-passed Lyddington, running directly to Caldecott and Rockingham. In 1754 a turnpike trust was set up to manage a road from Leicester to Peterborough, via Uppingham and Wansford.

The Research and Local Resources section continues to receive additional items, and transcription drafts for all of the Rutland towns and villages in the E A Irons collection at the University of Leicester are nearly complete. This resource provides a wealth of information from the 13th century and our online search routine includes data from all of the files, providing a very powerful tool for linking together family names, property and misdemeanours. The papers contain many amusing incidents, although no doubt at the time they probably were not so regarded. The website now also has nearly thirty detailed local history book reviews as well as many back issues of the Society’s Newsletters and some out of print numbers of Rutland Record.

To help other local history societies in Rutland and its surrounding counties we have started to offer help with web hosting or to allocate specific pages for them on our main site, such as http://www.uppinghamhistory.org.uk or http://www.rutlandhistory.org/cottesmore-home.htm. We are also trialling a search routine which searches all the files on our site and the Uppingham and Langham sites, http://www.langhaminrutland.org.uk/search.htm; it is remarkably fast, returning links to everything that matches your request – you might be surprised at what it turns up. When testing is complete, we will ensure that the search routine is directly available from a navigation button on the Society’s site. In the future, we may be able to include other local history sites in this dedicated search routine.

Mike Frisby, Webmaster

Acknowledgements
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Elaine Jones
worshipped and married still stands, but the church in Odessa
where John’s father Igor was christened was flattened during
the war. During WW1 Norman helped two Flying Corps
airmen who wrote books about their time in the Ukraine: 
Eastern Nights and Flights by Alan Bott MC, and Guests of
the Unspeakable by T W White DFC. In 1919 Bolsheviks
moved into Odessa and the young family had 24 hours to
leave. Their money was worthless but their silver icons were
priceless. They returned to England and Elena never saw her
Ukrainian family again. Norman’s son Igor went to war in
1939 as a commando and instructed Poles at Audley End in
Essex. He interrogated POWs in Italy and Austria and later
married Ann.

In May Mike Frisby of Langham Village History Group
gave us a potted history of the village from the 11th century
when Edward the Confessor gave Langham to Westminster
Abbeu. Langham is not mentioned in Domesday Book (1086).
In the 12th century Henry I gave Langham to the Earls of
Warwick, and the Ferrers became subtenants. In the 13th
century (1204) King John gave Langham to Isobel de Ferrers.
In 1221 Henry III received fees for a market in Langham.
Langham Church, the third biggest church in Rutland, was
built at this time. In 1600 Sir Andrew Noel purchased
Langham from Thomas Cromwell. A school is mentioned in
1640 and the Old Hall and Manor were built in the 1650s with
wealth from sheep. Langham expanded with the coming of the
railway to Oakham in 1848 and the arrival of the hunting
fraternity. In 1843 the Rev Heneage Finch set up the National
School and 1854 saw the building of the Baptist Church.

Nick Hill from Historic England spoke to us in June about
the history of Browne’s Hospital in Stamford. Nick and Alan
Rogers have written a book on the subject, and we followed
the lecture with a tour in August led by Alan. William Browne
was a wealthy wool merchant who built the accommodation
for ten poor men and two women. William, born in 1410
in Stamford, served as Alderman six times and was Mayor in
the 1470s. He died in 1489. His brother-in-law completed the
hospital in the 1490s. The building has changed very little on
the outside and beautiful stained glass windows survive to this
data. It contained a chapel and dormitory beds in cubicles on
the ground floor, and these became a meeting room in the 19th
century. Beautiful carving can still be seen in the chapel. In
1858 the Almshouses replaced the dormitories and are still in
use today. Nick also described the Little Crooked House in
Hopes Yard, Uppingham (see Rutland Record 30 (2010), 415),
and concluded his talk with photos and floor plans of Tudor
House, 8 High St West (RR 31 (2011), 42).

Brian Palmer spoke about the Hotchkin dynasty in July,
explaining his quest, following the discovery of documents in
the attic of Tixover Hall, to find out how the Hotchkin family
had acquired their considerable wealth in the 18th century. A
full account is given in Rutland Record 28 (2008), 304-15.

In September Hugo Speigl, Vice-Chairman of the
Stamford Mercury Archive Trust, spoke about the archives of
the Stamford Mercury. His publishing business produced
Vivian’s new book on the History of Uppingham to 1800,
which was successfully launched later in September. The
Stamford Mercury holds the record for the longest
continuously published newspaper. Started in 1690 as the
Stamford Post, it cost 1d every Thursday for the single sheet.
In 1712 it was reborn as the Stamford Mercury. During the early
years much news came from London. The paper is
owned by the Johnston Press today. The archive exists from
1714 to the present and contains other local newspapers. A
grant from the Heritage Lottery Fund in 2005 was used to
conserve the contents of the archive with digital microfilm
readers providing access for visitors’ research. The editorial is
now run from Peterborough and the archive is housed in
Cherry Holt Road.

Nigel Webb, speaking about Sarah Ogden’s diary (1842–
1851) in October, said a copy of the text can be found on the
Rutland Local History & Record Society’s website, under
local research & resources. Peter Lane has researched the
places where Sarah and her husband lived during their time in
Uppingham from 1843-48. In 1842 Sarah married a Leicester
banker and her diary from this time paints a vivid picture of
her social life during her married years. Benjamin Cort Ogden
married his first cousin Sarah Cort and lived in Rutland St in
Leicester; Benjamin worked in a bank in Gallowtreegate.
Their honeymoon was spent in London and thanks to the
coming of the railways they travelled to Hastings and
Tunbridge Wells. Benjamin’s bank collapsed in 1843 with
£540,000 of debts, so he was fortunate to become manager of
the Stamford, Spalding & Boston Bank in Uppingham where
he remained for 10 years. Their good friends included Hopes
the Chemists. Benjamin opened a new branch of the bank in
Grantham and moved there in 1848. Benjamin died in 1880
and Sarah in 1895 aged 77.

In November David Forbes spoke on the history of
Uppingham shops: ‘Butchers, Bakers, Boot & Shoe Makers’.
David has studied the period from 1890 to1940, when most of
the shops were family businesses. The advent of the bicycle,
tarmac roads and phones helped people to travel further to
surrounding villages. In 1907 26 people had a phone and by
1927 60 homes had phones in Uppingham. The butchers used
local meat and the bakers made use of the two mills in
Uppingham. John Colman had the agricultural ironmongers
(Norton’s today). On the site of Billsdon’s was Charles White,
an ironmonger in 1870. He sold sewing machines imported
from America. Alec Billsdon started his business in 1940.
Originally the site of Culpin’s the butcher was the Lion &
Lamb pub. In 1881 T W Southwell, butcher, sold his home-
owners to Goodacre & Culpin.

Our final meeting of the year saw Hilary Crowden
recalling the colourful life of Lord Lonsdale, ‘whores, hounds
& huskies’. Hugh Cecil Lowther was born in 1847. The family
seat was Lowther Castle in Westmorland. The Whithaven
Colliery was on their land and provided much wealth.
Barleythorpe Hall was inherited from Hugh’s mother. Hugh
was sent to Eton, but only lasted there two years. He was sent
to Geneva to learn French. He was a carefree, sociable young
man who lacked a sense of direction. His older brother
inherited the title in 1882, but died that year allowing Hugh to
inherit. His main interests were hunting and sports. He led a
colourful life but his wife stood by him. He became Lord
Lieutenant of Westmorland and was on the Rutland Council
for a while. He was president of the AA and first president of
the International Horse Show at Olympia. He became known
as the ‘yellow Earl’ because his servants wore yellow and he
had a yellow Rolls Royce. He died in 1944.

*Helen Hutton, Secretary*

*Note: The Rutland Bibliography section for 2015 has been held over until the next issue of Rutland Record.*
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The Society’s publications, with their main contents, are currently available (October 2016) as follows:

### Rutland Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rutland Record</th>
<th>Rutland Record Series</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rutland Record 16</td>
<td>2. The Weather Journals of a Rutland Squire ed John Kington (1988). Thomas Barker’s 18th century weather, farming and countryside records, with introduction (£1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland Record 17</td>
<td>3. Stained Glass in Rutland Churches by Paul Sharpling (1997). Complete survey &amp; gazetteer; introduction; lists of glaziers, subjects, dedications, donors, heraldry (£1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland Record 18</td>
<td>4. Time in Rutland: a history and gazetteer of the bells, scratch dials, sundials and clocks of Rutland, by Robert Owens &amp; Sheila Sleath (2002). Definitive account of dials, clocks and bells of Rutland (£10.00, members £7.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland Record 20</td>
<td>5. The Heritage of Rutland Water ed Robert Owens &amp; Sheila Sleath (2nd rev imp 2008). History, archaeology, people, buildings, landscape, geology, natural history of Rutland Water area; sailing, fishing, flora, birds and fauna (last copies £15.00, members £12.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland Record 21</td>
<td>Occasional Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland Record 25</td>
<td>4. The History of Gilson’s Hospital, Morcott by David Parkin (1995). The charity, its almshouse, and farm at Scrdington, Lincs; trustees, beneficiaries; foundation deed, Gilson’s will (£1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland Record 27</td>
<td>6. The History of the Hospital of St John the Evangelist &amp; St Anne in Okeham by David Parkin (2000). The 600-year old charity: history, chapel, trustees and beneficiaries (£1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland Record 29</td>
<td>8. Common Right and Private Interest: Rutland’s Common Fields and their Enclosure by Ian E Ryder (2006). Details of Rutland’s enclosures, with historical background, case studies, gazetteer and indexes (£1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland Record 30</td>
<td>9. Who Owned Rutland in 1873: Rutland entries in Return of Owners of Land 1873 by T H McK Clough (2010). Annotated transcript of the 563 Rutland entries; analysis; Lyddington and Chipping Campden (Glouces) case studies (£7.50, members £6.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland Record 31</td>
<td>10. Medieval Property Transactions in Rutland: abstracts of feet of fines 1197-1509 by Bridget Wells-Furby (2013). Introduction, discussion, detailed calendar of all 355 Rutland feet of fines, full indexes (£10.00, members £8.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland Record 32</td>
<td>11. John Barber’s Oakham Castle and its Archaeology ed Elaine Jones &amp; Robert Owens. John Barber’s notes on his 1950s excavations and other contemporary accounts; full colour (£8.00, members £6.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland Record 33</td>
<td>12. Oakham Lordshold in 1787: a map and survey of Lord Winchelsea’s Oakham estate, edited by T H McK Clough (2016). Evaluation and discussion of this map of the town, transcript of accompanying field books; full colour (£10.00, members £7.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland Record 34</td>
<td>UK postage and packing (2nd class, parcel or carrier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland Record 35</td>
<td>Rutland Record, Index, Occas Pub 4, 6: £1.25 one issue + 50p each extra issue; Occas Pub 7, 8, 9, 10 &amp; 11 and Stained Glass: £2.00 each; Occas Pub 12, Weather Journals: £2.50 each; Time in Rutland: £5.00, Heritage of Rutland Water £7.00 by courier.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This supersedes earlier lists. Please enquire for overseas postage costs.

**All orders and enquirers for publications** with payment incl p&p, to: The Hon Editor, RLHBS, c/o Rutland County Museum, Catmose Street, Oakham, Rutland, LE15 6HW, England, or purchase on-line via www.genfair.co.uk. See our website for OP issues.
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