

Durham E-Theses

The Manor of Cumwhitton Cumberland: a study in historical geography

Charnley H. J

How to cite:

Charnley H. J (1973) *The Manor of Cumwhitton Cumberland: a study in historical geography*.
Masters thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/10022/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

THE MANOR OF CUMWHITTON CUMBERLAND:
A STUDY IN HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY

A thesis submitted towards the Degree of
Master of Arts in the University of Durham.

H.J. Charnley
1973

VOLUME 1

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Acknowledgements	i
Abstract	ii
List of Abbreviations	iv
Chapter 1: Objectives and Definitions	1
Chapter 2: The Landscape in 1603	6
Chapter 3: Settlement and Population 1603-1840, An Overview	28
Chapter 4: Settlement Morphology, Two Levels of Resolution	53
Chapter 5: Landownership in Cunwhitton 1603-1800	69
Chapter 6: Enclosure	100
Chapter 7: Farms and Farming in Cunwhitton 1603-1840	128
Conclusions	164

VOLUME II

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
List of illustrations	i
List of plates	ii
List of appendices	33
Reproduction of part of 1603 Field Book	34
Bibliography - Primary and Secondary	53

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to the following persons for the help given to me:

The Staff of Durham University Department of Palaeography and Diplomatic especially to Mrs. L. Dary and Miss M. McCollum, and also to Mr. Fagg who kindly allowed the reproduction of maps in this thesis from the originals.

To the Staff of the Carlisle Record Office and the Staff in the local history section at Tullie House, Carlisle.

To Mrs. J.D. Horton for the typing of this thesis.

To Mr. D. Hudspeth for the photography involved in map reproduction.

To Jim for all his encouragement, and to my parents.

To my Supervisor Dr. B.K. Roberts without whose valuable advice and guidance, this thesis could never have been completed.

The Manor of Cumwhitton, Cumberland 1603-1840a study in historical geography

Abstract

This thesis is concerned with a study of rural landscape change within a small area of Cumberland - the manor of Cumwhitton between 1603-1840. The work was based on the extensive Howard of Beworth collection lodged in Durham - the earliest documents within which, form the starting point for study. A seventeenth century map and associated field book provide the means of making an examination of the pattern of settlement fields and field boundaries in about 1603, and this study forms a datum line from which to undertake a more detailed analysis of various aspects of the human geography of Cumwhitton. This involves an analysis of settlement change within the manor and a summary appraisal of population dynamics. The picture of settlement so provided creates a bridge to research more pioneering in character which attempts to examine the morphology of cluster settlements, both within Cumwhitton and more generally within the Barony of Gilsland. Cumwhitton manor forms the focus of a consideration of that vital but non-visible framework of human activity - landownership. The more complex problems of northern land tenure particularly as seen in its state of flux at the beginning of the seventeenth century, are examined. Enclosure is seen as an important input within a complex process - response system opening up as it did avenues for agrarian change, and leading toward developments in tenurial, economic and social sectors. Finally, many of the themes which have been woven into the thesis, problems of settlement, field patterns and landownership

arrangements are brought together in a chapter which considers farms and the functional components of the agrarian system. An attempt is made in conclusion to gain an overview of both change and stability in the rural landscape of Cumwhitton in the period 1603 - 1840.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

V.C.H.	Victoria County History - two volumes.
C.W.A.A.S.(NS)	Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society.
Geog. Mag.	Geographical Magazine.
A.H.	Amateur Historian.
Ag. Hist. Rev.	^{icultural} Agrarian History Review.
E.H.R.	Economic History Review.
D.P.	Department of Palaeography and Diplomatic, Durham University.
C.R.O.	Carlisle Record Office.
H of N.	Howard of Waworth Collection.
C.B.P.	Calendar of Border Papers.
S.S.	Surtees Society.
K.	Kulturgeographie.
G.A.	Geografiska Annaler.
I.P.M.	Inquisitions post mortem.
T.T.B.G.	Institute of British Geographers.
P.P.	Past and Present.

The Manor of Cumbhilton, Cumberland 1603-1840:
a study in historical geography

Chapter 1

Objectives and Definitions

This study is an attempt to do several different things: firstly, to study and evaluate the significance and accuracy of a detailed seventeenth century map for a Cumberland manor, relating this both to a contemporary^{or} survey and to later source material; secondly, the map and survey provide an artificial datum line for the commencement of a largely progressive study of a wide range of landscape changes (1), between the early seventeenth and mid nineteenth century; thirdly and perhaps most importantly the study attempts to define and analyse diverse processes leading to both change and stability within the rural scene - a study that extends beyond the pattern of villages, farms and fields into the functional, dynamic dimensions of the real world (2). The latter embrace themes as diverse as demographic trends, social change, the complexity of landownership, agrarian organisation and practice, and finally the influences of group and individual decision-making. The objectives of study are thus defined.

The historical record of Cumberland's political, social and economic experience, prior to the seventeenth century is fragmentary (3). Cumberland had long been subject to recurrent waves of political unrest, particularly from border clashes, until relative stability was obtained upon the accession of James I to the throne of England in 1603. In 1601, furthermore William Howard of Naworth became lord of Gilsland, and it is upon the rich and varied Naworth collections, that this thesis is largely founded. According to

Bouch (4),

the transition to modern times had been made or at any rate begun when Elizabeth I died in 1603.

Significantly, this study commences at a time when Cumberland was in a state of social, political and no doubt economic flux.

In the past, the attention of the historian and geographer has tended to focus upon romantic Lakeland (5). Lowland eastern Cumberland has inevitably been neglected (6). Even Wordsworth in self confession admits to having paid far too little attention to the picturesque land of the Eden (7), and so it is to the east of the Eden that this study will turn.

The area selected for study, Cumwhitton manor, comprises the most southerly of manors within that political-territorial organisation known as the Barony of Gilsland. The boundaries of the Barony as they stood in 1603 are illustrated in Fig. 1:1, and the location and delimitation of Cumwhitton manor is pin-pointed. Cumwhitton manor comprises a small, naturally defined elongate corner of the Eden valley, between the Eden in the west and the sharply delimited Pennine escarpment to the east. Cumwhitton is then a largely lowland manor - a characteristic of some significance if the "personality" of Cumberland is considered. Elliott, in a recent article (8) drew attention to the distinctiveness of Cumberland to the north and south of the Roman Wall. Very briefly the northerly portions were rugged, largely pastoral and particularly susceptible to lawlessness and poverty. To the south of this ancient cultural divide, the scene was very different, characterised by riverine lowlands with considerable agricultural potential (9). It is in this historical and geographical framework that Cumwhitton manor is most effectively viewed.

But why one might legitimately question, choose Cumwhitton manor as the focal point for study? Time, vis-a-vis the vast collection of source material available for each manor within the Barony of Gilsland, necessitated the selection of a small, manageable area for study (10). Secondly, as research proceeded, it became increasingly evident that the historical "experience" of each individual manor, could be very different from that in adjoining manors. Contrast and variability, key-notes from the very beginnings of research will emerge as recurrent themes throughout this study, especially when, for comparative reasons and one desire to seek a broader view, attention is turned beyond the confines of Cumwhitton, to neighbouring manors.

A further incentive to study this area in question was derived from an intriguing newspaper article from the "Cumbrian News" dated 1937 (11). This was written by an author whose initials were W.F.M., but who has so far eluded identification. In his article, headed "Cumwhitton", he stated the following,

Comparatively close to Carlisle, the district beneath the slope of the Eastern fells offers a wide field of inquiry for the archaeologist and the historian The inhabitants of this district, engaged in purely agricultural pursuits, and until recently little disturbed by contact with the outer world, retain to a remarkable degree, their old customs and traditions by no means the least interesting of these out-of-the-way Cumberland parishes, is that of Cumwhitton, a village whose name is well-known to all lovers of our dialect poets by the famous line of "Cumwhitton, Cumrew and Cumcatch", but whose remarkable historic monuments and local history, are not as familiar as they might be to visitors from Carlisle.

A collection of fragmented information followed, focussing upon the history and legends of the manor (12) and was sufficient to stir the imagination of the historical geographer, whose interests lie in rural landscapes of the past. The unnamed writer could

only draw from limited ecclesiastical sources (13), but the recent availability of the Naworth collection for consultation has permitted the opening up of entirely new lines of enquiry into the historical experience of the manor, especially as it became manifest in spatial terms.

The study is intended as a detailed pilot study, and will, it is hoped be of value to the increasing body of research being focussed upon Cumberland. In the pages which follow there are some fascinating patterns of human activity to be unravelled - patterns and processes, of very real significance in the wider context of studies in settlement and agrarian history, to which this can necessarily form only a very limited contribution.

Chapter 1 - Notes

1. Prince (1971) The study of landscape change is often elaborately labelled the "morphogenesis" of the landscape, and is an approach which has been widely adopted by the American school (Sauer etc).
2. Baker, Hamshere and Langton (1970) 19 discuss this methodological approach.
3. One of the more comprehensive accounts of Cumbrian history is to be found in Ferguson (1890).
4. Bouch and Jones (1961) 39.
5. Marshall (1971).
6. The above (4) is the only general historical coverage of Cumberland. Recent publications overlook the Eden Valley completely, or alternatively focus on the upper reaches. See Millward and Robinson (1972) Lefebure (1970).
7. Firth (1960) 365.
8. Elliott (1973) 74, in Baker and Butlin.
9. See Ramm (1970) the distribution of bastles (defended farmhouses) falls off markedly in these southern portions, south of the wall.
10. The boundaries of the areal unit Cumwhitton manor remained completely unchanged, a positive advantage for the collection of data.
11. W.T.M. (1937).
12. A fascinating source for comparable Cumbrian folk lore is Beresford (1954).
13. As for example those utilised by Graham (1913).

Chapter 2The Landscape in 1603i) Sources available to give a direct view

In examining the fabric of the landscape of the manor of Cumwhitton in 1603, two inseparable primary sources form the basis for study. The first is a map of the manor drawn on parchment, and the second, the relevant section of the Fielde Book that explains all the Map Book for Gilsland in 1603. The Field Book has been published (1) and the section which relates to Cumwhitton is included in full for reference in the appendix of vol. II 2:1. It was, furthermore possible during the course of research to consult the original Field Book of 1603, but for all practical purposes the modern version was considered sufficiently accurate to be utilised. In addition to the Map and Field Book, a third invaluable source was consulted - an eighteenth century copy of the original map, a portion of which has been reproduced in Plate 1. This copy proved invaluable where the original map had succumbed to the ravages of time (2) and whose state of preservation has rendered it extremely difficult to reproduce by normal photographic processes.

At the outset, it is instructive to consider several fundamental points which relate in a general way to the historical geographer, confronted with source materials of this kind. Firstly, when the two main sources are critically examined and evaluated, the emergent landscape is one which is a manifestation of the perception and purpose of the surveyors. Baker admirably and lucidly emphasises

this point,

the motivation, background and perception of the people who construct the documents with which they are working, must be fully understood. (3)

With regard to the "motivation" and "background" of those surveyors of Lord William Howard, Graham has suggested that the survey was undertaken with a view to satisfying two main ends. The first - to gather information concerning his newly acquired territorial domain, and the second, to explore the possibility of altering the conditions of land tenure therein, and in conjunction to raise the rents. This would account for the conspicuous absence of yearly rents with the exception of a few instances in the Field Book, and the equally striking lack of detail relating to tenurial characteristics. These points, the writer firmly believes are vital to establish, before any detailed examination of the source material can proceed. Turning now to the map and Field Book an attempt will be made to assess their accuracy, both relative to each other and each in isolation.

The survey in 1603 and its accuracy

The observations which follow are all based on the original map of 1603, which has been copied as accurately as possible and all the detail reproduced in Fig. 2:1. In order to test its accuracy the linear scale which was in effect 3.7 inches to one mile, was translated into an areal scale. A symbol based on the linear scale of the map represents an "acre" (shown in the key of Fig. 2:1), and from this basis the approximate acreage of the various parcels on the map can be estimated, viz: the toft on the northwest row of Cumwhitton was estimated to cover just over

two acres. In the Field Book the toft was measured as two acres, three roods, substantiating that the Field Book and map are compatible. The theme of accuracy was carried a little further. The acreages recorded in 1603 were compared with those quoted in the first edition of the O.S. at a 25 inch scale (1900). This was only possible where it could be established with reasonable certainty that the "container" sets of boundaries had remained unchanged, between the two surveys. A sample of eight of these comparable areas are tabulated below:

Sample of			Corresponding		
area/measurements in 1603			1900 area/measurements		
A	R	P	A	R	P
2	2	15	2	0	3
3	0	0	3	0	20
2	2	0	2	1	7
4	1	20	4	1	29
16	0	20	16	0	18
12	1	0	11	2	32
5	2	0	5	2	16
20	2	0	19	0	30
2	3	0	2	2	31

The disparity between the two estimates is variable, sometimes extremely slight but occasionally involving a difference of over an acre. However, most are so slight as to be virtually negligible and certainly no consistent margin of error can be detected. The measurements are surely sufficient to suggest that the surveyors in 1603, were in fact using a statute acre, and that differences probably arose from techniques of measurement and instruments which were less precise than those employed in modern surveys. It should be added in conclusion, that certain linear measurements

were taken between points on the 1603 map, and the 6 inch first edition for the manor. Once again, the early map, stood up well to the test of linear accuracy.

The areal accuracy of the map constitutes one vital facet of its character, but another, relating to cartographic detail must also be considered. For this purpose, the written "explanation", a key to the map as it appeared in its original state (but which has since lost much of its meaning) is included below:

all the grounds thereof within the Barony of Gilsland, all the common pastures are shadowed all over with a light green. The severalls only compassed about with a stroke of a sadder green. The waies are yellow, the rivers and water courses are blue

All the points raised so far, relate to the basic details of the map. The nature of the actual assemblage of elements forming the content of the landscape as it was mapped in 1603 will follow, initially in broad terms but subsequently each element will be dissected so as to define as precisely as possible, the character of the evidence provided by this important source. Extreme caution will be exercised so as to focus upon those elements visible on (Fig. 2:1) in a descriptive sense only.

a) Settlement

Cumwhitton manor presents a wide spectrum of settlement size - from the single, isolated farmstead (Fellend and The Holme) for instance, to simple clusters of two or three farmsteads, larger assemblages of houses as at the Morefoote (Moorthwaite) and High Norskue (Northscough), to what may be finally classified as villages - Cumwhitton and Hornsby, made up of fifteen or more farms. Not only is the size of settlement worthy of note, but

So also are the morphological characteristics of the larger settlements. Cumwhitton comprises three readily identifiable rows of farms, grouped around a central open space, which in the Field Book is termed a "grene". Hornsby, (Ormesby on the map) comprises two rows of farms facing each other across a linear open space or "wast". Contrast the form of these two settlements with the highly irregular girdle of farmsteads at Herefoote - a straggling line of farms clinging to the edge of the improved land. The "lay-out" of Cornbrigknoll, and Nether Norskue is much more simple, - three homesteads in a row, whilst at Over Norskue a further contrast is provided, for it comprises two "rows" of widely spaced farmsteads - much less compact than either Hornsby or Cumwhitton.

At a higher level of resolution further settlement detail can be detected. Tiny plots or garths in which farms are located at Hornsby (termed curtilages in the Field Book) are identifiable, - and similarly at Hornsby. Another interesting feature concerns the size of the buildings depicted on the map. One building is substantially larger than the rest - pinpointing the location of the only church, in Cumwhitton village. On the original map, all buildings were depicted "three dimensionally". The grouping of buildings provides a general impression of the size of each settlement, although it is unclear when there are more than two buildings shown on one tenement, whether this is purely figment of the imagination of the cartographer, or whether in fact additional buildings - barns or outbuildings of the farm complex are represented.

b) Fields and Field Boundaries

These elements form an important landscape component in 1603. They are striking features of the "man-made" landscape whilst offering at the same time much scope to the historical geographer. However, field boundaries as portrayed on the map are not without their problems and limitations. This is aggravated by the fact that no key which might suggest the nature of field boundaries is appended to the original map. In some cases it has been necessary to supplement the faded detail of the original with evidence derived from the eighteenth century copy. Occasionally the fading was so complete as not to be detectable under ultra-violet light. What is reasonably certain is that Cumwhitton manor in 1603, contained within its bounds, both fields which appear to be enclosed, indicated by continuous lines, and unenclosed fields shown by broken lines. The size-range and shapes of fields exhibited on the map, constitutes what can only be described as a landscape of astonishing complexity, contrast, and contradiction. In this light, consider in Fig. 2:1 the narrow attenuated enclosures bordering the south-western fields of Cumwhitton, and the small houseplots or tofts, on the north-western side of the village. Compare these with the long wedge-shaped fields which radiate from the kernel of Cumwhitton, often exceeding fifteen acres in area, some of which seem to be enclosed and others unenclosed. The nature of the enclosing boundary is never disclosed - be it a fence, hedge, bank, stone wall or indeed of compound construction, posing insoluble problems, and clouding any attempt to achieve a clear understanding of the agrarian landscape. Contrast the fields of Cumwhitton with the large lobate fields at High Northsceugh

(often exceeding fourteen acres) with those at Morefoot (Moorthwhite). Considerable pains have been taken by the surveyors to record tiny individual open strip parcels in the Morefootfield. The numbers on the map refer to furlongs which are described in the Field Book. Returning to Cumwhiton village it is impossible to overlook one huge field, over 80 acres in area. But there is something rather disturbing about this "field" - namely what appear to be loose or "trailing" boundary ends. Have inner details of field boundaries been omitted? Is this also the case at Nether Northsceugh? The writer believes that this was so in both instances. At High Northsceugh in accordance with information supplied on the original map, but not on this copy there were,

... three tenements and their lands divided equally.

Exactly how this was manifest in landscape terms remains sadly obscure. In a similar vein, there are obvious field boundary details omitted in the greater part of the Morefootfielde (Fig. 2:1).

To begin to unravel a few of the implications of these problems demands time and greater depth of consideration, and the greater part of this thesis will be dedicated to such objectives.

c) Routeways

The complete network of routes which must have traversed the manor, is not, unfortunately represented on the map. Only the truncated ends of routeways as they enter the manor testify their presence, although one route through High Norskue and a portion of a route entering from the south of the manor, called "Kinge Honrie" street are depicted in a little more detail. Again questions relating to whether or not the routeways were open or enclosed are raised.

Where routeways are recorded in more detail they become more easily recognised, and hence suitable for closer scrutiny, the routeway either traverses fields or enters a settlement. At Cumwhitton access tracks or fieldways in one case are open, whilst in another remain open on one side, enclosed on the other. Parallels may be drawn at Hornsby. Where a routeway approaches Cumwhitton notice the way in which it swings in and merges with the open space or green. It reemerges to the west of the settlement broadening in one place until it resembles a broad funnel of open ground. The Field Book describes this as the "common drove".

d) The Commons

Mention of the latter element - droveways leads effectively to a discussion of that dominant element namely the vast tracts of open common pasture - so characteristic a feature of the early seventeenth century landscape. Open pasture throughout the entire manor virtually swamps those "islands" or oases of cultivation. Bouch and Jones' statement with reference to the whole of Gilsland at this time reflects a similar image,

A remarkable feature of Gilsland is the great extent of common lands. (4)

Reference to the Field Book emphasises this dominant feature:

Ornesbye compassed about wth common pastures on everie side.

The comens of this lordship liing dispersed by or near the utmost bounds and compassinge in the severalls doe joyne themselves in one and conteine. 4218 a Or Op (5)

The very extent of common together with the droveways must surely emphasise the importance of the pastoral element in the landscape of 1603.

e) Territorial Boundaries

The final element to be considered is a relatively minor one, but none the less a manifestation of the creative works of man. Both at the northern and southern limits of the manor, the map indicates the presence of artificial boundary stones - otherwise known as "doolstones". Their identification was of obvious importance to the surveyors in 1603, for they demarcated the territorial limits of the manor.

f) Rivers and Waterbodies

The surveyors of the map in question appear to have paid considerable attention to including and also naming the courses of rivers - particularly the Eden, and Carne - not only because they were important landscape features but they respectively demarcated the western and eastern bounds of the manor. Moreover, many of their tributaries are included. A striking feature with regard to the latter is the way in which each settlement is closely related to a stream course. Cumwhitton village in Fig. 2:1 is virtually entwined around Cumwhitton Beck which flows through the village. A similar situation is encountered at Hornsby, and at Nether Worskue the presence of watercourses assumes new significance. Here the extent of improved land is sharply delimited by the courses of two becks. The cultivated lands at Carnbriggknoll, and Walmersyke (elements referring to watercourses are underlined) are likewise defined. It is interesting to recall Bailey and Culley's observations on Cumberland in 1794,

there are few places where water is so abundant and good as this district is blessed with - for besides the large river of the Eden every village and almost every farm enjoys the benefit of a pure spring or is visited by a rivulet. (6)

The map also shows that a short stretch of the Carne's course has

been diverted and straightened, to serve Cumwhitton's mill there.

Finally, the presence of "Y Terno" is problematical. It is impossible to ascertain whether it represents a man-influenced feature, or whether it is a small natural waterbody.

g) Moortland

This landscape element has been included in the category of more "natural" elements, because the descriptive terminology, - "King Henrie More" would imply the presence of a large tract of waste, characterising the southern portions of the manor. Above and beyond this information, nothing further can be added in relation to the "moortland element".

h) Topography

The map provides in this case only a modicum of information. Along the banks of the Eden, a narrow band of what are cartographically represented as "small hummocks", seem to suggest some sort of irregularity of terrain. Interpretation of such must await a modern appraisal of the physical landscape of the manor, as these details appear to have been of little interest to the 1603 surveyors, and hence are omitted. Topographical detail represented as such on the map concludes this section of the chapter, which has endeavoured to examine and describe as accurately as possible the highly variable nature of elements which comprise the landscape, as it was perceived, and with specific purposes in mind, by the surveyors of Lord William Howard. That the total picture formed is both biased and in many ways incomplete will have become quite obvious in the course of discussion.

The Map and Field Book - Concordance and Discordance

Hilberto, the two primary source materials the map, and Field Book have been viewed very much in isolation. This was necessary in order to become thoroughly familiar with the facts presented in their simplest visible form. Essentially, however, the two are symbiotic - that is, they "work" together. At the outset it must be stressed that the Field Book as a key to the map, is set out in a methodical, logical order. Reference to the Field Book will ascertain initially that the manor boundaries are precisely described. Then, the survey proper proceeds, beginning in the north of the manor, continuing south. Inclusion of what may be regarded as a typical entry follows. From this the nature of the format may be appreciated,

Anne Huitson ... hath a tenement there more west at the north west corner of the grene: between Xpr Earles tenement easte and Frances Scarfes south and in part west.

The same An hath a fielde of arable ground adjoininge more west between Franc Scarff south and Xpr Earle north, butting east upon the former croft.

Notice the explicit manner in which this holding is locationally "fixed" in relation to adjoining holdings and the points of the compass as represented on the map. There is thus, no difficulty in pinpointing these parcels on the map. The majority of the entries follow a similar pattern with the exception of the portion relating to the disposition of lands in that western portion of the Morefootfields where there is a distinct lack of information concerning relative locations of individual holdings, neither is the use of any natural feature, for example, a stream or field track employed. Generally speaking however, the accordance between

map and Field Book as regard order, detail, and locational information is almost harmonic. The writer has chosen the word "almost" intentionally, for there are a few noteworthy occasions on which the map and Field Book are discordant.

The first relates to information supplied on the map but not "explained" in the Field Book. Such is the case at Moorfoote, which comprises of nine recognisable farms and their appurtenant fields. The tenants of three of those houses only are identified, the others remain obscure. In a similar vein examine Hornsby, where the western row of cottages and tenements are described explicitly - not so with the eastern row - details of which are completely omitted in the Field Book.

The reverse is the case in the final instance of discordance. This time details are supplied in the Field Book and not on the map. Attention is drawn to the north eastern portion of the townfields of Cumwhitton, where, in one twelve acre field, no less than five tenants hold "peces" of ground. It is a curious fact that the "peces" are not included on the map, as they generally comprise one or two acres, when a good deal of trouble was taken at the Moorfootfields to portray strips a quarter of an acre in area! These then constitute the main elements of discordance encountered when the map and Field Book are compared. As the discussion proceeds in greater depth, and the complexities of the landscape begin to unravel, it may be possible to account for these curious discrepancies of recording.

However, it must be emphasised that overall, the "fit" of the two is good - proceeding from the north to the south of the

manor, beginning with each settlement and adjoining fields in turn - field by field and house by house, and concluding with a description and coverage of the isolated farms, which lie dispersed at the "outward bounds" of the manor. The methodology underlying the survey, is, in short, highly geographical and surprisingly accurate.

Supplementary Evidence

The following section focusses upon information which, because of its nature adds new depth and detail to the spatial patterns of the early seventeenth century landscape, described hitherto.

The first category of additional data contained within the Field Book relates to land-use, although its recording is by no means complete. Only a portion of the lands of Cumwhitton village and a few peripheral improved tracts are classified. The four types of land use described are arable, pasture, grassgrounde and meadow, each of which will be more fully discussed at a later stage in the thesis.

The second type of supplementary information derived from the Field Book concerns information relating to the types of farmhouse within Cumwhitton. "Stonehouses" are singled out in particular viz,

Jo Dixon a tenement and ground with a stonehouse
built upon the green.

Further distinctions with regard to the farmhouses are made. Many are simply described as tenements, but an equally large number are specifically classed as cottages;

Edward Hall a tenemnt more easte
Xpr person a cotage there adjoininge.

These details are of particular interest in the context of the evolution and structural characteristics of the Cumbrian farmhouse, with reference to Cumwhitton, and will be likewise reexamined in depth at a later stage.

The final category of information, and perhaps the most crucial, concerns the complex question of landownership. Fig. 2:1 excludes information of this nature because of format limitations. Both the original and copied map (Plate 1) include the name of each tenant written upon the fields and holdings to which they relate. But there are inevitably problems. Landownership detail in Cumwhitton village is comprehensive, but in the western section of Morefootfield no tenants' names accompany the field parcels. At Hornsby too, there are similar inconsistencies. The distribution of lands "late Patensons" is quite clear but details of landownership relating to the remaining tenants' field parcels are totally omitted, and instead blanketed with the name "Mr. Dacre". There are finally two additional details of value. The first refers to the term "lib" indicating the presence of freehold land. This is applied to the holding called Nunlande in Fig. 2:1. The second refers to an interesting situation duplicated at Nether Northsceugh and Carrbrighknoll, where all three tenants held equal amounts of land - although the disposition of field parcels is missing. At Cumwhitton a "sharing element" recurs, in some cases fields are shared among two or three tenants.

It is true to say that the survey of 1603 provides a good deal of scope for the historical geographer, as well as the inevitable array of problems and shortcomings. No attempt has been made to

probe deeper into what Kenridge has termed the "labyrinthine complexity of tenures" (7), nor their respective spatial implications. Neither have any of the additional categories of data contained within the Field Book, been explored at any length. The observations gathered to this stage form rather a "take off point" for future discussion and critical analysis.

Additional Sources

Source materials beyond the map and Field Book have only been included in so far as they throw extra light upon the landscape as it was portrayed in 1603. Although the following fragmentary sources are not precisely dated 1603, they refer to an early seventeenth century situation. The first additional source constitutes part of an important Rental of the Barony of Gilsland (8) taken in 1626. This document will be drawn upon heavily in later discussion, but its importance at the present lies in the fact that not only are the rents fully recorded, but also in the fact that the actual name of tenements are supplied. These may be locationally fixed on the map of 1603 with considerable ease. Moreover, the demesne farm is identified as that singularly large holding of Frances Scarfe (Plate 1), located on the western side of Cumwhitton village. It is a curious fact that this was not identified as the demesne farm in 1603, but the writer believes that it attained this status only after 1603. The 1626 Rental contains much invaluable landownership information which will be divulged at a later stage. In 1626, Cumwhitton apparently possessed a fulling mill (molendum fullorim) in addition to a granary.

The remainder of this "extra survey" material of direct relevance to the 1603 landscape is highly fragmented, affording

only occasional glimpses of some of that detail which was considered lacking. Very few of the early Court Baron records for Gilsland have survived. One entry only was considered to be of significance dated 1611,

that no man cutt quickwood of Rowland Robson's
head-dyke. The like for Iveson and John Nicholson's
head-dyke. (9)

This illuminating fragment casts interesting light upon the nature of the field boundaries at High Northsceugh. In the same vein, a second entry dated 1611 records that Thomas Scarfe, John Langrig and Nicholas Hall were fined for allowing gaps to form in their hedges. A 1530 copy of a document which may refer to 1423 - a feodary for the Barony of Gilsland mentions the fishing for lampreys in the Eden, together curiously enough with the presence of a fulling mill. This situation inevitably raises questions concerning the absolute accuracy of the survey of 1603.

Hutchinson's Victoria County History records some of Leland's⁷ observations of 1589, for Cumwhitton (10). There was here a

"woode called Skeabancke which is of very good oaks"

T.H.B. Graham too, in an article which relates to the history of Cumwhitton likewise quotes from a document dated 1613

between the Milbeck and the South dyke going down from
the oaks unto Stainwath Beck. (11)

Unfortunately the location of this oakwood is elusive, but presumably lay in the north of the manor near the River Eden. No reference to any woods is included in the 1603 Field Book. Although these additional sources cast only a modicum of extra light upon certain aspects of the early seventeenth century landscape of Cumwhitton, they do at least serve to reemphasise the point that by no means all of the landscape elements were recorded by the surveyors of Lord William Howard. (12)

ii) The Physical Background, a modern appraisal

It was noted previously that the seventeenth century surveyors paid little attention to the relief and topography of the manor. Obviously this type of information was of little relevance to their purpose or aims, yet it is the writer's firm conviction that, as the physiography of the manor forms an integral component of the landscape it should be fully examined and understood. In analysing the physical features of the manor, it may well be possible to identify ways in which the structure of the landscape may bear some relationship to the spatial patterns of human activity. For this purpose five maps have been compiled. The first, figure 2:2 identifies the main physical features of the landscape, whilst the second Fig. 2:4 represents a generalised statement of the 1603 map.

Figure 2:2 in isolation identifies the dominant features of the "natural" landscape. The feature is immediately apparent - the imposing bulk of what is today named "King Harry's Common", which rises in the south to over 800 feet. It merges imperceptibly northward with the undulating topography which characterises a good deal of the landscape of Cumwhitton, lying between 300 and 400 feet. King Harry's Common may be viewed in reality as an offshoot of the Fells which rise to the east of the manor. Upland and lowland are in close juxtaposition then, within the confines of the manor. Lowlands characterise the northern portions of the manor, whilst in the south lowland is restricted to the fringing flanks of King Harry's Common, and the narrow floor of the Carne river. Cumwhitton's undulating topography is broken by two extensive tracts of flat peat moss - Cumwhitton and Moorthwaite moss respectively, and secondly by the steep-sided tributary becks of the Eden, and in some

shape the Eden itself. All these features are readily recognisable in Fig. 2:1. In a few places the valley floor of the Eden widens laterally to form as a result crescentic ribbons of flat land along the river of approximately 100 feet.

The recent aspect of the physical landscape of Cumwhitton of relevance to this study is the pedological character of the territory. A soil texture survey of the Brampton District appears in the Geological Survey, and was undertaken by G. Wood (13). Unfortunately, as Fig. 2:3 (which has been redrawn from the original) indicates, the survey does not cover the southern portions of the manor, but where pedological information is available it is instructive to compare the spatial patterns of soil texture with Figs. 2:2 and 2:3. Broadly speaking, there are two main categories of soil type represented in Fig. 2:3. The first are sandy soils derived from parental gravelly glacial deposits, whilst the second are loamy soils varying from moderately heavy to very heavy in texture, and these are derived from boulder clay. The tract of light sandy soils in Fig. 2:3, forms part of a much more extensive belt which stretches from Brampton in the north, to the southerly portions of the manor. Notice that the lowland landscape for the most part, comprises sandy soils and lighter loams, whilst ⁱⁿ the south easterly portions, closely coincident with King Harry's Common, there is a marked concentration of heavy unattractive clay soils. Smaller tracts of these clay soils, in addition, occur in isolated bands along portions of the Carne and Eden rivers. But at this stage, an attempt must be made to draw together the significant features of Figs. 2:2, 2:3, and 2:4, so that both the physical landscape and the human landscape of 1603 may be related.

Consider primarily the absence of settlement and islands of cultivation in the south eastern portions of the manor, where the heaviest of clay soils are to be encountered. It would seem that height, exposure, slope and the intractability of heavy clay were deterrents to the agrarian efforts of man in the seventeenth century. Curiously though, the eastern portions of Hornsby fields (Fig. 2:4) coincide with the occurrence of these heavy clay soils. With this exception, the undulating lowlands mantled with sandy soils appear to have formed the foci for settlement and cultivation (Fig. 2:3,2:4). According to G.S. Wood,

ease of working, fairly high rainfall and diversified topography render this land (light sandy tracts) eminently suitable for arable farming ... as well as pasture for cattle and sheep. (14)

This agriculturally favoured soil does not characterise land between 300 and 400 feet alone. It recurs in sinuous tracts (Fig. 2:4) along the Eden and Carne rivers - the precise locations of these peripheral seventeenth century isolated farmsteads of Petewath, The Holme, Tombank, Fishgarth-holme and Fell End. (Fig. 2:1, 2:3 and Fig. 2:4). Many of the place-name elements of these farms reflects the physical suitability of their location - the "holme", (incidentally an alternative name for Petewath, was Holmewrangle) is of old Nordic derivation (15) and signifies a "piece of dry land" (16). Land classed in 1603 as "common pasture" lay largely upon light loamy clays - an interesting feature, to which discussion will return at a later stage.

A final point of note concerns the complete exclusion in Fig. 2:1 of any mention or indication of those extensive tracts of basin peat, to which attention has already been drawn. It is

obvious that the peripheral minor mosses mentioned in the 1603 survey, were of significance in a political sense only. This last feature draws to a close the section which has been directed in the main, toward establishing the nature of the "relational linkages" between the natural and man-made landscape, as it appeared at the onset of the seventeenth century. In the concluding section, some attempt will be made to draw together the diverse problems which have arisen in this chapter - to set up the springboard as it were for the following chapters.

Problems and Questions

This introductory chapter, intendedly descriptive could not avoid identifying just a few of the problems inherent in the source material. The first set of problems relate to those shortcomings of the map and Field Book in isolation. The nature of these limitations has been outlined, but it is as well to reemphasise this type of problem which must inevitably intervene in the process of interpretation. In other words, the way in which the data was collected in accordance with the, "motivation, perception and background" of the surveyors, in itself constitutes a problem.

Further difficulties stem from the spatial picture presented by the survey of 1603. It must be fully recognised that what we are seeing is but a still-life snapshot of reality, frozen for an instant in time, preserved verbally and graphically in historical record. This is not the landscape in its entirety or reality. The assemblage of elements which have been isolated and described are themselves closely interrelated, in a landscape which is moreover, in a state of constant flux. Their order and spatial arrangement is continually

being refashioned and remoulded in tune with the highly complex, invisible processes underlying the landscape. But above all, this seventeenth century landscape functioned - within an agrarian, political, social and economic framework. In the first instance, for example what type of "field system" bound together the agrarian landscape? - and by "field system", the writer refers to the

way in which the inhabitants of the manor tilled the land, together with the disposition of their holdings. (17)

Any attempt to answer such a complex question must take into account a whole series of interrelated variables, which include landownership and land tenure. How in addition, are those intriguing features, enclosed and unenclosed fields to be reconciled? Settlement too, within the manor of Cumwhitton must also be viewed as a dynamic assemblage of elements, responding to the everchanging economic and social tide. Which elements of settlement, did in fact respond to change, and in another slightly different vein, can we attain any insight into settlement characteristics prior to 1603? The questions which have been raised are just a few of those which will receive attention in following discussion, and are questions which cannot be answered in isolation. The "experience" of Cumberland beyond Cumwhitton must be sought, so that any hypotheses forwarded for this manor, can be viewed critically and comparatively. In sum, this thesis cannot be expected to offer complete explanation, but it can contribute toward a deeper understanding of the evolution of the rural landscape of Cumberland as a whole.

Chapter 2 - Notes

1. Graham (1934)
2. A note was encountered in the Waste Book of 1731 which requested (by the Earl of Carlisle) the copying of a number of maps.
3. Baker, Hamshere, Langton (1970) 14.
4. Bouch and Jones (1961) 89.
5. Graham (1937) see Appendix.
6. Bailey and Culley (1794) and from 1972 facsimile of 1805 edition 200.
7. Kerridge (1969) 60.
8. D.P.H of N C 217.
9. D.P.H of N C178a.
10. Hutchinson (1794) V.C.H. Vol. 1 176.
11. Graham (1918) CWAAS V. 18.
12. It has become increasingly apparent that this map can only be "an abstract of reality which cannot afford the detail of a landscape painting!" Beresford (1957).
13. Trotter and Hollingworth (1932) 173.
14. As above 174.
15. There is a remarkable resemblance between these occupation patterns in a seventeenth century landscape, and similar patterns identified in lowland Germany associated with esch villages. See Smith (1959) 284.
16. English Place Name Society (1950) Pt. 1 78.
17. Gray (1917) introduction.

Chapter 3Settlement and Population 1603-1840, an overview

In the previous chapter, attention was drawn to the concept of the landscape as a dynamic assemblage of structural elements - elements which in reality may be subject to constant refashioning or metamorphosis in space and time. The landscape, hitherto has been viewed largely as a set of isolated phenomena^a, and little effort has been made to relate these to the contemporary political, social and economic scene, of which it was inevitably a partial expression.

This chapter endeavours to trace the spatial evolution through a time period of over two hundred years, of one of the most important landscape elements - that of rural settlement. Several basic sources were available to enable such a study to be made, although the historical geographer has by no means a continuous record at his disposal. Instead, sources, widely spaced through time must suffice, provided that their limitations to the study of settlement evolution are acknowledged. Many transient landscape changes may pass unnoticed in the darkness separating one source from the next, but wherever possible a variety of sources will be drawn upon, in an attempt to bridge the gaps in graphic information. The foremost objective of the chapter is then, to gain an overview of settlement evolution in Cumwhitton between 1603 and 1840, but there is a second objective to be met, involving the examination of those underlying processes which act as agents of landscape change and shaped the patterns observed. Indisputably, the most important causative agent of settlement change - whether it is manifest in settlement growth or decay, is the oscillatory

movement of population. Settlement can be a remarkably sensitive barometer to the pulse of population dynamics and change. Population expansion for example, may engender the growth of existing settlements, the creation of new settlement, and subsequently precipitate the pushing forward of the frontiers of cultivation. Population decrease, on the other hand, may propagate a landscape response viz - the shrinkage or even desertion of settlement, together with perhaps a recession of cultivation limits. Clearly, population and settlement are closely interdependent - but the relationship in reality is not quite as direct as it would seem, for a change in absolute population numbers is in turn nurtured by the interaction of multiple variables - political, social or economic.

For the period 1801-1841, the study is able to draw from the census returns for data of relevance to the objective of the chapter. The two centuries which precede the census, must ultimately rely upon source material of a different nature, so that some insight into the "demographic dark ages" may be gained. According to D.E.C. Eversley,

the transition from the period of church - kept to the era of state-kept records now appears much less important than it once did. We do not move in 1801 or in 1837 from darkness into light. In population history the dark age of population history ended in 1537 not in 1837. (1)

Eversley is, of course, referring to the considerable scope offered by the critical analysis of parish register records. Incidentally, the crucial period for Cumwhitton is 1695, not 1537, but the virtually continuous parish record from this date, renders it a valuable source for this study.

Having completed the initial objective - to gain an overview of settlement and population in Cumwhitton a bridge or link will have

been forced with the chapter which is to follow. This will be largely concerned with the examination of the way in which change became written in to the morphology of an individual settlement. But at this stage, it is of value to list the four primary cartographic sources, which are to form the basis of discussion:

- a) The survey of Gilsland of 1603, a source which has already been described above.
- b) Thomas Ramshay's survey of the Barony of Gilsland, undertaken in 1771-1772. Unfortunately, no Field Book accompanies this survey. (2)
- c) Edward Bowman's survey of the Barony 1828-1831, in addition to which are two Field Books. (3)
- d) The Tithe Map and Survey of 1840, compiled and surveyed by E. Morley. (4)

The following constituted what may be regarded as supplementary sources, which provide relevant population information:

- i) Census data for the years 1801-1851 (5) from which a graph and table have been compiled, to be consulted in the Appendix of volume II.
- ii) Parish Register transcripts for Cumwhitton Parish. These run discontinuously from 1670-1674, 1680-1689, and then more or less uninterrupted from 1695-1830. (6)
- iii) Indirect sources of a more general nature extracted from diverse sources, which include material extracted from the publications of the Surtees Society, Border Papers and Court Leet Records of the eighteenth century. All the above sources will be referenced in the course of discussion.

The source material which require the most careful manipulation and interpretation are undoubtedly the parish registers. (7)

As a result, it was decided that a short discussion on the limitations of parish register analysis would not be out of place at this point before interpretation and evaluation can be initiated. The following constitute some of the most important points to be borne in mind when collecting and evaluating this type of demographic data:

- i) The population of Cumwhitton manor/parish, even in the nineteenth century was numerically small. It follows that even small changes in the annual number of baptisms and burials are likely to be exaggerated. The researcher must then, be concerned with the identification of broad demographic trends. With this problem in mind, a smoothing method, which has been employed effectively in many demographic studies was adopted. (8) The analysis of the long series of burial and baptism incidence was analysed on the basis of "nine year running means".
- ii) The "ecclesiastical year", prior to the late eighteenth century ran rather erratically from June, May, March or even April to that month in the following year. These have been adjusted to the normal calendar year, although the nine year running mean tends to lessen the significance of the changing frequency intervals.
- iii) It should be appreciated that all parish registers were totally vulnerable to human error, deliberate or otherwise. They may not, for a variety of reasons some of which include illegitimacy and nonconformity, record all burials or baptisms. It is interesting to note that a few references to baptisms of illegitimate children were encountered, as was the occasional reference to a Quaker burial. In 1797, according to Hutchinson (9) there were only two Presbyterian families and two Quaker families, so that even if they were omitted

From the registers, the overall trends would not be greatly affected.

ix) The final point worthy of note relates to the recording of marriages. At some stages these were obviously not always recorded, for no apparent reason. The information has not been included because of the incomplete nature of the entries. Nuptiality would have proved a useful cross-reference for baptism recording, but the study should not suffer greatly from its exclusion. Suffice to say, that the marriages which were recorded all demonstrated significant features, in that both partners usually originated from Cumwhitton manor itself, or alternatively one originated from an adjoining manor - Wetheral, Cumrew or Hayton. Very rarely was the recorded "marriage distance" in excess of ten miles in any direction from Cumwhitton. This feature is a useful barometer for measuring social behaviour in relation to the fiction of distance - in a seventeenth and eighteenth century context.

The above outline the type of major constraints to be borne in mind when evaluating parish registers as a source of demographic information. Overall, Cumwhitton records were considered a sufficiently reliable source, upon which certain assumptions could be based.

Settlement in 1603

It will be necessary throughout this section to refer back to the 1603 survey and the map which was examined in Chapter 1. As a preliminary to the study of settlement, however, attention will be directed toward the significance of place-name elements, in relation to the settlement within Cumwhitton. For, in themselves, they incorporate interesting elements which can offer some guidance as to the relative age of settlements, as well as the possible nature

of their origins. Initially then, some insight into the history which underlay the settlement as it was depicted in the seventeenth century, will be sought.

The Oxford Dictionary of English place-names (10) specifically singles out Cumberland as an area which offers a considerable amount of scope for the study of place-names, viz:

In Cumberland are found some typically British names - Cumenton, Cumwhinton and also such interesting names as Birdoswald and Cumwhitton.

It will be noted that "Cumwhitton" is indicated as a name of "great interest", and so merits closer attention. Ekwall suggests that it is a hybrid incorporating the element "cum", derived from the Welsh "cwm" - a valley. The second element is old English, with the plural from Hwitingatum, meaning in sum, the valley by Whittington. The antiquity of this settlement is hence suggested. In contrast, the remaining place-names encountered within the manor exhibit the pervading influence of their Scandinavian origins. Hodgson has aptly commented that,

The Scandinavian settlement in Cumberland, Norwegian no doubt, rather than Danish, we know only by its results. (11)

"Ormesby" for instance, according to Ekwall is of old Norse derivation - the "by" element meaning a "byre", and the "orm", a personal name - element. The "holm" element is one which recurs throughout the manor and is of Danish origin, whilst the "sk" element contained within the two Norskues, is indicative of the close affinity with the Nordic tongue. Likewise Scarrowhill - related to the Nordic word "Scalewra" or alternatively the "nook of the shielings".

This cursory survey has exposed some of the intrinsic value inherent in place-names, and has served to sketch something of the

unclear origins of the settlements within Cumwhitton. Of course, it should never be forgotten that a Scandinavian name attached to a particular settlement, does not necessarily indicate that the settlement was, in fact of Scandinavian foundation. A Scandinavian name may simply have become adopted at a later stage, thus obscuring an earlier form. This sort of situation has been uncovered in Denmark, and whilst Scandinavian influence cannot be denied in the history of the manor, it is as well to be aware of some of the limitations inherent in place-name studies.

To move then, from this introductory, background section to the core of the discussion, and to a consideration of settlement in an early seventeenth century context. To some extent, settlement has been briefly considered in Chapter 1, but reference to Fig. 2:1 will reemphasise the main features of the size of settlement, its density and spatial distribution. The following statement by Bouch, albeit in a tudor context, admirably summarises the settlement "scene" which confronts the historical geographer, in Cumwhitton,

even in those parts where men could live, the communities were small and isolated. A traveller in Tudor times, would have seen small villages and hamlets each surrounded by a few fields crossed if at all by rude tracks. (12)

Settlements in Cumwhitton were certainly small, rarely if ever exceeding twenty homesteads in all. Remember, moreover, that settlement size may well be overrepresented, particularly at Moorhwaite and Hornsby, for reasons already divulged. At the other end of the spectrum, hamlets comprising three farmsteads occurred in several places - at Scarrowhill, Carnbrigknoll, and Low Northsceugh.

It is impossible to arrive at any total population figure,

which this seventeenth century landscape supported. It can be stated with reasonable accuracy that there were 68 farmsteads, although the number of households per farm-unit remains obscure. A crude estimating technique employed in the analysis of Carlisle diocesan records of 1563 postulated 4.5 persons per household. (13) If it is assumed that there was one household per farmstead, then Cumwhitton's population could be estimated in the region of 300 persons. These assumptions, however, are extremely shakily based, but the total serves at least as a crude guide to the total number of inhabitants within Cumwhitton, in this period. If an accurate population total cannot, therefore, be compiled with certainty, are there any alternative means by which an insight could be gained into the characteristics of the population, and the "environmental context" within which the population can be viewed?

The settlements as communities were undoubtedly small, and they incorporated the essence of an almost clan-like organisation in so far as they afford multiple examples of identical tenants' surnames. In the Field Book, for example, six tenants possessed the surname "Scarrow", six similarly "Atkinson", five "Hall", four "Earle", four "Nicholson" - whilst the surnames "Hewitson", "Bird" and "Milburn" are all duplicated. Intermarriage, the custom of inheritance and low social mobility are all in evidence here. Houseman writing in the 1790's conveys a similar picture, even at this late stage,

The estates have passed (in Cumwhitton) for some centuries in a regular line of descent in the same families whence there is a great similarity of character and sameness of disposition of the people. (14)

It is indeed fortunate that documents survive to provide something of a wider context for the detailed material of 1603, and this

evidence may ultimately help to deepen the knowledge of the sort of demographic processes which may have underlain that early seventeenth century landscape. T.F.F. Graham in his introduction to the published version of the 1603 survey, has the following to contribute, which he in turn extracted from the report of Thomas Carleton the land ~~serjeant~~^{ea} of Gilsland dated 1600, and referring to the Border troubles of the late ~~fifteenth~~^{six} century.

I dare be bold to speak it, that £10,000 will not well and sufficiently repair the decay and losses of the said country (Gilsland) by fire and sword, spoil and oppression of the Scot and enemy: besides the great dearth and famine wherewith the country has been punished extremely these three hardy years past, and now last of all, the plague of sickness lately fallen amongst them. (15)

A formidable array of Malthusian checks would appear to have racked Gilsland prior to the survey - checks which would no doubt provide great scope for the investigator of local demographic behaviour. The absence of parish records for this early period however, renders impossible any further research. The historical geographer must be content to speculate as to the possible effects of the above disasters upon the population and settlement of Cumwhitton.

Consider further, the evidence supplied in the Master Rolls for Gilsland in 1581, when 75 able-bodied men were to represent Cumwhitton "Bailifworke". (16) Yet in a comparable muster roll for 1598 only 62 names are included. (17) It is debatable whether this could be taken as evidence for the depletion of the fighting force. If it is, the fall in the number of able-bodied men, may well have had at a later stage, some influence upon the demographic trends within the manor. An entry discovered in the Border Papers dated 1598 is however, an indisputably sorry one:

Cumwhitton:

Horses sufficient 9; insufficient 6; absent 2.

Nags sufficient 6; insufficient 3; absent 7.

In addition John Musgrave, the land sarj^{ea}ant for Gilsland reported that in 1598, at Cumwhitton,

The Scots spoils there totalled £200 and above. (18)

Overall conditions, from this somewhat fragmentary evidence, were hardly conducive to economic prosperity. Neither does it seem feasible to envisage demographic stability, or a pronounced rate of natural increase in population - although, of course, one cannot overlook the possibility that Cumwhitton may have proved an anomaly; but an extract from a letter dated 1600, does set seal to the overview which has been gained so far,

insecurity to property is a complete barrier to any progress in material prosperity. (19)

To return, after a cursory view of the environmental conditions of the early seventeenth century, to the question of settlement in 1603. Some piecemeal evidence of the type of population dynamics, to which Cumwhitton may have been subject has been uncovered. Yet, there is little to suggest, from the visual evidence of the survey, that war, pillaging and destruction had swept through the manor, except perhaps in the case of that curiously empty garth at Scarrow-hill Fig. 2:7. Where Mr. Dacre possessed a

...croft being a decayed tenement (20)

of course, a "decayed tenement" may simply be attributed to the death of the former tenant leaving no successor, rather than a testimony to the instability of the times.

Lord Howard's accession as lord of Gilsland, did, however coincide with that of James I to the throne of England. Border

warfare subsequently ceased - for a while at least. Perhaps then, the landscape of 1603 rather than exhibiting the imprint of centuries of instability, represented the beginnings of an economic rehabilitation.

This section, has attempted to sketch in the historical framework, together with its economic and social components, - a framework within which the landscape of 1603 (as it was recorded by the surveyors of lord William Howard) must be viewed. Absence of suitable data has prevented the formulation of a more precise measurement of the dynamics which may have underlain this essentially static landscape, but the nature of dynamics, political and social in the main, have been outlined in a general sense.

Some one hundred and sixty nine years separate the 1603 settlement "scene" and the next graphic source dated 1772. Any transitory changes which may have become recorded upon the landscape and then perhaps disappeared during this "silent interlude", must remain largely unknown - such are so often the limitations of the historical record. It is unfortunate that the extrapolation between two fixed points cannot be avoided, but the historical geographer must be consoled with the fact that the mere existence of major eighteenth century documentary evidence is fortune in itself.

The "silent interlude" is, however, not entirely obscured. The Fine Books of 1626 (21) and 1650 (22) contain some interesting entries which relate to "improvements" of "new and diverse lands", involving the payment of anything from a few pence to over two shillings extra rent for several tenants. According to Dilley, who has compiled a list of Cumbrian agricultural terms, (23) an "improvement" signifies

...an encroachment on the common land thus improving its value.

If this was so, then agricultural expansionist activities would seemingly have got underway by 1650. But after this date "improvement" entries cease. They may in turn reflect a demand for the extension of land - possibly as a response to population increase - but this is purely speculative, although it is interesting to note the location of these "improvements". Four tenants at High Northsceugh were charged with additional rents, three at Hornsby, and four at Cumwhitton by 1626. The exact implications of these activities are difficult to assess in terms of population and landscape change, but they will be reexamined at a later stage in this chapter.

Settlement in 1772

As a preliminary section, the nature of details which relate to the accuracy and motivation of the survey to be employed, must be examined. Fig. 3:1 represents a copy of the 1772 map of the Barony compiled by Thomas Ramshay, the steward of Gilsland. There are, incidentally three maps, differing slightly in the portrayal of detail - although their twofold aim is unmistakable,

- i) To identify the location of the Earl of Carlisle's immediate possessions throughout the entire Barony.
- ii) To survey the extent of unenclosed, unimproved common.

In both, detail of the tenants' land is omitted. How accurate then, can the portrayal of settlement be in these circumstances? Once again, the problem of interpretation arises - in that all the rectangles on the map are simply described in the key as "buildings". It is by no means easy to ascertain which are farmsteads and which are subordinate buildings. For example, take the group of buildings labelled "Morleyhill". These constitute, in fact a single farm.

due care must be exercised before meaningful conclusions can be drawn, where change in settlement is to be evaluated. The map can deceive, - an increase in the total number of buildings in 1772, as distinct from those in 1603, may not necessarily correspond to an increase in the number of farms, but merely the addition of further structures to existing nuclei.

If the two maps are closely compared, several settlement differences relating to the process of change from 1603-1772 can be identified with certainty. First, and most important relates to the appearance of entirely new farmsteads. These in Figure 3:1 have been labelled wherever possible to ease identification. In all, over twelve "new" farmsteads can be identified with complete certainty. Attention is drawn to a striking feature of their distribution in that nearly all of these new farms are located in close proximity to the peripheries or limits of cultivation of 1603. It is a curious fact that there does not seem to have been any corresponding extension of these limits, or intake of new land, since 1603! The slight discrepancies in cultivated area represented on the two maps, may have arisen from their fractional differences in scale. This observation and its possible significance will be developed at a later stage in the discussion.

Returning to Fig. 3:1, it should also be noted that the "decayed" tenement at Scarrowhill in 1603, Fig. 2:1, had by 1772, become regenerated, and a new farm had appeared. The villages themselves, however, present problems. The period 1603-1772 had at Cumwhilton registered little change, with the exception of the growth of the demesne farm complex, although it could be argued that the way in which it stands out on the map is an interesting

... of the ... of the Northsceugh and If the number of buildings ... is considered, then both display signs of growth. High Northsceugh on the other hand, is, indisputably a case of a settlement which has undergone expansion. Lower Northsceugh has changed little, whilst the three tenements at Carnbrigknoll, in 1603, had by 1772 been reduced to two. Evidence of settlement growth was by no means universal on the landscape of Cumwhitton. Some portions had witnessed relative stability, whilst elsewhere, positive expansion had taken place.

It would seem reasonable to suggest, in view of the appearance of new farmsteads in the landscape, that the years 1603-1772 may have witnessed a corresponding increase in population. Yet why then, was there no subsequent intake of new land indicated upon the map. Were those cultivation limits shown in 1772 a reflection of reality? The writer has reason to believe that they were not. Suspicion is founded on information contained within a) the evidence (~~contained within~~ the Fine Books has already been disclosed in the previous section, where several "improvements" were recorded at Cumwhitton. These were apparently legal and taxable; and b) the Court Lect Records. (24) In these, several interesting references to illegal encroachments within the manor were encountered. These appear sporadically in the 1750's and 1760's and come to a head in 1779. The following extracts illustrate the nature of the entries:

- | | |
|------|--|
| 1750 | Margaret Schollick and her son and heir for taking up and making incroachments upon Cumwhitton common adjoining their own estate at Hornsbygate. |
| 1762 | John Atkinson of Hornsby for an incroachment on the common of Cumwhitton at a place called Foulpool. |

In 1775, the court lect held at Hayton was presented with a

... of enclosure maps

... particularly in some parts of Cumwhitton manor where incroachments abounded much.

Some ten names of offenders were listed, but they reappear in 1779, as part of a considerably larger list of offenders. This time the list comprises 40 offenders - at least three quarters of the tenants in Cumwhitton, although the exact acreages involved were never disclosed. It will be noted that all the "new" farms were involved in this illegal activity, together with many other farms located within the established villages. Incroachment it would seem, was a virtually universal activity throughout the manor in the mid and late eighteenth century. (25) Interestingly enough, the person responsible for reporting the offender was one Thomas Ramshay, steward to the court - that same Ramshay, it would appear who undertook the survey of the Barony in 1772, yet who seems to have overlooked these extensions of the limit of cultivation! In the face of this new evidence, the survey of 1772, may well demonstrate the art of deception and the influence of perception. Only that landscape which was "legal" in the eyes of the Earl of Carlisle was portrayed.

There is one further source of evidence from which the study may draw with a view to probing this question of population and settlement change in the late eighteenth century. I refer in this instance to the scope offered by an analysis of parish registers - the trends of annual totals of burials and baptisms of which, are summarised in Fig. 3:2. These have been grouped into four broad periods on account of the differing demographic dynamics exhibited between 1695-1830.

The first, from 1696-1705, is but a short and incomplete phase, but which has been identified because here, there is a clear deficit of baptisms as opposed to burials. It may have been a shortlived phase, but it could equally indicate that the population was either stationary or even decreasing, in total numbers. Phase two, in contrast from 1706-1750, is characterised by fluctuating burial and baptism rates, but in which there is always a surplus of baptisms over burials. In this case, slow population growth may be postulated. Unfortunately time did not permit an investigation of the causes of these peaks and troughs. One must always be aware that they could be a reflection of local baptismal practice or the vagaries of recording, rather than any reflection of demographic activity. However, one demographic characteristic, which cannot escape the attention of the reader is that curious change which appears to have taken place after 1750, in Fig. 3:2. Thereupon follows a marked trough in "demographic events". This feature is sufficiently interesting, and potentially significant to warrant a pause in the present discussion, in order to probe some of the deeper implications. The abrupt fall in the annual number of baptisms could indicate the activation of a number of processes. It could represent a "safety valve" process by which the population growth and hence increase in numbers experienced from 1706-1750, was relieved. Emigration could then, be postulated. Certainly early sources, considered previously, did indicate that the demand for new land had set in by 1626. (See also in this context footnote (25)) Emigration may have been sparked off or rather aggravated by a whole series of events, in addition to the early evidence of land hunger and encroachments. The Earl of Carlisle in 1747, enclosed (26) a large part of King Harry Common Fig. 2:1,

and in doing so, valuable cattle pasture belonging to the tenants of Cumwhitton and their dependents, was lost. Some may then have become forced to forfeit their means of subsistence, which leaned heavily upon pastoralism. The above are of course, mere speculations. A number of mechanisms may have contributed toward the process of emigration, if indeed emigration had taken place between 1750 and 1770.

By 1774, however, population trends had become reversed, with a sustained rise in the number of baptisms which was to continue well into the nineteenth century. Drawing together what evidence is available, the encroachments within Cumwhitton which came to a head in 1779, can be viewed as an outcome of the rise in population which had begun c1774, or possibly as the culmination of a long process of encroachment activity spanning the years 1750-1779, or perhaps even 1626-1779. The encroachment activity may have been aggravated by an imbalance between the demand for land and the number of mouths to be fed - or perhaps a combination or interaction of these variables. Whatever the situation was in reality, a series of complex, and probably interconnected processes of change were taking place in the late eighteenth century - which had direct repercussions upon the landscape, as well as upon the structure of society which supported it.

One point which has emerged from the above discussion concerns some of the ways in which reality may be distorted - unbeknown to the interpreter of the historical record. Clearly wherever possible, as many sources as are available and relevant to study must be presented and evaluated, before any conclusions can be formulated.

Settlement in 1828

The next datum line at which the progress of settlement evolution can be clearly viewed falls in the years 1828-31, when E. Bowman undertook a survey of the entire Barony of Gilsland. In contrast with the preceding survey on a comparable scale, Bowman's comprises a map, together with two Field Books. The latter unfortunately can shed little extra light upon the settlement study in question as no buildings recorded on the map are "explained" in the Field Books. Once again, basic problems of data interpretation are encountered. The motivation and purpose of the survey is centred essentially upon the disposition and extent of the tenants' lands in addition to the extensive possessions of the Earl of Carlisle. There is then, a distinct shift of emphasis in purpose and mode of recording in evidence, when the surveys of 1772 and 1828 are compared. It was possible to reproduce the relevant section of Bowman's survey photographically (Plate 2), and this reproduction will form the basis for the following discussion.

The first feature to note when examining Plate 2 is that each tenement is numbered and can be subsequently identified in the Field Book. It is readily apparent that Bowman's survey records a number of new farmsteads, this time accompanied by a corresponding intake of new land from what were the commons, particularly along the Eden and the flanks of King Harry Common. Enclosure of the commons had clearly antedated Bowman's survey. New farmsteads had appeared beyond the nuclei of pre-existing settlement, for example, Mill Farm, Eden Banks, Woodgill House and King Harry Farm. It is less easy however, to assess the impact of change in those settlements which were already established in 1828, chiefly because of the

scale limitations of Bowman's survey (Plate 2). The outbuildings of one farm, merge imperceptibly with those of an adjoining farm, rendering the task of measuring change virtually impossible.

The first census of 1801 provides some additional material for research into the types of social dynamics which must have underlain the landscape as it was recorded in Bowman's survey. Extracts from the census data are summarised in tabular form in the Appendix 3:1.

A cursory examination of the general trend of the total population within the parish of Cumwhitton demonstrates that Bowman undertook his survey at an extremely timely period. It closely coincided with the zenith of Cumwhitton's total population numbers as it was recorded at ten yearly intervals. In 1831, 579 persons resided within the confines of the parish which was synonymous with the manor. A glance in addition, at the population trends, illustrated by the analysis of the parish registers Fig. 3:2, confirms the general statement that the total population of the manor had risen steadily between the years 1801 and 1831. It is against this backcloth of expanding population that the landscape of 1828, with its new farms and newly improved lands, can be viewed most realistically. If the increase in buildings in Cumwhitton village, and to a lesser extent at Moorthwaite and Hornsby, can be taken as an indicator of settlement expansion and development, then the population statistics can only reinforce this viewpoint.

Settlement in 1840

Rural settlement information in this section is derived from the Tithe Survey, and more particularly, the Tithe Map. This survey,

which marks the end of the time sequence through which rural settlement within the manor has been viewed is infinitely more accurate than the three preceding surveys. The original Tithe Map, drawn to the scale 2 inches = 8 chains, is extremely detailed and cannot be reproduced in full because of the format limitations. A second asset is that each building is enumerated enabling the identification of the farm complex and the individual homestead. Precision and detail are then the key-notes of this particular survey. For the purposes of this chapter, the minute detail is not required, but portions of the survey will be employed to illustrate settlement themes in the following chapter.

A close examination of the 1840 landscape revealed that in comparison with the periods 1603-1772, and 1772-1828, the years 1628-1840 had witnessed a considerable deceleration as far as the creation of new farms was concerned. It is for this reason that a detailed map of 1840 has not been reproduced in this thesis. Instead, the only farmstead of any notable size to have appeared in the final phase has been located on the 1828 copy (Plate 2). So also have the two "cottage farms", respectively named, Thwaits and Cairn cottage. Population growth, as was concluded in the pregoing section had apparently passed its zenith (App. 3:1), and so it would seem had the creation of new farmsteads and the demand for the extension of cultivated land. But, there is another facet of the settlement - population relationship which remains to be explored. Extracts from the census for Cumwhitton in 1841 included the enumeration of those houses which were uninhabited. In the Northsceugh with Moorthwaite sector, 7 houses lay unoccupied. Whilst only four in the Cumwhitton sector were classified thus

(App. 3:2). Careful scrutiny of the Tithe Survey, in conjunction with the above, allows more locational precision to be added to the statement of deserted dwellings. The presence of a deserted farmhouse can be detected when a situation arises in which a farmer owns two farmsteads and yet occupies only one - neither is the other sublet. It is possible to state then that at Moor-thwaite, one small farmstead lay unoccupied; four farms including one cottage were deserted at Hornsby out of a total of 10 dwellings; two small farms at High Northsceugh were similarly fated. In complete contrast, Cumwhitton village comprising in 1840 twenty-two dwellings, seems to have changed little in size or structural layout between 1828 and 1840. Carnbrigknoll, Low Northsceugh and Scarrowhill similarly exemplify settlement stability.

The Tithe Survey, when viewed in conjunction with census information provides interesting source material which points to a reversal of population trends and a parallel process of landscape dynamics involving structural change. Deserted dwellings may reflect the operation of a number of complex economic and social variables - for example, the abandonment of small uneconomic tenements perhaps eclipsed by expanding farms. Whatever the active variable, rural emigration would no doubt result, contributing in turn to the downward trend in total population observed.

Although the finishing touches to the landscape of 1840 lie beyond the chronological limits of the thesis, it is of interest to note that the trends observed in the final period of study, marked the beginnings of a gradual process of population decrease and the continuing desertion of farmsteads. The present landscape,

particularly in the southern portions of the manor is littered with the remnants of cottages and farmhouses, in varying states of disrepair. Hornsby, in particular, appears to have been hardest hit, for today, five cottages stand empty, whilst only slight disturbances on the ground testify to the former presence of a farmstead.

In concluding this chapter, an attempt must now be made to draw together that set of observations which relate to change in the spatial distribution and structure of settlement in Cumwhitton between 1603 and 1840. The magnitude of change experienced by individual settlements through time was variable, but it is possible to compose a meaningful general statement concerning the structural landscape changes which have been observed.

Change and stability have together formed the two main themes underlying the study of the landscape in this chapter. From the surveys which have been examined several generalisations may be forwarded. The first of which relates to the northern sector of the manor roughly delimited by a line drawn from the Fishgartholme to Fellend (Plate 2). Within this sector the established settlement nuclei seem to have experienced a marked stability of the structural landscape. The southerly portions in contrast, underwent a more varied experience. The settlements of Hornsby and High Northsceugh proved extremely sensitive to the invisible pulses of change - be they triggered socially or economically. In short, many of the settlements in this southern section experienced what may be regarded as negative change. It should not be overlooked however, that beyond the established settlement nuclei change became manifest in different landscape terms. Throughout the entire manor, the creation of new

farmsteads was a universal feature of the landscape throughout the study period. Side by side then - contraction and stability of settlement, was in close juxtaposition with expansion and development of the single farmstead.

The second objective of this summarising section relates to the classification of the processes of landscape development. On the basis of the observed processes the following modes of landscape development may be identified: by

i) The creation of "isolated farmsteads", a process which continued sporadically between 1603 and 1828, but which had slowed considerably between 1828 and 1840.

ii) The addition of new structures to preexisting settlements.

Two categories of these "new" structures were identified - firstly, entirely new farms as were occasionally added to the settlement of High Northscough between 1772 and 1828, and secondly the addition of ancillary buildings. The latter in reality refers to the development of the farm complex, from what was probably a simple single structure in the early seventeenth century, through to a more complex farmstead which developed gradually with the addition of outbuildings and barns - a process which was virtually complete by 1828. The evolution of the farmstead will be explored at a higher level of resolution in a later chapter.

iii) The final category of landscape dynamics is essentially a negative one, referring in the main to the desertion and in some cases, the disappearance of settlement structures and subsequently settlement shrinkage. Hornsby is of course, the prime example in this category. Later chapters will endeavour to probe some of the complex processes which could have underlain this direction of settlement change.

Chapter 3 - Notes

1. Glass and Eversley (1965)
2. D.P. H of N 271 A
3. D.P. H of N 272 A
4. C.R.O. Tithe Collection.
5. Extracts from the census returns of 1851.
6. C.R.O. DRC/61-48 (1666-1877).
7. Quite a large body of work has centred upon the scope of parish registers. See in particular Wrigley (1963) 198
Wrigley (1966) 14
8. Wrigley in Baker, Hamshere, Langton (1969).
9. Hutchinson (1794) Vol. 1 V.C.H. 175.
10. Ekwall ed.(1967) 136 also intro. xxiii.
11. Hodgson in Place Names of Cumberland Pt. 2.
12. Bouch and Jones (1961) 17
13. As above 16.
14. Houseman in Hutchinson (1794) 177.
15. Graham ed. (1937) ix.
16. C.B.P. I (1894) 72.
17. C.B.P. II (1896) 557.
18. C.B.P. II (1896) 687.
19. S.S. (1877) Letter to Lord Burghley.
20. See Appendix 127.
21. D.P. H of N 217.
22. D.P. H of N c611-15.
23. Dilley (1970) 192.
24. D.P. H of N C1-5.

25. The Court Leet papers for Hayton quarter were meticulously searched for evidence of encroachment in manors other than Cumwhitton. Jones (1962) cites two Cumbrian manors, Bolton in 1763, and Aspatria in 1710 where similar activity was recorded in the late eighteenth century. Clearly as regards the rest of Gilsland, Cumwhitton seems to have been something of an anomaly.

Chapter 4Settlement Morphology, Two Levels of Resolutioni) Gilsland

This thesis has, for reasons of limiting the work to a reasonable scale been restricted to the manor of Cumwhitton, but in this chapter it is proposed to extend the argument and consider the morphology of the cluster settlements in Cumwhitton within the wider setting of the whole of the Barony of Gilsland. This topic has so far been neglected in a Cumbrian context, although the preliminary findings of the discussion which is to follow should be viewed in conjunction with parallel research carried out by Roberts and Sheppard elsewhere in Northern England. (1)

Thorpe has classified the plain to the south of Carlisle (2) (of which southern Gilsland largely comprises) as an

... intermediate area of villages interspersed with many scattered homesteads and hamlets and occasional market towns.

The manor of Cumwhitton, as was observed in chapter two represents what could rightly be regarded as a microcosm of lowland settlement forms. As well as a great diversity of settlement types the range of settlement size is well represented throughout this area, but it is the characteristics of the plans of these settlements which is to form the cornerstone of this analysis. A consideration of settlement distribution and settlement character thus provides a suitable introduction to the topic of settlement morphology.

Fig. 4:1 illustrates the area which has been selected for study - the lowlands to the east of the Eden and Irthing rivers.

This region includes, in addition, territory adjoining the historical boundaries of the barony, for the territorial unit has little relevance to the study of settlement morphology. The striking feature of the distribution of settlement is at once apparent. Several authorities, among them Smailes (3) and Graham (4) have drawn attention to that remarkable line of Pennine "scarp-foot" settlements, which is continuous from the north east of Brampton to Brough in the south in the upper reaches of the Eden, beyond the limits of Fig. 4:1. There are reasonable grounds for identifying a second belt or arc of settlements further west, focussing upon the Eden lowlands proper, rather than the sharp junction between upland and lowland. This second "arc" may be traced from Brampton through Hayton, Greater Corby, Cumwhitton itself and Hornsby southward.

The analysis of those villages which were considered to be of sufficient proportions to possess an identifiable ground-plan is summarised in Fig. 4:1. This classification of settlement form was based on the First Edition of the Ordnance Survey for the region of 1863, at the scale of 6 inches to the mile. Wherever possible, the much earlier cartographic sources, particularly from the suite of maps dated 1603 were consulted for supplementary information on the classification of village morphology. In many instances, the morphological construct of a village is much more simple and easily identifiable in the absence of later accretional features. Two excellent examples of this situation are illustrated in an earlier Fig. 5:1 which traced the details off a 1603 map. Fig. 4:2 on the other hand illustrates the nature of some village-plans in the region, as they appeared in 1863. Incidentally, both Cumrew and Newbiggin are represented in 1603 Fig. 5:1, and 1863 Fig. 4:2, and

It is of interest to compare morphological change exhibited in these two settlements.

Classification of settlement form or plan, as illustrated in Fig. 4:1 was based on the following criteria:

- a) the type of row-structure of which each settlement ^{was} comprised.
- b) the presence or absence of a central open space or green.
- c) the absence of a definite village plan.

In addition, the locations of all known deserted villages (5) have been identified in Fig. 4:1, together with a "possible" site, located where a church stands in conspicuous, inexplicable isolation (6). If the presence of an isolated church is an effective indicator of the possible location of a deserted village, then the remainder of Cumbria afforded no other potential candidates for lost village sites. The final observation at this general level concerns the question of orientation, which may or may not be of significance. In general, the trend of settlement orientation along the Pennine scarp is distinctly north-south, whilst the more westerly arc, more variable in the orientations it exhibits, does incorporate a few settlements with an east-west orientation. It is as yet, too early to attach any historical significance to the orientation of settlements in Cumberland, but the writer believes that the features which have been briefly touched upon, may be of future significance in the study of settlement.

It is now fitting, however, to fix attention firmly upon the characteristics of settlement morphology in the Eden and Irthing lowlands. It is impossible to overlook the general uniformity of village plans represented in Fig. 4:1, and 4:2. The majority of

settlements under review can be assigned to what has been concisely described by Roberts as the "two-row greenvillage" class. A large number comprise two distinct rows of houses facing each other across a linear open space, much of which by 1863, as the examples will testify had become obscured by colonisation and infill. The term "village" is perhaps a little confusing where Hayton and Brampton are concerned, but if the 1603 maps are reliable, it is believed that a much more simple rural village form, underlay the more complex urban plans where multiple row structures had eventually developed by the nineteenth century.

The second major plan-element to which attention must now be drawn is the green. Most of the greens are most effectively described as "linear" or "street greens", some of which possess distinct funnel-shaped proportions. Fig. 5:1 and the example of Cumwhitton village itself exhibit a noticeable narrowing of the green at one end of the village. In 1603, however, according to information recorded in the suite of maps nearly all the greens had direct access to either surrounding open fell or pasture, or less direct access, by means of a field way, to the wide expanses of open pasture beyond. (This intimate juxtaposition of green and pasture still identifiable at Cumrew (Fig. 4:2) in 1863, became, especially after the enclosure of the commons somewhat obscured.) Yet in 1603 this link was especially striking. At this point, the discussion must inevitably impinge upon the controversial topic of the function of the green. (7) In this context it is interesting to note that the Rev. R.S.E. Oliver, referring to the village of Millburn, offered the following explanation of what he termed "closed villages":

It is said that in times past the inhabitants used to close all the entrances to the village, and turn their cattle onto the village green during the winter. I have been told that this "closing" was a measure of protection against marauders (presumably the Scots) whose object was cattle. (8)

His opinion was just one of many, and little further can be added that is until the individual village of Cumwhitton is brought under close scrutiny. Whatever the historical function was in reality, the link between the green and encircling pasture, and the regulation of the movement of livestock, may be crucial.

The shape of the green as evidenced in Fig. 4:2 is rather distinctive in these lowland villages, and hence deserves closer attention. In nearly all of the two-row green villages examined, the green was certainly linear, narrow, and in some cases rather sinuous. One cannot avoid recalling the similarities in the morphology of the green in lowland Cumberland, with those of ~~north-~~west County Durham - for example, Eggleston and Cockfield(9), where the close link between green and open fell is forged by means of a wide droveway or outgang. Linear greens, and two-row structures which comprise the majority of village plans in lowland Cumberland, accord particularly closely with village plans in the north west of County Durham. Interestingly, (with one exception) none of these Gilsland villages resembled the distinctive village form encountered in eastern County Durham, where "regular" village plans are recognisable - comprising above all a broad, rectangular almost geometrical green, with regular row structures encasing it. This comparison of village forms east and west of the Pennines has thus uncovered some interesting features, which may be of significance when the ultimate origins of the village plan are questioned. Clearly the examples observed in Gilsland closely resemble the more

land. The plan shows a green village encountered in the western portion of County Durham. There was however, one apparent exception to this generalisation. The village of Laversdale, located to the north west of the Irthing (Fig. 4:1) is a case in point. In 1863, (Fig. 4:2) it comprised of four, albeit discontinuous rows, set around a broad, roughly square green - a striking contrast to neighbouring settlement. Time did not permit a detailed examination of this village, but reference to the Field Book indicated that Laversdale was somewhat unique, especially in the relationship between the houses and appurtenant fields. (10)

Beyond the distinctive category of two-row village plan, Gilsland affords examples of settlements, some with what was once a form of green, and some without the same. These cluster settlements do not possess a readily identifiable ground-plan which lends itself to classification. The villages of Farlam and Walton Wood fall into this rather ill-defined category of village plan, which by 1863 had become extremely difficult to identify in the absence of any characteristic structural elements. This final settlement category concludes the survey of village forms in southern Gilsland. The review has been intendedly cursory but it is believed that a number of valuable points have been identified. It is reasonable to state, in the light of the findings, that a surprising number of villages in Gilsland display an overall similarity in plan and hence structural elements. The two row, linear green village, rather irregular in construct seems to be the dominant species of settlement form. Moreover this type of village plan extends far beyond the limits of Fig. 4:1, for between the Eden and the Pennine scarp

to the east southward to Appleby, the villages of Gamblesby, Melmerby, Skirwith, Blencarn, Culgaith and Knock, to identify but a few, all display the unmistakable morphological characteristics of the two-row green village. The implications are fascinating, but here the study must terminate in order to examine the effects of morphological change, as wrought in the village of Cumwhitton. The detail afforded by analysis at a much higher level of resolution, in a sense complements and balances the more general observations compiled so far.

The study of village morphology, with particular reference to Cumwhitton

Cumwhitton is the only settlement within the confines of the prescribed study area, which lends itself to retrogressive morphological analysis. As a preliminary and necessary backcloth to an examination of Cumwhitton's morphology, a short discussion of the site of the village was considered to be of value. Several detailed settlement studies have placed considerable emphasis upon the characteristics of site, not least among them Conzen in his fine study of settlement evolution, focussing upon Alwick town. (11) However, Cumwhitton did not lend itself to a similar study because no profound or obvious linkages between village site and village form could be detected in a strictly topographical sense. Cumwhitton's site has little to distinguish itself from its environs, in fact the site in itself is somewhat featureless. As one approaches the village from the north, the line of houses which comprise the north-west row can just be detected, as the village is situated on a slightly elevated ridge at its lowest in the east (352') and rising gradually in the west to 370'. The highest point in the village interestingly enough (and perhaps significantly?) is the village

church standing at 376'. To the north, west and south of the village the land falls gradually and merges imperceptibly with the surrounding countryside at c.350'. If the topography of the village as regards site seems rather featureless, and hence places little value on closer scrutiny of micro-topography, there is one important physical feature which cannot be omitted. I refer in this instance to (Plate 3) Cumwhitton Beck. Attention was drawn in Chapter Two to this stream. In this case, the form of the village seems to have been closely determined by local site characteristics - i.e. the beck. (Figs. 4:3 and Plate 3 illustrate the dominance of this natural feature.) Notice the way in which the Beck delimits the northerly tofts and likewise those longer tofts in the south-east. The importance of a constant water supply to centres of human occupation appears to have been of paramount importance in the original site selection of the village. Yet, one cannot avoid the possibility that the course of the beck could have been altered intentionally - especially if in Fig. 2:2, the curious swing in its course is examined. All this, however, is speculative, and even field observation could do little to prove whether in fact the course was natural. The implications of the problem are nonetheless fascinating.

Moving on to an analysis of the morphology of Cumwhitton in 1840 and then in 1603, it is worth mentioning at this point that the structural elements which make up the morphology of any settlement, can be most effectively discussed under two broad headings - public and private land. (12) The distinction between the two is important, and forms the framework in which morphological change will be examined.

i) Public Land

The first and perhaps most important morphological element in the category - public land, is the green. In 1840, the green (stippled for ease of identification) (Fig. 4:3) was highly irregular in form - roughly linear, widening slightly near the centre of the village, opposite the church. It was interrupted by "islands" of occupation on its central portions and at its south-western extremity. In 1603, the characteristics of the green were much changed, for during the period 1603-1840, the green had undergone considerable metamorphosis (Fig. 4:3, ii). Houses located on the central portions of the green and according to the 1603 Field Book, their "yards" were still recognisable features, but the absence of the garths, orchards and garden plots which had appeared by 1840 meant that the green of 1603 was very extensive. In fact, in its seventeenth century form the green was unmistakably triangular, with the apex in the north-east and the base at the south-western end (Fig. 4:3). One surprising point emerges, however, in 1603 for the houses according to the map of that date appear to have sat on the green, thus blurring the distinction between public and private land. (13) This point will be returned to when the tofts or garden enclosures which comprise the row structures of the village are considered.

Notice also the curious protruberance of one farm-unit onto the green at its south-western corner (Fig. 4:3,ii). Exit and entrance to the village at this point are considerably restricted, and it is at this stage that the question of the function of the green is recalled. Indeed Cumwhitton was easily defensible, and was akin to what the Rev. Oliver labelled a "closed-village".

The importance of the green in the regulation of livestock movement is evident in the particular instance of Cunwhitton. It is the ruteways, however, which forge the pastoral link between green and pasture. Two types of routeway may in 1840 (Fig. 4:3,i) be identified - the throughway, which swings noticeably into the village from the north, merges imperceptibly with the green and again swings sharply out of the village at the western end. The routeways and access-lanes, maintained their exact courses and characteristics in 1603 (Fig. 4:3,ii) with one exception. The approach route from the south in 1603 bulged noticeably just before it entered the green. The reasons for this morphological characteristic are unclear, but the "bulge" probably served a type of pastoral function similar to the green - that was, to control livestock movement.

ii) Private Land

Several morphological elements can be viewed under one heading - private land. The first relates to the assemblage of buildings in Cunwhitton, or alternatively, the row structures. In 1840 the assemblage of buildings fell into three readily recognised rows. The first, and most northerly appears initially rather irregular but on closer inspection a relatively regular building line is discernible (Fig. 4:3,i). The most southerly row is far more haphazard, with buildings aligned at differing angles, whilst the third "row" on the south-west consists of two buildings only, forming a short, incomplete "head-row". The row structures are inseparable from the second element - the tofts or house plots. In 1840, in accordance with the Tithe Plan, the assemblage of buildings are physically linked with their respective tofts. Both elements in short constitute

private land, yet in 1603 the two were physically detached. Row structures, in the northwest row only in 1603 were classifiable as public land (Fig. 4:3,ii). (14) In 1603 also, the "head-row" similarly located on the green was more developed, (comprising incidentally the Tithe Barn and Priest's Chamber, long since disappeared). In contrast, the houses of the southern row in 1603 were enclosed, as in 1840, within their respective crofts, for tofts are absent here, and instead continuous crofts radiate outwards from the house-plots. Tofts in 1603 are absent adjoining the buildings of the head-row. As regards the evaluation and measurement of change with respect to toft boundaries between 1840 and 1603, considerable difficulties were encountered. If the scale at which the original village plan was drawn (little more than a thumb-nail sketch) is considered, the difficulties are easily identified. There were a number of features, however, which permitted the plotting of the 1603 boundaries, as accurately as was possible. These were certain fundamental elements of the morphology which had not changed apparently between 1603 and 1840, and could therefore be adopted as fixed points.

Tofts in Fig. 4:3,ii have been numbered to facilitate comparison with the figure above. The boundaries of tofts 1 and 2 had experienced little change between 1603 and 1840, although toft 3 does appear to be slightly narrower than its counterpart in 1840, but still wider than 1 and 2. Again tofts 4 and 5 seem unchanged, whilst toft 6 represents a subdivision of a larger and later toft. Change then is discernible here, but again stability of the eastern boundary of toft 7 provides an additional point of reference.

Toft 8, as in 1840 was in 1603, still an anomalously large toft. The accuracy of the Tithe Map of 1840, and the apparent stability in toft boundaries on the north-western row, led the author to examine this now at closer quarters. It was in 1603, clearly different in its morphological construct from the remaining rows of the village. One is tempted to speculate as to the possible historical significance of this section of the village plan hence harking back to its ultimate origins. But, alas - documentary evidence prohibits such an exercise. Attention is drawn however, to Fig. 4:3,ii and to the toft widths or frontages represented thereon. There are reasonable grounds for detecting a similarity in "toft width" between tofts 1,2,3,4 and 7. In view of these superficial characteristics, the writer decided to test the method known as "metrological" analysis in order to express these relationships in more precise terms. (15) The toft widths, or frontages present in 1603, were measured in accordance with the Tithe Map scale, and the results are tabulated below:

Toft Number	Toft Width in Feet	Toft Area 1603			Relationship between Toft Width and the Rod of 16.5'
		A.	R.	P.	
1	231	2	3	0	14
2	231	2	2	15	14
3	233	2	3	10	14
4	99	1	0	10	6
5	165	1	2	0	10
6	66	0	3	0	4
7	99	1	0	15	16
8	264	not supplied			-

Some interesting points emerge if these results are examined carefully, although there is no crystal clear pattern of toft widths

to be identified. Tofts 1,2,3 are comparable both in width, or frontage and area, as also are tofts 4 and 7. The remaining tofts are more problematical and it is difficult to establish their numerical relationship with the others. The conclusions of metrological analysis, as applied to Cumwhitton northern row must therefore be rather tentative. There may be just a suggestion of metrical regularity underlying the dimensions and lay-out of the tofts in this northern row - but the evidence is admittedly rather flimsy. The relationship in a metrical sense between the toft-widths may indeed be there but they are extremely difficult to unravel. It is fascinating to consider the implications of that final column, in the table. In the second chapter it was concluded that the surveyors of William Howard were using a statute acre. It might be assumed (although with caution) that these tofts were laid out with a rod of 16.5'. When this assumption is tested, the results are intriguing, for, many of the toft widths are exact multiples of this rod length!

Leaving aside the northern row structure, and all the speculation encircling it, the study must return to consider the experience of the remainder of the village in the face of change. Those tofts on the south-eastern-row (Fig. 4:3,ii) experienced considerable change of toft boundaries between 1603 and 1840, but the long continuous crofts further south displayed marked stability.

Finally, the morphological element, Cumwhitton church should be examined. In 1840, as in 1603, the church, set at a conspicuous angle to the rest of the row, protruded furthermore, in front of this row. Little change was apparently registered in the proportions of the tiny church toft, whose locational implications will be

reviewed in the following chapter.

Cumwhitton village then, during the prescribed period experienced both features of change (some of which are of particular interest to the historical geographer) as well as many features of stability. It should not be overlooked that these observations drew heavily from two snap-shot "stills" of reality. Undoubtedly, the two hundred and fifty years which separated the documents must have witnessed transient changes in village morphology, which can never be discovered. Yet, as a close study of this single village has demonstrated, Cumwhitton village experienced remarkably little change in its constituent morphology. The picture in 1603 was admittedly much simpler, but the major structural elements - the row structures, the tofts (their boundaries in particular) and the green were still identifiable. Yet in dissecting the morphological elements of the village, one cannot avoid contemplating the curious construct of Cumwhitton in 1603 - the singularity of the north-western row, and its tantalising metrical implications: the absence of tofts in the southern row and instead long continuous crofts: the buildings on the green: the size and location of the church toft. These in turn raise fascinating questions of the relative age of each section of the village plan, and above all the ultimate origins and proto-form of Cumwhitton itself. At this point discussion would depart from the known to the unknown - a tantalising problem on which it is hoped additional light will be shed in the following chapter. But in conclusion, a unifying bridge has been forged between the broader aims of Chapter Three which adopted a progressive view, and the higher level of resolution to which the latter part of this chapter has been dedicated and which adopted a retrogressive viewpoint.

Chapter 4 - Notes

1. Roberts (1970a) 275. He has developed the study of settlement form and outlined a type of methodology which may be followed in doing so.
See also Sheppard (1966) & Sheppard (1972); Roberts (1969); Roberts (1970b); Roberts (1971).
2. Thorpe (1965) in Watson and Sissons, 360-361.
3. Smailes (1968) 102.
4. Graham (1918) 95-100.
5. Beresford and Hurst (1971) 185.
6. Beresford (1963) cites examples of isolated churches - indicators of deserted medieval villages.
7. See for example Thorne (1949) 75 who suggested possible pastoral and military functions of greens.
8. Beresford (1954) 120.
9. Roberts (1970a) Other examples of Durham village plans to be consulted on p. 240, 241.
10. In the Field Book Graham, ed. (1937) 25, Laversdale village appears to have been split between the five tenants of the "Eastfield" and five tenants of the "Westfield". In the former case, all tenants held 61 acres, whilst in the latter all held 64 acres. This remarkable uniformity and regularity, no doubt reflected in the village plan, indicates the scope for much future research here.
11. Conzen (1960) (Alnwick study).
12. Roberts (1971)
13. Graham (1937) Field Book, see p. 122 for evidence of farm-house on the green.
14. One cannot overlook the possibility that the depiction of these houses in front of their tofts may be more apparent than real, i.e. the cartographer adopted this style to maintain perspective.

11. Helminthological analysis has been adopted by Swedish workers notably Goransson (1961) and, Roberts (1970c) for County Durham villages, and Sheppard (1972) in Yorkshire.

Chapter 5

Landownership in Cumwhitton 1603-1800

Aims and Objectives

Treatment of a topic so complex as landownership, will for the purposes of the historical geographer resolve itself into two distinct sections. The first will deal with the non-spatial aspects of landownership and will involve a thorough examination of landownership problems peculiar to the North country - exercising care not to lose sight of the wider context of things. The repercussions of what are essentially the "non-geographic" aspects of landownership - including the incidents of tenure, and the manner in which tenures are hierarchically organised, as opposed to the spatial expression of their organisation. "Land tenure" is most effectively defined for the purposes of this study as,

... the manners and conditions of service by which lands are held of the lord (1);

and the intricacies of tenure form basic ingredients in a framework which manifests itself spatially ^{into} as what D.R. Denman has termed a "proprietary land system". (2) The second section in contrast will involve the translation of the landownership information relating to the seventeenth century and later into spatial terms - concentrating particularly upon the disposition and patterns of landownership and occupance.

a) Problems of northern landownership in the seventeenth century

In order to obtain a clear understanding of Cumbrian landownership characteristics an attempt will be made to draw together the

evidence available in secondary sources concerning landownership and tenure in North West England between about 1600 and 1800.

W.H.B. Graham in his article entitled "The Border Manors" (3) postulated a simple, descriptive model which may be seen as three nested systems which formed the infrastructure for landownership.

- i) The great overlords of the baronies held by the crown.
- ii) Lords of petty manors, dependents and kinsmen of the great barons.
- iii) Customary tenants of manors occupying the soil.

The two uppermost tiers of the landownership pyramid will be dealt with presently, but it is to the third category - the customary tenants, that attention will be turned initially. At this level, the man-land relationship (4) is at its most intimate, yet, as will become evident in later discussion, the relationship was by no means simple or direct.

The close of the sixteenth and onset of the seventeenth century was to witness important changes in systems of landownership. (5) Northern customary tenure in the form in which it existed at the onset of the seventeenth century has received considerable attention. (5) The question of security in customary tenure is of central importance as it was just one of the facets of landownership which became subject to change. The situation in the north of England in the sixteenth and seventeenth century is summarised as follows by Kerridge (6):

In the north-west and north-eastern lowlands, and the north country, the prevailing tenure was tenant-right. Customers by tenant-right were bound to do military service on the borders.

This generalised statement is not in fact entirely true. In the context of the sixteenth and seventeenth century, tenant-right was

undoubtedly built into customary tenure - but to suggest that it bore such a symbiotic relationship to the duty of border service appears rather erroneous. In fact this very misconception was one of the root causes in the struggle of tenant-right which was to bedevil Cumbrian tenants and their lords in the early seventeenth century. A brief outline of these troubles will be provided, chiefly because in tracing the "tenant-right" struggle considerable insight into the key-notes of northern tenure may be gained.

The "tenant-right" barangue was precipitated it seems by the actions of James I who in 1603, believing Border Service to be an integral component of northern customary tenure, decided to eliminate this service. (7) He in addition declared that ancient body of regulations known as "tenant-right" thereafter extinguished. Tenant response to these proposals was at once bitter. In defence of threats which could undermine their time honoured rights as occupiers of the land, a series of suits was presented at Carlisle Assizes against Lord William Howard, who was endeavouring to carry out his monarch's wishes. Cumbrian tenants clung fiercely to their ancient rights and privileges which stood to be infringed - especially those relating to their customary estates of inheritance. One cannot, of course be sure of the exact tenurial conditions which existed prior to these troubles, because of the enormous variability which could be encountered from one manor to the next. (8) (App. 5:1) Lord William proposed from 1603 onward, that the existing customary tenures be substituted by twenty-one year leases, together with the obligation to pay "reasonable rents". It is not difficult to envisage tenant reaction to such proposals - Bouch has even alleged that tenurial conditions enjoyed in the North were "tantamount to freehold" (9)

although retaining the following reservations:

... though the northern customary tenant with an estate of inheritance seems to have been in a much safer position than some tenants further south who only had copyhold for life, there is evidence to show that the security of his holding was not complete.

Security of land occupance there could not possibly be if Lord William Howard's proposals were enforced yet Gilsland tenants apparently submitted in 1610 to his terms. Submission, however, was not quite so immediate elsewhere in Cumberland and Westmorland especially in the Barony of Kendal where the struggle raged for several years. But finally, after the death of James I in 1625, it was decided at a national level in 1626 that the tenants were justified in their claims of antiquity, and that significantly, border service was not an integral condition of Northern customary tenure. Those who claimed to hold their estates by tenant-right continued to do so. The whole matter would seem then to be peaceably settled, but there was just one aspect of landownership - the fine which was to cause sporadic friction between the lord and his tenants throughout the eighteenth century. (10) This constraint will be reexamined shortly.

It is convenient at this point in discussion to review the tenets of customary tenure which have been uncovered so far. The first feature concerns the prevailing tenure in Cumberland commonly referred to as "tenant-right". Its rights and privileges in all probability of great antiquity were jealously guarded. Secondly, the importance of the custom of inheritance emerges with considerable strength and significance in the North. It was the key to relative security and tenurial freedom. To the lord however, these conditions were "thorns in the flesh", unable as he was to intervene in the

conveyance of land, or to substitute new "improved rents". In this sense, the characteristics of seventeenth century northern tenure gain significance for the historical geographer, who must be concerned with changes in the structure of landownership - in as much as they may or may not influence the agrarian landscape - its resistance to or potential to change. (11)

It is of course impossible to evaluate the exact influence of this period of tenurial instability upon an individual manor. Two documents of interest in this context were encountered during research and one has been included for consultation in the appendix. (App. 5:1) The two, dated respectively 1693 and 1631 specifically refer to the custom of tenant-right in the clauses of a conveyance. The importance of tenant-right it seems still lived on. The repercussions of this tenurial struggle in Gilsland at least are evident according to Graham (12) in a negative sense - in that they were directly responsible for the lack of tenurial information supplied within the 1603 survey, (App. 2:1) with the exception of those tenants who held their land "free". (In Cumwhitton the estate of Nunlande was held "free", as was Antonie Scarrow's estate at the Morefoote.(13))

Little attention has so far been directed to the vast array of additional obligations and services which the northern customary tenant might owe his lord. These must be considered because they form part of that body of constraints which intervene in the man-land relationship, and which constitute in toto what Kerridge has termed a "service-tenancy" system. (14) It is to Hutchinson (15) that the study will now turn. The following extract albeit eighteenth century in context, serves as a useful, if not rather over-romanticised introduction to the subject of land tenure conditions:

These bare tenures greatly retard cultivation and the improvement of estates, for the miserable tenant who is to pay an arbitrary fine, and a heriot is perpetually impoverished; presuming the arbitrary fine to be a 2 years rent it may happen that land be subject to a fine upon the death of a tenant sweeps away 4 years value together with a cow horse or best beast, what has the unhappy heir to possess? - his tenement lies unimproved he sinks to old age through a state of abjectness.

It must be remembered that Hutchinson reviewed the situation very much through the spectacles of an agricultural improver, but Bailey and Galley (16) reporting to the Board of Agriculture in 1797 were of much the same opinion. The apparent resistance of Cumbrian tenures to change, is a characteristic of direct and central importance to this study, especially in landscape terms. Hutchinson's caricature of the Cumbrian tenant was no doubt exaggerated, but the case of an individual manor will be examined shortly, so that a reasonable perspective may be presented. One important set of monetary burdens, however, do merit closer attention. These were the fines to which reference has already been made. It is not easy to summarise concisely this particular facet of the "service tenancy" system but several sources have been drawn together in an attempt to do so. The most lucid breakdown of the system of fines is provided by Thomas Ramshay in an uncatalogued volume dated 1772. There were first two basic types of fine - the General Fine, payable upon the death of the lord. It was alternatively labelled the "twenty penny" fine, being twenty times the "ancient yearly rent". The second type of fine was payable upon the death of a tenant. The estate could then be passed on either by alienation or by inheritance, and the fines were respectively known as alienation (or dropping fines), and descent fines. These were fixed at two years improved rent viz, double what the estate would give if it was let. The letting rent, according to Huddleston (17)

were no relationship to the ancient or lord's rent. These second fines were in contrast with those of the first category arbitrary, whilst the former were certain. The whole functioning system of monetary payments, will it is hoped emerge with more clarity when the entire landownership framework of Cumwhitton is reviewed.

This section it is hoped has provided a general introductory basis for the discussion which is to follow, which intends to dissect the multidimensional aspects of the system of landownership in one Cumbrian manor as it can be discerned from the study of the historical record.

b) The hierarchical and spatial components of the systems of landownership as evidenced in Cumwhitton

The manor of Cumwhitton forms the functional unit for the following discussion. To what extent the manor functioned as a separate entity in the seventeenth century in a political sense, and exactly how the manors of Gilsland functioned within the Barony are largely unknown. Bouch too has echoed that the intricacies of Gilsland administration are somewhat obscure (18), but one thing is certain, that the boundaries of Cumwhitton manor (naturally defined as they were) were to retain functional significance through to the late nineteenth century (19). The ecclesiastical unit, Cumwhitton parish was coterminous with the manorial unit, and so it would seem was the military unit according to sixteenth century evidence, the "bailifworke". (20) The nesting of political systems at the regional level was complex, but it was equally so at the level of the individual manor. Graham's model forms a useful basis in the understanding initially of the hierarchical organisation in Gilsland. At the apex, in 1603 stood Lord William Howard - lord of the Barony and also lord of Cumwhitton manor. It is of interest to

note that his interest in the "soil" of Cumwhitton was not apparently direct in 1603. Yet by 1626 (21) the large conspicuous holding in the west of the village (Plate 1) was recorded as the demesne farm.

Below Lord William in the "ladder of tenures", the situation is particularly interesting. Eighteenth century source material revealed that Hornsby was not merely a secondary village, subordinate to Cumwhitton, but that it in fact constituted a "mesne lordship" - a manor within a manor. This situation was by no means unknown in Gilsland, for both Brampton and Irthington manors incorporated submanors. To what extent Hornsby manor functioned as a separate system, is difficult to ascertain, but it was discovered from source material lodged in Carlisle (22) that Hornsby in 1674 at least possessed a Court Baron. Scanty records testify that it was still held in 1804 and 1809. But the Court Baron at Hornsby was an extremely local affair, for the inhabitants constituted the jury, and the court was held in a tenants' house. The petty lord of the manor (Mr. Dacre in 1603, see the Survey) presided - but exactly how the petty lord fitted into the system of the collection of fines and rents (usually carried out by the steward) is unknown. Court cases, involving lengthy correspondence in 1796 and 1797 (23) do clarify the situation. They were concerned with the rights of one John Atkinson (the then petty lord of Hornsby) and his claim to the common prior to enclosure:

Four or five centuries past, the Barony of Gilsland granted panels and tenements in Hornsby to one Christopher Dacre - these tenements have since been demise'd in 1688, or granted out by Dacre to sundry persons (12 or 13) who now hold them by custom called Tenant Right but besides these tenements there are a great many others there which have always been held under the Earl of Carlisle (the then Lord of Gilsland) parcell of the manor of Cumwhitton their lands lie intermixed.

The extract is of great value for it touches upon a number of problems which have been considered to date. It will be remembered that in the survey of 1603, Hornsby harboured "elusive tenants" of which only nine are accounted for in the text. In addition to the tenants directly related to Lord William, there were in 1688, some twelve or more tenants. Hornsby then, comprised around twenty tenants, a more sizeable village than was initially realised, which serves to emphasise more vividly the size to which it had shrunk (Chapter Three) by the mid nineteenth century.

The extract is also of value as it introduces the concept of intermixed land occupancy - where the interests of two or more manors were closely juxtaposed. But the situation in Cumwhitton was even more complicated, for, at Moorthwaite (which again in 1603 harboured "elusive tenants") the inconsistencies of recording became now much clearer. Some of the tenants of Moorthwaite belonged not to the administrative system of Cumwhitton manor, but to the adjoining manor of Corby, located to the north west. The tenants of "Murthat" are recorded not in the Fine Books, Call Books, or Court Books of Cumwhitton but in the records of the Court Baron of Corby (24) which survive for 1674, 1675 and 1677. Eight tenants are listed, which would imply that Moorthwaite in the late seventeenth century possessed at least eleven tenants. In this way, a measure of accuracy can be built into the observations of the second chapter.

But the mosaic of interlocking and overlapping systems does not halt here. In documents dated 1502 and 1530 (25) the tenants of Northsceugh are referred to as, curiously enough, the tenants of Ainstable - the manor which adjoined Cumwhitton in the south.

The spatial implications of this information are again of interest to the historical geographer. The manor, in this part of Cumberland cannot be regarded as a closed territorial and political system. There are in addition two minor parties who also possessed a corpus of rights over the soil of Cumwhitton. These were essentially ecclesiastical. The Cathedral Priory of Carlisle possessed the small church toft adjoining the church in Cumwhitton (Fig. 2:1) whilst Armathwaite Nunnery retained linkages with the estate of Hunfield (Fig. 2:2). Armathwaite nunnery granted Nunlande/field as a gift, but the exact date is unknown, - the tenant of Nunlande was obliged to render a cartload of coals and a goose annually to the nunnery. (26)

This section, in conclusion has sought to identify what amount to multiple rights to the soil in Cumwhitton in both a spatial and hierarchical sense. Cumwhitton, the single manor, departs strikingly from the model of the "one lord, one village, one manor", so often postulated as the normal situation. Reality in a seventeenth century context is infinitely more complex. The manor embodies a number of interacting systems - administrative, political and ecclesiastical which overlap and interlock. This invisible framework constitutes a dimension which must be examined before its spatial implications in landscape terms can be explored.

c) Cumwhitton - its land tenancy and system of land occupancy

This section will, it is hoped, set Cumwhitton in a comparative sense, against the general backcloth of land tenure characteristics which has been sketched previously. An attempt will be made to reconstruct the system of legal and monetary ties which actually

bound together into a functional whole the varied components of the landownership pattern. For this purpose, two sixteenth century documents provide basic information which relates to the way in which land was organized in Cumwhitton. The first dated 1502, is an extract (27) from a feodary of the lands of Thomas Dacre in Gilsland and refers to the manor of Cumwhitton:

At the same place (Cumwhitton) the lord holds 21 messuages and 40 bovates of land which pay £6-15-4d annually. The lord holds 8 cottages and lands adjacent (gardens) - 12s-10d.

Bovates, then were the units by which lands were rated in this part of Cumberland. The presence of a two-tiered tenantry - those who possessed messuages in bovates, and secondly, those who were cottagers. This basic stratification of the village community will recur throughout ensuing discussion. The second source (28) does not add a great deal to the skeletal information of the first, but was derived from a document dated 1530 and headed "The Earl of Carlisle's Muniments":

There is at Cumquitton 12 messuages and 8 cottages. From this we may deduce that the first source probably incorporated a number of outlying farms (if reference to the 1626 rental is a guide); in the 1626 Rental for Gilsland (29) a similar situation is described. The tenants of Cumwhitton "at the will of the lord" are again divided into two classes. The first group comprises 21 tenants whose holdings may be taken as "husbandlands". The term employed in the rental is somewhat unusual, for nowhere else in the Gilsland Rental is it applied to any other manor (although it is a common term throughout the north of England), and moreover, no other tenants in the manor of Cumwhitton are so classified.

The Patent Rolls of England (1 Hen VII - 1485) (30) support the presence of husbandlands within Cumwhitton viz:

In Cumwhitton, parcel of Irthington are 9 messuages and lands and meadow adjacent called husbondlandys.

The second class of tenantry are labelled "cottagers" and comprise 6 at Cumwhitton, 6 at Moorthwaite and 4 at Hornsby. Their rents were nominal, and each cottager possessed a small garden or garth and perhaps one or two acres of land.

Thus far, information relating to land occupancy in Cumwhitton has been essentially verbal and non-spatial. But it is now possible to introduce the areal dimension from the records of the 1603 survey. From it actual acreages can be extracted. If indeed the husbandland units in which Cumwhitton was assessed, were occupied by the husbandmen in the 1626 Rental, is it possible to detect any regularity in farm-unit size, perhaps approximating to the Northern husbandland of 30 acres (where, according to Seebohm (31) two bovates at 15 acres equalled one husbandland)? In this context the Table in App. 5:2 attempts to relate the 1603 survey to the Rental of 1626. It is apparent that the average size of a tenement in Cumwhitton village was 18 acres, the range represented is between 14 and 26 acres. It is possible from these observations to forward some tentative suggestions that:

- a) Cumwhitton farm units display a rough similarity in size.
- b) each farm unit, as it was recorded in 1603 approximates rather to a one bovat husbandland, rather than two.

It is tantalising to speculate upon the significance of these characteristics. There is an identifiable sense of equality discernible

in the acreages of Table 2. The presence of half units is equally distinctive, but can these observations be carried further? At first it was thought not, until a fascinating document lodged at Carlisle (32) came to light. It is dated 1558 and again is a Rental for Cumwhitton manor. Unfortunately its contents present difficulties. The time-lapse between 1603 and 1558 renders the task of relating the two by tenants' names, difficult. The contents of the fiscal rental have thus been included in Table 2 but do not correspond to the names of 1626 and 1603. But, three points must be made. Firstly, that a remarkable regularity of recorded tenement acreages cannot escape notice. Secondly, the striking similarity between the theoretical size of a husbandland, and those recorded here (15 acres), - again half husbandland units are readily identifiable, and thirdly the remarkable relationship between acreage and ancient rent. The writer however, does not intend to place too much emphasis upon the recordings of this curious document for the village of Cumwhitton. Can, for example, the stark regularity reflect reality? Or, did the surveyors simply enter the acreages to approximate as near as was possible to theoretical husbandland holdings, ignoring variabilities and deviations? These questions are not easily answered. The problem of perception is of uppermost concern in the interpretation of this early document, and for this reason no conclusive "explanations" can be formulated. Suffice to say for the present at least, that the acreages of farm-units within Cumwhitton village display some intriguing features of size. The relationship in 1626 of these, to their fiscal assessment is not clear, unlike that exhibited by the 1558 rental (App.5:2) which are curiously substantially more than those of 1626. There are however,

some noticeably smaller farm units which incidentally, and perhaps, significantly are fragmented paying markedly less than the majority of husbandmen in 1626. This observation concludes the examination of Table 2 and from here the discussion will turn to examine the 1626 Rental in isolation.

Recorded within this survey is some very valuable information which discloses the array of services, in that service-tenancy system, which bound the tenants of the manor to their lord (William Howard). The tenants were obliged to render the following:

- 1) payment of an antient yearly rent
- 2) payment of multure money or cofn silver
- 3) payment of an annual custom - fosterfee (33)
- 4) payment of "mossfarm"
- 5) payment of landseriant fee
- 6) payment of "greenhughs", for the right to collect the lord's wood
- 7) a boundary fee. The tenants in 1626 no longer repaired the boundaries.
- 8) a "Mobile Rent" - this applied to two tenants of Moorthwaite who were to render annually "as of old" two capons to their lord. The tenants of Cumwhitton in 1502 and 1530 owed respectively 36 harvest days and 38 boon days to their lord - perhaps remnants of a medieval servitude.

At this point discussion again turns to the question of fines. A search was conducted through the suites of Fine Books for the Barony, and a few examples have been extracted for Cumwhitton manor. In this way the most direct view of the type of fines payable can be achieved. (34)

1700 Elizabeth Bailton heir to Richard fine £5-10-0 on the death of Thomas Dobinson for a messuage and tenement at the antient yearly rent of 1s-0d.

1692 Thomas Langrig for a General Fine, at the antient yearly rent of 5s-2d, fine £5-3-4d.

1725 Thomas Pearson purchases of Johnathan Gibson at the antient yearly rent of 1s-4d, fine £1-3-6d.

The above entries indicate the three different fines which a tenant in Cumwhitton may pay; viz, a general Fine, an alienation fine, and a dropping fine. Cumwhitton manor then accords well with the conditions of customary tenure which applied throughout Cumberland in general.

c) Bowman's survey of 1828 and its contribution to the understanding of landownership

A cursory review of E. Bowman's survey is at this point necessary, although the survey in reality lies beyond the chronological limits of this chapter. Nevertheless, the Field Books (35) contain some information of relevance, which no doubt refers to a tenurial situation of some antiquity. Each tenement is meticulously recorded together with the type of tenure by which an estate was held. Surprisingly, customary tenure was by no means as straightforward as it would seem. On the contrary, a range of terms, some of them rather obscure, were utilised in the survey:

Customary tenure simple
ancient customary tenure
ancient land.

The final category is puzzling. It can hardly relate to a type of tenure, yet it is singled out as a specific "type". The second and third categories presumably indicate forms of tenure of some antiquity as distinct from the first category. Only a close examination of these terms for the whole of Gilsland, may be able to shed a clearer

light upon the problem. The spatial manifestation of these tenure-types in Cumwhitton will be examined shortly.

Part II - Patterns of landownership in Cumwhitton in 1603

The landscape of Cumwhitton in 1603, in terms of the spatial organisation of land occupancy displays an astonishing range of contrasting situations. The main problems which emerge will be examined thematically under the following headings: Consolidation, fragmentation and partability. All three relate to the spatial patterns of landownership within the improved lands of the manor, but the final section of the chapter will extend beyond these limits to the encircling commons and waste. The relationship between "inby" land and the commons will thus be considered.

i) Consolidation

Fig. 5:2 will form the key for the ensuing discussion, whilst Fig. 5:3 illustrates the translation of verbal landownership information derived from the 1603 Field Book into spatial terms for Cumwhitton village. Some extremely interesting features are at once apparent. Contrasting shading techniques enable the form and pattern of the individual farm holdings or units to be identified. The pattern is striking. Each unit is roughly wedge-shaped, the farm boundaries forming radiating "spokes" focussing on the hub of the village. This radial pattern permeates the entire township-plan and a logical progression of farm units can be traced in a clock-wise direction, beginning in the North western section (section 1 in Fig. 5:2) and proceeding to the south west sector 4.

Section 1

This North and North western sector of the township (Fig. 5:2)

incorporates the Demosno Farm, which is notable for its size (81a) almost $\frac{1}{2}$ the size of the remaining farm units in this sector.

A second characteristic feature of the section is that a threefold relationship is discernible: farmstead, toft and adjoining fields. The radial spatial pattern is manifest vividly - the progression of farm units mirroring the ordering of tofts in this row. It is obvious, however, that three tofts in this row do not conform to the spatial order characteristic of the others. These will be discussed in due course.

Section II

This section is somewhat anomalous and will be dealt with under the general heading "fragmentation".

Section III

In this south-eastern sector (Fig. 5:2) the sequence or relationship between the toft and the remainder of the farm unit is somewhat "delayed" - farmstead and toft being separate from the fields which are located to the north. There may be a simple explanation for this situation, in that the presence of Cumwhitton Moss could have presented a constraint to the extension of improved lands immediately adjacent to the farmstead and toft. Although the fields are located farther north, the sequence of farmstead order in the village, is nonetheless faithfully mirrored - again, emphasising this radial pattern.

Section IV

It is in this south-westerly sector of the village that the relationship between farmstead and farm is at its most simple. The farmstead is actually located on the wedge-shaped farm-unit. No tofts are present here. The equality of the farm units (Table App.5:2)

is particularly striking and it is here that the themes of radially and consolidation indisputably emerge.

The spatial arrangement of farm-units displays an astounding rational ordering of the land resources of Cumwhitton village. It could even be suggested that the lay-out of farm units in sector 4 in particular, exhibits characteristics not at all unlike twentieth century planned Israeli moshav. The comparison may seem rather far fetched but the inset of Nahalal moshav in Fig. 5:3 (36) proves the point. Radial planning in this case similarly permeated the ground-plan of the entire village, for it permitted the attainment of three principles - accessibility, rationality, and equality. Yet here, in an early seventeenth century context, the same principles of rationality are discernible. It must be stressed that no other townships in the Barony exhibited a comparable spatial lay-out. The opposite was normally the case, for at adjoining manors, Cumrew, Hayton and beyond in Talkin and Castle Carrock, farm holdings lay scattered in small open field parcels throughout the cultivated areas. The pattern of land occupancy was conversely intermixed and fragmentary - not consolidated. Figure 5:1 has been copied as accurately as was possible from one of the suite of maps in the 1603 survey (37). It admirably illustrates the agrarian landscape at Cumrew and Newbiggin, characterised by open strip parcels.

It is tempting to view these variations genetically, and envisage the stellate pattern in sector 1 as an area of primary development originally consisting of village toftlands and possibly scattered ⁵⁸parcels in a form of open field. It will be remembered that attention was drawn in chapter four to this row in the village. Later reorganisation has created this radial pattern of enclosed farms, evident

at the onset of the seventeenth century. It is interesting to speculate as to the nature of the environmental conditions - war, famine, or pestilence which could have engendered a form of deliberate organisational activity. A fragment of information dated 1362 is in this context of value (38):

Ranulph de Dacre seised of the manor of Irthington. Brampton ... the extent includes 36 acres of meadow worth nothing because they cannot be let ... on account of the herbage in these parts, divers holdings of tenants at will which have been unoccupied for many years by reason of the destruction done by the Scots ... the rents of the tenants at will in Cumquityngton and lands there formerly held by tenants at will NOW LONG SINCE WASTE.

The writer is not suggesting that these incidents were the propagators of reorganisation - merely that the extract illustrates just one of many occasions of destruction after which, ruined tenements lying wasted, may have been replanned (39) or relaid out.

The concept or idea of radiality may have grown gradually with the development of sectors 3 and 4 (Fig. 5:2). This however, is pure hypothesis but it is a possible explanation for the observed patterns. It is surely significant that the church toft is an intake in the driftway between sectors 3 and 4 (Fig. 5:3). The church is at least nine hundred years old architecturally (40) and is first documented in the thirteenth century. It is not the purpose of the thesis to carry the argument toward ultimate origins, but the chronological implications are fascinating. Nunlande or Nunfield which adjoins sector 4, was donated to Armathwaite nunnery, itself founded in the reign of William Rufus. Unfortunately the date of the acquisition of Nunlande in Cumwhitton cannot be ascertained but it was certainly in its possession in the fourteenth century.(41)

It is at this point that the study returns to Bowman's Survey of 1828. The light its tenurial detail sheds upon the village of Cumwhiton alone is fascinating. The majority of the tenements at Cumwhiton in 1828 were held by customary tenure. All the tenements in sector 1 were held by some form of ancient customary tenure, whilst sectors 2, 3 and 4 are merely classified as "customary". This is an interesting dichotomy which is spatially distinct, and may be of significance in terms of the relative chronology of the two morphological sections of the village. Secondly, the writer proposes that the tenements labelled "ancient land" and "ancient customary" may be coincident with those very tenements which, prior to the seventeenth century were held by that ancient tenure of "tenant-right".

ii) Fragmentation

Two instances of what amount to the total opposite of the findings so far, have been selected to demonstrate the theme of fragmentation within the manor. Figure 5:4 illustrates that the disposition of field ~~parcels~~^{sc} is in this sector (2) rather anomalous, comprising small open field parcels of intermixed occupancy. The relationship between farmstead and farm here is rather intriguing because some of the farms with land in this sector were in reality cottages. Reference to Table 2 indicates that the tenants - Weller, Rea and Watson who possessed noticeably smaller farm units, held land in sector 2. Oddly enough, the farmsteads of Weller and Watson were located in the north-westerly row of the village, unlike the remaining tenants in this sector, Wilson Rea and Person who possessed cottages located on the green. Yet one tenant, a Jo. Earle occupied a tenement in sector 2 (Fig. 5:4) which was in form rather more akin to those in sector 1 - being a consolidated wedge-shaped unit.

It is indeed interesting that the three smallest tofts in the north westerly row of Cumwhitton belonged to farms with land in sector 2. There must be some linkage however tenuous between toft, size and disposition of farm holding and the status of the peasant. Yet the relationship is extremely hard to grasp. Whatever the ultimate origins of fragmented land occupancy it certainly contrasts with the status quo throughout the rest of the village. But a glance beyond the village of Cumwhitton to the remainder of the manor is instructive.

The survey of 1603 (Fig. 2:1) records some interesting details of landownership for the western extremity of the Moorfootfield. It is fortunate that the surveyors for Lord William seem to have attached some importance to the land of one James Scarrow (see F/B, App. 2:1 p. 126) who held 2 fieldparcels in each of the four furlongs of the field. The panels were moreover open, tenants of the panels adjoining those of Scarrow are only mentioned in passing - Greme, Dodd, Coulthard, Atkinson and Muncaster. (These were presumably, tenants of Corby manor.) Although the information available affords only a glimpse of the spatial disposition of holdings there are hints of a recurring pattern, for Scarrow's fieldparcels generally fall between those of Dodd and Greme. Above and beyond this, little can be added except to say that at Moorthwaite, farming was practised in small fragmented farm units which formed part of a larger area of a single open common field. This situation was to survive until 1832 when a portion of the field was enclosed. In so doing the following details are disclosed (41):

... in Moorthwaite Common field - several parties thereto were entitled to their several open dales or panels of the said common field and some such dales or panels were of customary tenure held under the said Earl of Carlisle for a customary estate of inheritance according to the custom of the manor of

Cumwhitton, and under customary tenure under the said Henry Howard for a customary rent according to the manners of Great and Little Corby ...

To summarise, the parties with an interest in the newly enclosed land were:

- 1) The Earl of Carlisle, lord of Cumwhitton
- 2) Henry Howard of Corby Castle
- 3) Thomas Graham of Scotby (freeholder)
- 4) George Dixon of Whinnyhill (freeholder)
- 5) plus several customary tenants who actually tilled the soil.

The above case study admirably illustrates not only the recurrent themes of intermixture and fragmentation, but also the complex overlapping of landownership interests which were in this case extended over an area little more than 30 acres.

Little extra light can be shed on the landownership situation in the rest of the manor - the situation at Hornsby being beset with many difficulties. But perhaps the case of the hamlet at Low North-Sceugh can add a little more depth to the study. Here the 1603 survey discloses that the land here was equally divided between three tenants - but exactly how, be it in intermixed parcels or consolidated holdings, is never revealed. In the court leet records for 1758 the following was discovered, (43)

... by virtue of an order, the jury were called in to view the Common Field at Low Noscue in dispute between Robert Leach, William Leach Andrew Irwin - we accordingly set several mark stones by consent of the above upon the evidence of Jacob Nixon, Johnathan Watson and Robert Watson. And likewise an ancient hedge called the Burdike ... the said A. Irwin is to take and keep sufficient and the said Robert Leech is to keep the gate in sufficient repair for time to come.

For it should be fully recognised that the above relates to a situation over 100 years after the 1603 survey. Yet, there are still only three tenants. The passage does imply that intermixed field parcels within a Common Field seems to have been the case here too. That stones should be set may be significant in that it would appear that the boundaries were open. This may all be conjectural, but if in fact these three tenants did hold land in fragmented parcels, then the same may have been the case at Carnbrigknoll. Court leet material is again instructive on this point. In 1794 "disputes had arisen between John Bowman, and Thomas Milburn in Cambridge Common Field" - where a water course had been "opened over several dales" onto the common. The disposition of land at both Low Northsceugh and Carnbrigknoll it would seem was in open intermixed field parcels. Again in complete contrast (Fig. 2:1) illustrates that at High Northsceugh yet another situation was to be encountered.

iii) Partability

This theme in reality is of relevance in the case of Cunwhitton village only. Shared pasture lands and grassgrounde are located in Sector 2 (5:4) around the peripheries of the cultivated land. Two or three tenants possessed land here. Exactly how the shared lands were divided is unknown, neither does the survey expose whether or not the shares were periodically reallocated or not.

Partability, then constitutes the final landownership theme in this section which has referred solely to the cultivated lands. Many of the problems raised will be reconsidered, particularly in Chapter Seven, when the functional aspects of the spatial manifestation of land occupancy are considered, but first landownership with respect to the commons and waste must be considered.

Landownership and the commons

The commons, moorland and waste in Cumwhitton manor comprised important landscape elements in 1603. Some 4,000 acres were classified by Lord William's surveyors as "common". Utilisation of these valuable resources of pasture was not simply uncontrolled. On the contrary the intangible rights of tenant and lord extended from the villages and hamlets and their areally defined farm-units to the pastures beyond. Theoretically the question of landownership and the commons was not a difficult one as the following so explicitly states:

On King Henry Moor, Ainstable and Cumwhitton depasture their cattle and sheep. The Earl of Carlisle is lord and has the soil.(44)

The tenants of the manor were allowed by a body of ancient rights and privileges to utilise the commons viz:

... there are within the several manors divers commons and waste grounds whereon the customary tenants are entitled to the common of pasture for their sheep and cattle levant and couchant on their customary tenements, and to common of Turbary and to the privileges of pulling furze and fern to be spent and consumed in their customary houses. (45)

A draught copy of the enclosure Bill for Cumwhitton dated 1796 is valuable in that it adds information regarding the way in which tenant was bound to lord as far as the commons are concerned,

... waste grounds called King Harry subject nevertheless to certain limited and particular rights and privileges of several owners or occupiers of lands and tenements with the township of Cumrew and other townships and villages to depasture their cattle and sheep thereon, under and by virtue of the payment of an annual pasture rent or Moorfarm Rent. (46)

Not only does the passage emphasise that landownership with respect to the commons constituted a bundle of complex rights and privileges, but that King Harry Common is emerging as a distinctive and important

pasture reservoir. The feodary for Thomas Dacre of Gilsland dated 1500, to which reference has already been made provides additional detail relating to the organisation of economic activity on this common:

The lord holds at Cumwhitton of the tenants of Ainstable an escap on King Harry.

The "escap" was a fine for stray animals. Hutchinson quotes from a description of the manor recorded in 1589 thus:

There are divers great commons of waste and heath, namely King Henry, Cumwhitton Moor, Northsceugh, Ormesby Moor and others ... Wherein the tenants do common their beasts and cattle. In the time of the late Cuthbert Gray of King Henry fell-end, a flock of whethers, and their pasture was of a several place of the wasters of moor called King Henry. The bounds of the same moor lay open and not enclosed, were very well known, and none of the tenants who had common in the said moor might put their cattle to common within the same, and now it remaineth unstored. (47)

This fragment of evidence provides fascinating insight into the time-honoured claims to the common, which were not translated into landscape terms.

King Harry Common then was a focal point for the intercommoning of beasts from Cumwhitton, Ainstable and Cumrew. Any infringement of closely guarded bye-laws were fiercely contested. In 1730, for example some tenants of Ainstable had allegedly encroached into the territory of Cumwhitton upon King Harry, carrying away "flacks and turves". (48) In 1680 an interesting situation occurred, where the interests of the lord of the manor clashed head on with those of his tenants. The lord of Cumwhitton attempted to improve and enclose a portion of the common at "Dale and Dale Bottom waste". (49) Opposition was at once kindled, for the inhabitants of Cumwhitton are reported

... throwing down some of the inclosures and fences.

... and the lord, who proceeded to enclose "dale and dale bottom waste", although the exact location could not be pinpointed - until at least the following was encountered:

I am content to pay the arrears for the tithe-meal for the tenement called Brocklewath or Dale Bottom.
(A. Whelpdale 1713) (50)

Yet in 1772, according to Thomas Ramsday's map, no enclosure or tenement is recorded (Fig. 3:1). Once again the credibility of the details shown on the map becomes increasingly questionable.

In the mid eighteenth century a second clash of interests were recorded. This relates to the attempts of thirty tenants (mentioned in Chapter Three) to extend their estates into the common, thereby enclosing and improving it. The fate of these activities at Hornsby is explicitly described:

... a number of tenants at Moorthwaite and Hornsby ... having made considerable encroachments on the common and waste 20 years ago, the agents threw down all encroachments and their fences. (51)

Here is an interesting comment upon the success or otherwise of two parties both with essentially the same aims. Both the lord and the tenants were in a sense "improvers", but here the significance of rights and claims over common-land is important, in terms of the landscape. One set allowed the process of change to proceed uninhibited, whilst the other failed. In 1747 and 1772, the Earl of Carlisle was to set seal upon his supremacy over the rights of common, by enclosing a substantial area of the same (Fig. 6:4). Only when the clauses of the Enclosure Award of 1796 were finally agreed upon, did tenant opposition die down:

... so to prevent disputes it hath been agreed by and between the Earl and several manors that Frederick Earl of Carlisle shall forever hereafter have, hold and be entitled to all the part of waste ground called

King Henry which lies to the East side of a certain street or road called King Henry Street for his own private estate or freehold ... in consideration of his giving up his exclusive right to all that part of the said ground lying on the western side of the street, agreeing that the same shall be deemed a part of common and waste ground of the said Parish.

A final source of information to which Dilley has attached value (52) lies in the records of the court leet - in this case for the Hayton quarter. The entries for the seventeenth and eighteenth century contain many references to the infringement of the rights of common. A few have been selected and included in the footnotes for scrutiny and evaluation. These serve to illustrate the operation of a closely controlled system of rights and regulations over the commons, without which the economic well-being of the agricultural community might be seriously affected. (53)

An investigation of extension of landownership rights over the commons concludes what has intendedly been a somewhat lengthy discussion. It is believed that the study of an individual manor has contributed not only to a deeper understanding of the make-up of northern land tenure in general, but also that the manor selected has afforded fascinating insight into man's capacity to organise land resources, which it was discovered were manifest in a rather unique spatial manner.

Chapter 5 - Notes

1. Kerridge (1969) 2.
2. Duncan (1969).
3. Graham (1911).
4. Darby (1966) 189, effectively summarises this relationship, "the peasants' existence was really set against a double background, partly artificial and partly natural. The complicated tenurial relation between lord and peasant fitted into the agrarian framework provided by the physical conditions of the land itself."
5. Kerridge (1969) devoted lengthy discussions to this subject, particularly with regard to the relative security of tenures.
6. Kerridge (1969) 43.
7. Graham (1934) x, outlines the course of events in his introduction to the Field Book.
8. Variability between manors is a feature to which attention has been drawn. See Bouch and Jones (1961) 66. Ramshay's map of the Barony incidentally includes a short description of the customs and services due within each manor in 1771.
9. Bouch and Jones (1961) 70.
10. A long discourse on a series of court suits concerning the question of "fines" - whether they were certain or arbitrary, was discovered in the Fine Book 1724-29. Cases had arisen in 1611, 1615, 1617 which accused several tenants (some of whom were from Cumwhitton) of "pretending to hold tenements by custom of tenant right ... claiming absolute inheritance of their tenements by tenant-right" ... the cases also included references to their being "tenants at will", fines and rents. Eventually the matter was settled, as prementioned ... but these meticulously recorded court cases held at Carlisle Assize, offer considerable insight into the complexities of tenant-right.
11. Northern tenure with particular respect to tenant-right has been reviewed and assessed by a number of authorities in addition to

- those mentioned above. See Barot (1961); Watts (1971) 64.
12. Graham (1934) x.
 13. Appendix p.125, 126. Field Book reproduction.
 14. Kerridge (1969) 3.
 15. Hutchinson (1794).
 16. Bailey and Culley (1794). See section under customary estates, 205.
 17. R. Huddleston (1973) by personal communication.
 18. Bouch and Jones (1961) 88. Each manor possessed a bailiff who was responsible for the collection of ancient rents, and the drawing up of reports in the compilation of the Fine Books.
 19. The boundaries of Gilsland and each manor were surveyed in 1603. A perambulation of the Barony boundaries was also undertaken in 1840. Some maps of high quality accompany this survey. Cumwhitton is surveyed in Map 4, and its boundaries in 1840 (c170-104) remained unchanged from those described in 1603.
 20. See Border Papers V. 1 (1894) 37.
 21. D.P. H of N 217.
 22. C.R.O. Court Baron records, Hornsby.
 23. D.P. H of N C66a - 25 - 50.
 24. D.P. H of N C -179 - 2.
 25. See D.P. H of N C201 - 1 and C201 - 4.
 26. See Bulmer (1840).
 27. D.P. H of N C201 - 4a.
 28. D.P. H of N C201 - 1.
 29. D.P. H of N 217.
 30. P.R. reproduced in Graham (1918).
 31. Sechohm (1883) 69.
 32. C.R.O. Barony of Gilsland 1558.
 33. According to Graham (1918) 99, fosterfee was in fact the forester's fee of the Forest of Geltsdale (Fig. 1:1).

34. Notes of the books, D.P. H of N C611 - 4, C611 - 8.
35. D.P. H of N C201 - 25.
36. Blake (1959) 299.
37. D.P. H of N C713 (Box).
38. I.P.H. 36 Ed. III.
39. Parallels may be drawn with actual recordings of parallel activities e.g.: Thirsk (1964)9, cites an instance in Germany where a new allocation and a new pattern of occupation was created after a period of destruction. Thirsk also cites comparable cases in the East Riding of Yorkshire, where villages were re-planned after devastation in 1069.
40. Pevsner (1967).
41. Dugdale (1821) 272.
42. D.P. H of N C1 - 5 - .
43. D.P. H of N C1 - 5 - .
44. Longstaffe (1868) in H of N C1 - 37.
45. From a document largely concerned with enfranchisement of customary holdings in Gilsland 1771. D.P. H of N C - 168.
46. D.P. H of N C66a - 26.
47. Hutchinson (1794).
48. D.P. H of N C1 - 19.
49. D.P. H of N C172 - 25.
50. D.P. H of N C66.
51. D.P. H of N C181a - 25.
52. H of N C66a - 23, 28.
53. Dilley (1967) has demonstrated the scope afforded by Court Leet records in respect of the use of the common lands, and the manners in which they were controlled. The following is a typical extract from the Hayton Court Leet,
- 1766 Leo Hall of Hornsby for digging peats in John Atkinson's moss.

Other presentments refer to the illegal taking of flacks and turves from the common. Several of these were apparently strongly discouraged because of the hazardous pits which were an outcome of excessive digging. The cases were only forwarded when the law was apparently infringed, but the presentments throw little light upon the nature of these laws which are never officially quoted.

54. An extensive search of the Haworth papers with specific reference to Cumwhitton manor failed to disclose the workings of any system of stints upon the extensive common pastures. Perhaps in the seventeenth century, these grazing regulations were unnecessary, but a solitary reference to this system of control was written into the instructions for enclosure: D.P. H of N C66a -26

... the allotments be freehold ... and to remain undivided and used as a stinted pasture.

The exact implications of the term are not fully understood. (1796) Whether stinting was practised prior to enclosure is unknown. Enclosure could have fossilised this system of control, or it may have initiated the practice of stinting. (See the pattern of landownership on King Harry Common Fig. 6:4).

Chapter 6

A straight line in any period is usually a symptom of something sudden, something planned, something added, something altered.
Beresford 1971

ENCLOSURE1. Early Enclosure

The question of early enclosure in Cumberland is one which has eluded generalisation - an intriguing problem which has been recognised by a number of authorities, not least among them W.E. Tate who commented,

How and when much of the open land disappeared in Cumberland is difficult to say. (1)

The statement aptly summarises the problem.

Bailey and Culley reporting for the Board of Agriculture in 1797, described the inclosures of Cumberland as "old, small and irregular". (2) The chronology of what must have been a protracted process of early enclosure remains largely unknown, for Cumberland is usually regarded as a predominantly pastoral county where enclosure took place probably direct from the waste. The problem of lowland Cumberland, where many of the townships cultivated their land in open strip parcels (Fig. 5:1), is still evasive, simply because of the absence of information relating to the process of change and enclosure. The following statement made by W.E. Tate summarises, in a general way, the dual process probably responsible for the disappearance of open fields,

Enclosure had been going on sporadically for centuries both by means of intakes from the commons and waste and by combining dales and strips into crofts and closes. (3)

Cumwhitton affords insight into the operation of both processes, widely separated in time. By 1749, in the Moorthwaite common Field, as the following extract from the Court Leet (4) exemplifies, small enclosures held in severalty occurred in juxtaposition with open field parcels:

A dispute has arisen between Thomas Milburne, John Bowman, Robert Smith and Joseph Dobson of Moorthwaite, concerning a parcel of ground inclosed by Thomas Milburne in Moorthwaite Common Field.

The three offenders were fined for illegally making a way to their open field parcels via the ground of Thomas Milburne. In contrast, it was discovered in the last chapter that the fields of Cumwhitton township were enclosed, and consolidated at the onset of the seventeenth century (with the exception of the anomalous sector 2 in Fig. 5:3). Yet, these open field parcels, underlain by a system of intermixed land occupancy had disappeared by the early eighteenth century, with the creation of two new farms Morleyhill and Whiteheadhill in the midst of newly consolidated fields (Fig.3:1).

At Hornsby a similar process seems to have taken place with the establishment of the new, peripheral farms (Fig.3:1) at Fieldhead, Foulpool and the farms at Far and Near Hornsbygate. Most of the open field parcels, which presumably existed at Hornsby but were not included on the 1603 map, must have disappeared between 1603 and 1772. The resultant farm-units, however, were by no means as regular in lay-out as those early enclosed units in Cumwhitton village.

Yet elsewhere in southern Gilsland, according to Eden's report in 1797 (5), cultivation was still practised in open fields, in "gales and doles" - at for example, the townships of Cumrew, Castle Carecock, and Hayton. Elliot has drawn attention to the extent of

these open fields of Cumberland (6), in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, and yet, according to Conner (7) the enclosure of only 1.7% of the total land surface of Cumberland where open fields existed was covered by Act of Parliament. Whatever the timing and nature of the early enclosure process, where open common fields were concerned, Cumberland was to suffer little hardship from this gradual process, unlike other parts of England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. (8) As Tate has pointed out, Cumberland was exempted from the Depopulation Act of 1536 (9) and received no mention in Wolsey's commission (1517). Some enclosure activities have been chronologically assigned to the period of Border troubles in the sixteenth century, but the key to the whole question of early enclosure is, in short, variability.

The study will now leave the complexities which shroud the problem of early enclosure, to focus on the central theme of this chapter, which is concerned with a different kind of enclosure. Enclosure, in this sense refers essentially to the enclosure and division of commons, moorland and waste.

2. Enclosure of the Commons in a) Cumberland b) Cumwhitton.

Sir John Clerk in 1731 commented that in the Eden valley whilst journeying to Penrith, "on the left hand only wild moors and commons" and that "these are vastly improveable". (10) Similarly Bailey and Culley (11) in 1797 constantly reiterated that the untapped potential of land "lying open and unenclosed" was scandalous, particularly where, in

the less elevated parts of the country there are many large tracts of excellent light soil ... capable of being improved to many times their present value ... it is lamentable to see such extensive tracts of good corn land lying waste, instead of the ill-formed poor, starved meagre animals that depasture the commons at present.

The process of enclosing the commons, and the acreages involved is tabulated below for the Gilsland manors.

Manor	Acreage	Date of Award
Parlam	2300	1777
Brampton	1750	1777
Cumwhitton + Cumrew	6000	1801
Upper + Nether Denton	3300	1800
Castle Carrock	1900	1805
Askerton, Troddermaine	6000	1807
Walton + Lanercost		
Hayton	200	1814
Ainstable	2000	1821

In Cumberland as a whole the enclosure process reached its high water mark between 1801-10, when 9.2% of the total land surface of Cumberland was enclosed. Enclosure activity fell off gradually, after this period to 5.2% between 1811 and 1820; 4.4% between 1821 and 1870. The table above however, illustrates that enclosure at Cumwhitton falls within the period of peak activity. (12)

It will be recalled that in 1603, 4,500 acres of common were lying open and unenclosed in Cumwhitton manor. Yet, a pedological examination revealed that there was no apparent reason why the commons should not be cultivated (Fig. 2:3, 2:4) - as most of the commons were ~~located on~~ extensive tracts of well-drained light sand and light loam. Only the summit of King Harry, where height, together with the presence of heavy clay soils, could the development and improvement of the commons be considered unprofitable. Not all, however, of the commons was enclosed at one fell swoop under the Act of 1796, for Chapter Five has demonstrated that enclosure had been nibbling at the commons in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Even the most desolate portions of King Harry Common were considered worthy of improvement for sheep pasture at least, as the notes accompanying a sketch of the common would indicate.

One of the largest acreages of common land in Cumberland was, as the table indicates annihilated at enclosure. The commissioners for the Earl of Carlisle in Cumwhitton estimated that 2000 acres excluding King Harry Common were "improveable ground", (13) although another 501 acres were mossy ground. Overall they concluded that

... that common is well situated and mostly pretty good ground.

The Bill was secured by Private Act of Parliament in 1796, the award being dated 1801. By 1798, Gregg (14) in correspondence revealed that

they are proceeding to set out land for sale at Cumwhitton.

The process which was to radically transform what was still essentially a seventeenth century landscape, was then, well under way.

3. The Impact of Enclosure upon the Landscape.

The enclosure of the commons was a highly organised and calculated movement, the imprint of which upon the landscape is manifest in the tell-tale straight lines embodying the key-notes of the enclosure process - regularity and rectangularity. The way in which the landscape of Cumwhitton became dissected is summarised in Fig. 6:1, the "strike" or "grain" of the newly staked-out landscape contrasts with that of the more irregular "ancient enclosures". The main structural elements created by enclosure will be examined under three broad headings: fields and field boundaries, roads and farms.

Fields and field boundaries

The newly surveyed and staked boundaries formed the cornerstone of agricultural improvement, permitting as they did, the extension of agriculture. The fields in the main were bounded by "quick fences" and occasionally superimposed upon low earthen banks, in complete contrast with some of the ancient field boundaries at Cumwhitton

village - some of which were observed to be almost eight feet high, comprising well-matured hawthorn hedges superimposed on hedge banks often three feet in height. But in southern, higher portions of the manor, dry stone walls were constructed.

If enclosure is viewed as a uniform process undertaken at a single point in time, - the field shapes and forms which were resultant, were by no means uniform. In fact, a whole spectrum of field forms, shapes and sizes can be identified. In examining these characteristics, the historical geographer may gain insight into the motivations which underlay the process of division.

The largest fields range from 35-70+ acres, the majority being located on the flanks of King Harry Common, with one exception - "Bartholme Moor", a 70 acre field located just to the south of Cumwhitton village. Elsewhere field sizes range from 10-25 acres, but attention is drawn to two locations where field forms are particularly distinctive:

i) at Hazlehead (Fig. 6:1) and ii) at Cairn Close, both on the north-eastern bounds of the manor. The first group are aligned at 90° to the River Carne, and are noticeably uniform, long, narrow fields. These are generally 4-5 acres in size, whereas fields at Cairn Close vary from 6-8 acres, laid out on either side of a minor road which traverses a ccl over the common. The latter group is worthy of attention, for the field pattern it creates (Fig. 6:1) is not at all unlike that which could be associated with the ground plan of a deserted medieval village! This observation emphasises the point that, structural landscape elements with similar morphological characteristics may, in fact have been created by processes widely separated in time and motivation.

It is possible to distinguish a further distinctive field form, clinging to the peripheries of the "ancient enclosures" in Fig. 6:1, around Cumwhiton village, Hornsby and Moorthwaite. These fields are distinguished not only by their size (less than ten acres) but also by their irregularity. It is tempting to attach some significance not only to the form but also to the location of these fields. The writer is convinced that they may represent just a few of those very numerous encroachments which were reported in the late eighteenth century. The enclosure award specifically states that the

encroachments of the last twenty years to be deemed part of the common. (15)

This fixes the crucial period at 1776, but encroachments made prior to this (and there had been many) need not necessarily have been eradicated. Incidentally, many of those small fields are in the Tithe Survey named "intake", perhaps adding weight to the above hypothesis. In one case, the award specifies that a 24 acre encroachment of Richard Leach at High Northsceugh be included as a legal enclosure. The suggestion that the fields in question may represent earlier encroachments is admittedly speculative - but if the morphology of these field parcels is of significance, then what the enclosure plan illustrates is the translation of illegal manifestations of human activity into legal and structural reality.

Roads

The laying out of a new standardised road network was another outcome of the enclosure process. The award stipulated that roads be 20' and 40' and occasionally 15' wide - depending chiefly on the function of the road for example,

there will be a private cart road for the purposes of leading lime to the allotments from High Northsceugh to King Henry common.

and the change provided of the process of agricultural improvement.) In addition to the creation of a new road system in Cambridgeshire, enclosure totally eradicated what had been an important north-south route through the manor - King Henry Street (Fig. 2:1) to which reference was made in the 1603 survey, and which was recorded in full on Thomas Ramshay's map. The former course of the road only is fossilised in a continuous hedge-line which runs along the flanks of King Harry Common, and can be identified in Figs. 6:1 and 6:4.

Farms

In comparison with the rate of landscape change between 1603-1772, in terms of the establishment of new farmsteads, enclosure created surprisingly few new farms. There was little dispersal of farmsteads outwards beyond the village nuclei, as was experienced in the Midlands or Yorkshire for instance. (16) There were however, a few exceptions within the manor for example, (Plate II) Eden Banks (100 acres) located on fertile loamy soils by the Eden; King Harry farm (200 acres) located on the lower flanks of King Harry, and finally Woodgill House located again in the south east of the manor (35 acres). The impact of enclosure upon the spatial distribution of settlement was very slight.

Allocation

The process by which the commons were allocated was complex, but essential to the study of the landscape - but it affords fascinating insight into those invisible forces - rights, preferences, individual choice and the whole process of decision-making, which underlay the creation of the new post enclosure landscape. Allocation

will be treated systematically under a series of headings. In this way the variety of processes which were operational can be reviewed most clearly.

i) The mosses: Enclosure entailed the allocation and division of shares in the mosses of the manor, which were discovered in Chapter Two to be extensive. Allocation in this instance was the least selective of processes, in that almost all received a share of usually less than two acres. Cumwhitton moss became dissected into 57 shares, Northwaite moss into 15 shares and Traney moss, in the south of the manor into 20 shares.

ii) Sales: Several blocks of land were offered for sale to the highest bidder. One of these is illustrated in Figure 6: . It is interesting to note that there was sufficient capital available for two farmers in Cumwhitton who were purchasers. The other two resided at Castle Carrock and Ainstable.

iii) The Lord of the manor: The Earl of Carlisle for his right as lord of the soil received a twelfth of the commons in the manor (300 acres). In addition he had received 1,000 on King Harry Common, shortly before enclosure.

iv) The tenants: The manner in which King Harry Common was enclosed, was mentioned in the preceding chapter. To the East of King Henrie Street, the tenants received shares based on the payment of a Moorfarm or pasture rent. The mosaic of intersecting interests, which hitherto were elusive, emerge vividly in Fig. 6:1 where the rights of tenants from Cumrew, Bowbiggin and Ainstable manors became translated into permanent landscape terms, side by side with those of Cumwhitton. On the western flank, oddly enough, allocation was based on a different criterion. The inhabitants of Cumwhitton manor were allotted shares vis:

Dilley also allot common to those entitled to the Right of common upon the said messes, commons and waste grounds by and according to a Rule or Rate known within the manor by the name of Purvey - to divide according to each respective purvey.

The purvey was, to quote Hutchinson, "the rate or rule of taxation" and which "seems to be only of use in this county"(17), whilst Dilley defined it as

the county rate peculiar to Cumberland and Westmorland.

To return however, to the principles of general land allocation in Cumwhitton which is summarised diagrammatically in Fig. 6:2(i), chiefly tenant by tenant in each settlement respectively. The first class of tenants, those who received the largest shares (50-100 acres) constitute an anomalously varied class - two hailed from Scarrowhill, ~~two~~^{two} from Holmerrangle, two from Low Northsceugh and one finally from Munfield. With the exception of this class, one cannot avoid noticing that there does seem to be some relationship between the size of share and the settlement - the breakdown of which is, in addition, markedly hierarchical (Fig. 6:2.)

The second class of tenants is classified in Fig. 6:2(i) as those who received intermediate shares (40-50 acres) most of whom, rather surprisingly are Moorthwaite farmers. The tenants of Cumwhitton received shares which cluster noticeably in the 20-40 acre range (with one or two exceptions). A contrast is provided by the recipients at Hornsby who were allocated between 5 and 15 acres only. The tenants at High Northsceugh all received c20 acres, whilst those at the hamlet of Carnbrignoll received 7-15 acres; and finally the peripheral farms, for example Fellend, received in the regions of 25 acres.

The ladder of land allocation which emerges from an examination of Fig. 6:2, is interesting. It is difficult to ascertain on what the survey payment was originally based - whether it was land value, or type of tenure, or size of farm for instance. The first class certainly included the three "freeholders" of the manor, - the tenants of Whitefield, Nunfield and Scarrowhill, but no other distinguishing criteria are available for the remainder in this class, nor is there any apparent reason why a few tenants of Moorthwaite should have received such seemingly disproportionate shares. (19) The contrast in acreage allocation between Cumwhitton and Hornsby is well marked. It is suspected that the roots of these differences lay probably deep in the contrasts of tenurial status between the two, especially if the number of cottagers at Hornsby, discovered in the second chapter, is recalled. The two settlements were essentially different. Cumwhitton's tenants were in the main the occupiers of medium-sized estates secured for centuries by inheritance. The tenants at Hornsby were in the main cottagers, with neither the security of tenure, as will become evident shortly, nor the size of farm unit as their neighbours at Cumwhitton.

There remains a final class for consideration - those who received no shares whatsoever at the division of the commons. The exact numbers are difficult to specify, but at least 6 cottagers at Cumwhitton, 4 at Hornsby and 2 at Moorthwaite can be assigned to this class. The implications of this consequence will be evaluated in a broader context in the following section, in which an attempt will be made to examine just a few of the complex repercussions of the enclosure process.

The ramifications related to the enclosure process were many

and varied, direct and indirect. After careful examination of the apparent "backwash-effects" of enclosure, derived from many documents within the Howard of Naworth Collection, it was decided to treat the whole spectrum of repercussions as a type of "multivariate response-system", triggered in the main by the initial impulse, or input - enclosure. (20) The model of such a system also indicates the series of feedbacks and linkages which were discovered during research, and all are summarised in a general form in Fig. 6:5. The main elements will be examined systematically, although those repercussions essentially economic in nature will receive closer attention in the final chapter.

i) Landownership and fiscal change

The enclosure award states that the new allotments be freehold. It should be remembered that enclosure facilitated above all the extension of preexisting farm-units - yet it was only these extensions which were to be held freehold. The remainder, or ancient farmstead core continued to be held as a customary estate. (21) A curious duality or dichotomy of land tenure thereafter developed, although the distinction by this time was probably purely fiscal having little influence upon actual agricultural practice.

The second feature of importance, relates to agricultural potential released upon enclosure. In addition it should not be overlooked that agricultural extension was not always simple. Far from consolidating preexisting estates, (many of which had attained maximum consolidation long before enclosure) the allocation process did in some cases fragment farm units. App. 6:1 illustrates a number of examples where the frictional factor of distance was introduced in 1796. Other farms however did receive shares adjoining

the original farm unit. The process, however, did not halt here, as a detailed analysis of the structure of landownership evidenced in the 1840 Tithe Survey demonstrated. Many of the farmers in Cumwhitton whose newly allotted land lay at some distance from the farmstead (and this applied to all the farms as indicated in Table (App. 6:1)) never in fact reaped the benefits of their extended farms in a purely agricultural sense. Instead, they leased or sublet these separated field parcels to fellow farmers, or in a few cases to farmers outside Cumwhitton. New elements in the structure of landownership in Cumwhitton, hitherto little developed were beginning to emerge, and the hierarchical web was becoming increasingly more complex.

Returning to the repercussions of enclosure, it was discovered that there was an additional aspect of agricultural extension to be considered. This is more fiscal in nature and relates to the "dropping fines" payable by the tenant who was to succeed an estate upon the death of the previous owner. Close scrutiny of an important Naworth document - the Summary Book (22), spanning the years 1792 - 1835 proved remarkably valuable in this context. In it, each manor is recorded systematically, enumerating and describing each tenement within the respective manors, and all the fines paid in the above period. The importance of this manuscript lies in the fact that fines payable prior to, and after enclosure are disclosed. The fiscal commitments of ten tenants in Cumwhitton are tabulated below for inspection.

Some of tenant (Cumwhitton)	Dropping fine prior to enclosure (1760-1790)	Dropping fine post enclosure
	£	£
Wm. Blacklock	36	172
I. Fisher	40	90
Wm. Morley	23	70
John Earl	20	70
Isaac Leach	20-10	45
John Morley	14	30
J. Hewitson	36	50
L. Robinson	34	55
W. Leach	20	50

There is an unmistakable increase in the fines paid after enclosure discernible. The dropping fines had apparently been readjusted (often double or even treble the previous amount) so that the Earl of Carlisle might reap some of the financial fruits of the newly enclosed lands. But there are other ways in which these changes were of significance, and will be considered shortly.

ii) Changes in the real estate market.

By far the most dramatic impact of enclosure which research revealed in a non-landscape context lay neither in agricultural extension nor in the increase of fines levied, but rather in the dynamic process of land sales (either of entire estates, or parcels of land). Figure 6:3 depicts the rate at which estates had changed hands by sale in the years 1603 - 1835. (23) Sale of estates was by no means a process which was unheard of in the manor, or elsewhere in Gilsland, contrary to that dismal picture of stagnating estates which was sketched by Hutchinson. The number of estates, according to the records, which changed hands between 1603 and the end of the eighteenth century in Cumwhitton was small - a startling contrast to the situation which occurred after 1800, with the

remarkable upsurge in property exchange (Fig. 6:3). This quickening in the pace of land conveyance would seem to be related in a chronological sense to enclosure, which had been proceeding four years previously. The writer would suggest that there was a correlation between the rate of land exchange and the process of enclosure, although of course, there could have been tributary variables which were not uncovered in the course of research. (24)

The pattern of estate conveyance raises a number of questions. Why, for example, should many of the farmers in Cumwhitton who stood to gain so much from agricultural extension and increased profits, decide to sell their estates, which had for centuries been handed from successive generations? As already mentioned, the causative agents underlying this fascinating process, cannot be explained in terms of a single variable. As many variables which were considered to be related to this process, will in turn be examined, but it is important to note at this stage, that the phenomena which have been observed point to the operation of a much more general process more commonly known as "the decline of the yeomanry". This interesting socio-economic process has been much debated by a number of authorities, in a specifically Cumbrian context. (25) But first a number of points must be clarified. The yeomanry usually refers to that portion of the rural middle class which fell between the gentry and the cottagers. It is thus a widely embracing term but simply identifies an occupier of land, not necessarily a freeholder but one who possessed the dignity of freehold. There are definite echoes here of that rather distinctive form of tenure in Cumberland, tenant-right. This feature gains significance if it is recalled that the majority of customary tenants in Cumwhitton, at the onset of the seventeenth century probably occupied their estates by tenant-right.

In Cumberland as a whole, the decline of the yeomen, paralleled by a decline in the number of tenements had been a steady process since the seventeenth century, although Jones has added

There are indications that the decline in the number of farms was far more rapid in the C18 and early C19 than it had been between the middle of Elizabeth I reign and the Restoration. (26)

The processes observed in this chapter so far would support the above allegations, but a closer look at these changes in the structure of landownership will be reexamined shortly.

The background to the debate which focusses upon these occupiers of medium to large estates, or the yeoman, has been briefly reviewed, but it is not fitting to propose a range of contrasting variables which may have contributed in some way to their decline. Not only do the variables listed below include those which were found to be "active" in Cumwhitton, but they also incorporate additional factors which have been found to operate elsewhere in Cumberland (particularly by Jones (27) and in a wider, earlier context by Chambers and Habakkuk). Grieg has also expressed interest in this process (28), whereby the yeoman decreased in numbers. The following have been postulated as active, causal agents underlying this fascinating process of social change:

- i) the expense of enclosure. To the Hammonds (29) this factor was considered of importance, especially to the small farmer and cottager. No evidence which might point toward the operation factor was encountered for Cumwhitton.
- ii) the fragmentation and distance factor which for many farmers in Cumwhitton it involved (App. Table 6:1).
- iii) the increased areally defined size of estate that enclosure entailed (App. Table 6:1). Chambers has identified the situation

which found the tenants.

... where farms were too large to work with the family labour alone and too small to permit the accumulation of a reserve against adversity. They were big enough to be dependent on the grain market not to be vitally affected by its fluctuations. (30)

Chambers may well have hit upon a very important point - for Cumwhitton at least. Those farms which changed hands between 1801 and 1828 are tabulated (App. 6:1). Before enclosure the size of enclosed farms, extinguished their rights of common was 15-25 acres, but after enclosure the acreages were visibly increased to between 35 and 60 acres. The differences were considerable, and they may indeed have created hardship to what were essentially family-run farms.

iv) The increase in fine to be paid on the succession of a new tenant. Jones has explored the whole question of the burden of fines in Cumberland, and states that,

... the pressure of fines on the death of the tenant or lord might be high. (31)

This was certainly the case after enclosure in Cumwhitton manor.

v) The operation of chance factors, as distinct from those of a social or economic nature must not be omitted. Jones again has drawn attention to the records of eighteenth century writers who recorded that the ¹⁹writers of 1739, 1742 and 1749 were particularly severe. (32)

vi) There remains the question of the burdening of the land with population, which with fallen prices it could not carry. The movement of prices and yields is a complex topic (33) about which very little is known particularly at the sub regional scale. Wilson (34) classified the period from 1736 - 1745 as a period characterised by low prices for essential products meat, wool, cheese and butter, for

England as a whole. More immediate to the concern of this thesis was the information supplied by Thomas Ramshay in a letter dated 1892 to Francis Green: some rare glimpses into the operation and state of prices at this time are afforded (35):

... desire to induce the respectable farmers upon the estates to remain during the depression ...

(Notice here, the choice of the word, remain, implying that perhaps the livelihoods of many farmers were threatened.)

Our new wheat is selling at 4s 8d bushell and fat cattle sheep can scarcely be turned into money at all and when sold at nearly the price they were bought in at leaving nothing to the procurer.

Then followed a proposal to reduce the Martinmas rent by 10% - so the problem must have been a pressing one throughout Gilsland, for the above extract is referring to the situation at Brampton market.

Any of these factors, or indeed a combination could have underlain that generally observed process by which the yeomanry declined.

Following the directions of change illustrated in Figs. 6:5 there are yet a number of important repercussions of the enclosure process to be considered. These are closely related to that upsurge in estate conveyance to which reference has already been made, and concern a theme of central importance - the nature and incidence of change as it affected the whole social structure of the Cumbrian community particularly, in that complex set of linkages by which man was related to the land. Changes in the structure of landownership are usually unrecorded, but the nature of the documentary evidence contained within the Raworth collection affords very rare insight into a few of the mechanisms underlying change especially in the nineteenth century. The findings for Cumwhitton may eventually help to clarify the problems of agrarian history identified by G.P. Jones,

The story of the relations of landlord and tenant and the change from late medieval to the nineteenth century pattern of land-ownership, if and when it comes to be written, must therefore be long and complicated geographically and chronologically. (36)

The chronological component of the question has been one of the central themes of this chapter, but the geographical aspect has yet to be probed. Why for example did some tenants or yeomen within the manor succeed and survive, whilst others were eclipsed? This two-sided process was identified within Cumwhitton, but it seemed to be randomly distributed in a spatial sense. Of over twenty estates which were seen to change hands (App. Table 6:1 for a few examples) between 1800 and 1830, thirteen had been previously occupied by these customary tenants with considerable tenurial security. The purchasers of these estates, or parcels of land became increasingly non-Cumwhitton tenants, but there was a small but distinct group of Cumwhitton farmers who also took advantage of this new fluidity in the real estate market. Figure 6:6 demonstrates the rate at which four tenants: Fisher, Leach, Blacklock and Hewitson (and there were others besides) expanded their estates - slowly at first, but much more rapidly in the period 1800-28. This class of tenants is referred to as the "opportunists", and appeared to become promoted subsequently from the status of yeomen, to that of notable small landowners. But their intentions lay not, it would seem in the extension and amalgamation of their original estates, but rather these farmers became engaged in subletting. They replaced the former tenant by another on shorter leasehold terms. By 1840, (37) the new strands in the web of landownership had become firmly woven into the previous structure which was considerably simpler. It must be stressed, above all that the processes which are being observed had no direct impact upon the structural elements of the landscape

as such, but rather formed the framework for the organisation of society.

Returning however, to this newly established "gentry". Close scrutiny of the details within the Tithe Survey revealed that Fisher and Blacklock possessed additional concerns. At the onset of the nineteenth century Isaac Fisher (of Nunfield) possessed four cottages at Hornsby, and two shops within the manor, all of which were leased out to various tenants. Similarly W. Blacklock leased out two cottages in Cumwhitton and the blacksmith's shop there. This evidence has been included because it accords well with Jones' observations that much of the capital formation which formed the basis of the purchasing powers of the "new" yeomen, was often derived from secondary, supplementary sources which were non-agricultural in nature. (38) This group of farmers in Cumwhitton seemed to be able to participate in the competition for land resources in the early nineteenth century. The question of the position of the cottagers in the web of landownership will be examined in the following section.

At this stage in the discussion, it is advisable to outline the more important issues of the section. The theme of change is one which has run through the entire thesis - whether change has been manifest in landscape terms or not. The intention of this section has been to examine the structure of landownership and to identify some of the changes it was to undergo. The structure can have changed little in essence for centuries but appears to have been undermined in the early nineteenth century. Leasing and sub-letting of properties together with the disappearance of certain land-occupiers were all components in this process. So also was the growth of that class of opportunist yeomen. In Cumwhitton

this group comprised at least nine farmers, whilst fifteen tenants remained unchanged in status. Some of this latter group left the manor completely, hence the decline in the number of tenements, although the decline in numbers of yeomen in Cumwhitton (39) was by no means as marked as that exhibited elsewhere in Cilsland. There was however, a change in tenurial structure for those new tenants taking over estates which had been sold - a process of fundamental importance. William Blamire, an astute observer of social conditions in the lakeland counties commented,

since 1815 a greater change has taken place in the proprietors of small farms than in any antecedent period of much longer duration.

This was exactly the case in Cumwhitton, contrary to those who see the "decline of the yeomanry" as a process centuries in duration. It is the writer's contention that the "decline of the yeomanry" together with a gamut of related changes, was for Cumwhitton at least, essentially a feature of the early nineteenth century. It is suggested that the root-cause lay in the enclosure process which seems to have been responsible in part for important changes in landownership, and in estate size.

- - - - -

There is however, a second set of enclosure ramifications in Fig. 6:5 to which attention must now be directed. These are more demographic and sociological in nature.

Population change

The exact impact of the enclosure process upon the population of the manor is rather difficult to evaluate. Theoretically, an increase in population could be supported (as was the observed situation in Chapter 2 from 1780 - 1830) from the increase in

agricultural output - an outcome of enclosure. Reference to App. 3 will ascertain that increase in the growth of total population was a steady process in Cumwhitton for the first half of the nineteenth century. Within the manor, there were discrepancies, for the Cumwhitton sector experienced a fall in numbers between 1801 and 1811, but this decline was shortlived and soon recovered. Enclosure and more especially the sale of estates may have been the root-cause of this decline, but the fact that most of the tenants who sold their estates were replaced, would surely argue that the overall effect of this process was negligible.

Bailey and Culley in 1797 (before the enclosure of Cumwhitton's commons) (40) were asked to draw up a report which was to be concerned particularly with the question,

has enclosing the commons decreased the population? The reporters emphatically insisted that the converse was the case. They could not foresee how a process which involved agricultural extension and intensification, could fail to benefit everybody - setting up as it might an increased demand for hired agricultural labour. Now it is the latter suggestion which brings the discussion to consider a final class of the Cumwhitton tenantry, who have received little attention to this point.

The Cottagers

It was the cottagers, above all, who stood to lose the most upon the enclosure of the commons.(41) They received no shares whatsoever in the allocation of new land, which was a particularly severe blow, because they originally possessed a few acres of land, ^{to} ~~if any~~ ^{farm only}. Their reliance upon the commons to depasture their small herds of livestock was completely undermined by enclosure. Two

inventories, C16 and C16 samples, illustrate the somewhat meagre estate of the cottager:

1720 - H. Fisher	1579 - D. Bowman
£ s d	£ s d
horse 1 5 0	1 cow 12 0
15 sheep 6 0 0	1 heifer 5 0
householdgoods 110 0	4 sheep 8 0

Reference to Fig. 6: will also illustrate (as far as the evidence obtained from the Fine Books will permit) the rate at which the turnover of cottage tenants proceeded in the 17C and 18C. (42) Clearly the cottager possessed the most insecure of tenancies, as the steady tenant replacement rate would indicate. But exactly what effect did enclosure have upon this class? Were they forced to abandon their cottages? Was this the process in time which underlay the gradual shrinkage of Hornsby village (largely comprised of cottagers) and those houses which were reported deserted in the census and Tithe Surveys? These are questions which are not easily and directly answered. An attempt to approach the matter will be considered in two sections. The first will deal with the possible mechanisms which underlay the shrinkage of Hornsby, and the second will examine the fate of those cottagers who had survived until the onset of the nineteenth century.

With reference to the first problem, some interesting details came to light during an examination of the long series of Gilsland Fine and Account Books (42) available for study. At the onset of the eighteenth century, one Isaac Fisher (ancestor to the Fishers who have already received attention) purchased in 1716, and 1717 three cottages and their respective parcels of land at Hornsby. A fourth was acquired soon after. Some of the details of these

urchases are included below, because they provide instructive detail into the conditions of the cottage holding, and their subsequent change:

- 1716 Isaac Fisher purchased a house and a yoking of land, and half a day's work on the meadow of Thomas Atkinson of Hornsby.
- 1716 Isaac Fisher purchased Shawlands and one day's work of meadow of John Hall of Hornsby.
- 1717 John Briggs sells to Isaac Fisher two acres of arable land, half a day's work of meadow a quarter of his peat moss.

Yet, by 1840, the Fishers possessed and leased out two cottages in Cumwhitton, a cottage and shop there, a blacksmith's shop in Cumwhitton. The deserted farmhouse at Tarnhill which was never relet was also in the Fishers' possession (the adjoining estate became merged into the Nunfield estate). It is noticeable that no cottages are registered at Hornsby, and it might be inferred that these cottages had been allowed to fall into disuse. In this case, the shrinkage of Hornsby was a process which was initiated long before and not incumbent upon enclosure. A less notable figure but nevertheless an "opportunist" was James Robinson, a farmer at Hornsby. Between 1800 and 1835, he too had expanded and consolidated his estate at Hornsby by purchasing small crofts, and in the process, purchased a cottage and its appertaining lands. By 1840 too, this cottage had become deserted. The chronology of what was a protracted process behind the shrinkage of Hornsby becomes, then a little clearer.

But what of the remainder of those cottagers who managed to weather the annihilation of the commons? The Tithe Survey and reference to a directory (43) of Cumberland dated 1847 are instructive. These describe the occupational or employment structure within the manor. In Cumwhitton village seven inhabitants were

employed in non-farm occupations which comprised the "service element" of the village - shopkeepers, blacksmiths, shoemakers, joiners, and a schoolmaster, together with a few farm labourers. The pattern was similar at Moorthwaite and at Hornsby, where one at the former, and five at the latter were again occupied in non-farming activities. It would appear that cottagers, in order to ride and survive the tide of economic change, may have sought alternative occupations. They may equally, however, always have possessed these secondary occupations to supplement their meagre land resources. These cottagers, then, who had survived until the onset of the nineteenth century were in short little affected by enclosure.

- - - - -

Conclusions

The enclosure of the commons in Cumwhitton, it will be agreed involved in landscape terms a simple process of dissection. But the discussion has endeavoured to probe deeper than the simply visual impact of enclosure. Instead, an attempt has been made to review the multiple interrelated processes - social, economic and legal in nature, which appear to have been related to enclosure. Economic change, chiefly that process commonly termed "agricultural improvement" will be scrutinised in the following chapter.

At a time when much criticism is levelled at that particular historical approach,

which allows only for an extrapolation between two fixed points in time, without much insight into the dynamics of change (44)

it is indeed fortunate that the source material has provided a number of windows through which the dynamics in question; together with the rates of change experienced, can be viewed.

CHAPTER 6 - NOTES

1. Tate (1943)
2. Bailey and Culley (1797) 214
3. Tate (1943)
4. D.P. H of N C1-18 (Box).
5. Eden (1797) in Gray (1917) 227.
6. Elliot (1959) 92.
7. Gonner (1912) 279.
8. See for example Beresford (1963) for the experience in the Midlands.
9. Tate (1943)
10. Clock ed. Prevost (1930)
11. Bailey and Culley (1797) 235.
12. Gonner (1912) 279.
13. D.P. H of N C66-28.
14. D.P. H of N C66-24.
15. Encl. Award. C.R.O. for Cumwhitton and Cumrew, no. 40.
16. Harris (1961) 71.
17. Hutchinson (1793) Vol. II.
18. Dilley (1970) 192.
19. It should be recalled that farming here was associated with open, scattered strips.
20. Baker (1972) 17, who elaborated on the importance of the study of process and systems in historical geography. It should be stressed however, that this particular approach which frames the enclosure process is but one of several, and does not intend to be deterministic. The writer admits that the whole system was inevitably much more complex in reality. Enclosure, although it is viewed in this thesis as an important, indeed the central process, was probably just one of several operative variables which must go undebated, because of the inevitable limitations of the source materials.

21. Bowman's Survey, D.P. H of W 272A, records these distinctions in all cases.
22. Summary Book, D.P. uncatalogued , Shelf 13.
23. These estate sales were traced by an analysis of the continuous sequences of Fine Books and Rentals for the manor, and the Summary Book e.g. H of N C611-15, C620.
24. There are many hidden variables (chance etc.) that the historical geographer may never uncover. See 21.
25. Bouch and Jones (1961); Jones (1962). Tracing this type of non-landscape change, may seem to depart somewhat from the central core of the thesis. These changes, however, are important, and constitute the invisible, functional framework of which the landscape was a partial expression.
26. Jones (1962)
27. Jones (1962) examined prices, the pull of the towns, fines etc. Chambers (1958) Hughes (1965) 213 Habakkuk (1940)
28. Grier (19~~59~~⁶³) looked primarily at land tax returns.
29. Hammond (1911)
30. Chambers (1966) 45
31. Jones (1962) 202
32. D.P. H of F C565-14. See also in this context Beresford (1957) 53.
33. See Vau Bath (1963) for an examination of price movements and crop yields on a European Scale. The impact at a local scale is extremely difficult to assess.
34. Wilson (1971) 243
35. D.P. H of B C565, 1-11.
36. Jones (1962) 212
37. Tithe Survey, C.R.O. Tithe Collection.
38. Jones (1962) 214
39. See Jones (1962) 202, 211. In 1603 according to details taken from Nicholson and Burn, Cumwhitton had 80 tenements. On p. 211 of this article, according to the Gilsland survey of 1603, Cumwhitton had 44 tenements. This poses somewhat of a

problem. The discrepancy arises from the exclusion of the cottagers of Hornaby in the main, and those at Moorthwaite. By 1829, (Parson and White 1929) Cumwhitton had 38 farmers (again excluding the cottagers) of which only 24 were "yeomen".

40. Bailey and Culley (1797) see introduction.
41. See Hammonds (1911) for this side of the argument concerning the enclosure process: Kerridge (1969) 45, Ernle (1932) 307.
42. Fine Books, D.P. H of V 6174-38.
43. Mannex and Whellan (1847) 603.
44. Baker (1972)

CHAPTER 7Farms and Farming in Cumwhiton 1603-1840Introduction

In the preceding chapters diverse aspects of the farm-unit have been discussed; the collective adjustment of farm-units to the physical landscape circa 1600; the size of the farm-units; the dispositions of the appertaining lands and the structural changes which these lands were seen to undergo through time. The tenorial framework which underlay the customary estate has likewise received attention again with regard to its increasing complexity through time. There remain however, several facets of the farm-unit which are of relevance to a study in historical geography, and these will be viewed in three sections, which will work progressively from the study of the individual farm-house to a more generalised level embracing the wider topic of agrarian practice. In doing so, a number of themes which have been raised systematically in previous chapters will be drawn together, and it is hoped, unified in the wider horizons of the agrarian landscape.

1. The Farmhouse. Study of this important element of the structural landscape, and the metamorphosis which it may or may not have been subject to, adds a refreshing dimension to what has been the central theme of this thesis - that is to the study of landscape change.

As Houston has observed (1),

... rural house types illustrate the interaction of the physical and human controls in the use of building materials and their influence upon architectural features.

The validity of this statement with reference to Cumwhitton will be tested, paying special attention to the "architectural features". The rural house plan, its mode of construction, together with the lay-out of the farm complex may all have responded in different ways and at different rates to the pulse of economic and social change.

2. The functioning farm and the logical extension to incorporate farming in a broader sense. An attempt will be made to interpret and evaluate source materials widely differing in nature, so that the basic characteristics of crop and animal husbandry in Cumwhitton, for the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, can be assembled.

3. The advent and acceleration of agrarian change in so far as it can be detected from the historical record in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, will form the basis of the final section.

The Farmsteads

In the second chapter attention was drawn to an interesting category of information recorded in the 1603 Field Book (Appendix 2:1). It will be remembered that some farmsteads or tenements were singled out on account of their mode of construction. These were the stonehouses, sufficiently notable features of the recorded landscape to merit the attention of Lord William's surveyors, especially as they yielded extra rent. Figure 7:1 illustrates the distribution of these stonehouses of 1603 and forms the spring-board for the following discussion. One feature which cannot escape attention in Fig. 7:1 must surely be the striking absence of "stonehouses" in the settlements of Cumwhitton and Hornsby (with the one exception indicated). The spatial distribution of stonehouses appears distinctly peripheral, along the banks of the Eden and Carne rivers, together with the three tenements at Low Northsceugh and a solitary

farm at Scarrowhill. In the search for reasons which might have underlain the observed pattern, it became increasingly apparent that this pattern could not be explained in terms of a single variable. The spatial distribution reflects rather the interaction of a number of possible variables. The first is related to the availability of suitable building stone. Outcrops of new red sandstone, that distinctive local freestone in the Eden valley occur in several localities - along the Carne and Eden Rivers, especially they have become incised into the bedrock, and secondly near the summit of King Harry Fell.(2) Freestone quarries exploited in the early nineteenth century, and which largely reflect these geological occurrences have been located in Fig. 7:1. Proximity to these outcrops would appear of some significance - but in reality there is no apparent reason why all the farmhouses in the villages (often no more than two miles from a source of building stone) should not have been constructed in stone, instead presumably ~~in~~ of clay or wood, less permanent and durable materials.

Brunskill (3) in his study of clay houses in lowland Cumberland (of which there are still examples to be found) attributed this mode of construction to the operation of two factors. Firstly to the none availability of building stone (which was clearly not the case in Cumwhitton), and secondly to environmental instability. The clayhouse was easily constructed, usually communally, and in a region particularly vulnerable to waves of pillaging and destruction the clayhouse was at a premium. Cumwhitton had certainly had its share of Border troubles (as was discovered in Chapter three), so what in fact the 1603_A could reflect, was the beginnings of peace and stability and the parallel demand for house-construction in more permanent materials. Indeed a sprinkling of farmsteads in the

central portions of the manor had appeared by 1603 (Fig. 7:1). Unfortunately no continuous insight into the process of farm building in stone after 1603 could be attained, for all the farm-houses by 1840 had been constructed in distinctive red sandstone - such a striking feature of the present landscape. A solitary reference, derived from the Naworth Waste Book dated 1762 (which was in reality a type of account book) (4) discloses:

... paid John Hetherington and William Blackburn of Cumwhitton for winning stones for their new house at Scarrowhill.

But discussion must return to the 1603 survey and the development of the theme of change with respect to the rural house type. To summarise, the survey identifies three types of rural house:

- 1) the Stonehouse
- 2) the tenement constructed of less distinguished durable materials
- 3) the cottage.

Field work revealed that it was extremely difficult to ascertain whether any of the original stonehouses in 1603 remained, as nearly all farmsteads bore the marks of modification, improvement and extension - features in themselves of geographical significance. Perhaps the only clear example of an early stone Cumbrian farmstead was encountered at Nunfield (Plate 4). The fascination and significance of this particular farmstead will become evident when the question of the evolution of the Cumbrian farmstead is tackled. But survival here has been remarkable, vis-à-vis the response to change evident elsewhere in Cumwhitton, manifest in renewal and often total replacemant of farmsteads.

By way of an introduction, a cursory review of research which has already been undertaken on the subject of rural architecture in Cumberland, would be of value in establishing the proper perspective.

Again, it is to Brunskill that the discussion must turn (5) to whom the main corpus of research, which focusses upon the evolution of the small farm-house in the Eden valley, is attributable. According to Brunskill, the small farmhouse emerged as a distinctive type c.1650 in Cumberland and which he subsequently labelled the "statesman" farmhouse. This usually represented the dwelling of the yeoman farmer (providing an interesting parallel with the social and economic structure within the manor, discussed previously) and Brunskill's terminology because of its applicability to this thesis, will be adopted hereafter.

The "statesman" farmhouse could be either lofted or single-storeyed, but its distinguishing features lay firstly in the simplicity of the ground-plan and secondly in the characteristics of the front elevation which displayed an unmistakable assymetry. Brunskill has also recognised three variations in type of this early provincial farmstead. The first class is characterised by the presence of doors at each end of the farm house, an assymetry of the frontal elevation and the separation of the farm buildings from the farmstead. It is to this class that the farmstead at Nunfield can most readily be assigned, closely resembling that working example at Brampton which Brunskill utilised. Plate 4 illustrates the external appearance of what appears to have been the earliest surviving farmstead in the manor, which bears the date 1692 above the doorway (together with the surname of Fisher). Observation, together with information supplied by the present owners ascertained that this single storey structure of which only a part was clearly recognisable was, in fact phase 1 (which is also represented diagrammatically in Figure 7:2). The remainder of the farmstead had at a later stage become incorporated with the

second development phase, although the end of the eavesline in Fig. 7:2 demarcates the limit of the first farmstead. The entire building, even the earliest phase is of stone. Of course, one must be aware when making any general statements from the evidence of one farmstead, which was after all owned by freeholders in 1603. It does, however, closely conform to Brunskill's first category of "statesman" house. The second phase of Nunfield's structural development will be examined presently. The original farmstead at Nunfield cannot have differed greatly from these farmsteads constructed in stone recorded in 1603, for it was characterised by architectural simplicity and by its size. The roof, however, was probably thatched, as are still indeed a few cottages in Hornsby (Plate 5). Houseman (6) as late as 1792 noted that in Cumwhitton,

... the houses were not better than hovels and covered with straw.

The Court Leet records provide a fascinating reference to this widespread structural feature, for according to a presentment of 1753, John Robinson of Hornsby

... for resting his rafts or spurs upon Joseph Hall's hedge and for thatching his house and barn and letting rubbish lye on Joseph Hall's ground for half a year fined 6s 8d. (7)

It would seem then that the early seventeenth century farmstead in Cumwhitton was probably single-storeyed and thatched, with separate farmbuildings - at least as far as the first type of "statesman" was concerned. Several farmsteads in the manor however, testified to the former presence of a single storey which has since been masked by the addition of a second storey, probably in the eighteenth century. (8) Turning specifically to the example of Nunfield once more, it is evident that Figure 7:2 provides a little

more information. For, at Nunfield in the confines of a very small parish, three phases of farmstead evolution can be recognised architecturally and spatially:

- i) the earliest farmstead
- ii) the eighteenth century structure
- iii) the separate nineteenth century farmstead.

Rarely is it possible to view structural development in its entirety, and it is for this reason that so much attention has been directed to the farmstead at Nunfield.

Brunskill identified a second type of early "statesman" farmstead which is perhaps the best represented of farmsteads in the present-day landscape of Cumwhitton. Fig. 7:2 illustrates the front elevations and generalised ground plans of two of these farmsteads, (S_2) both located in Cumwhitton village. Architectural features to note include the incorporation of both dwelling quarters, barn and cattle byre into one extremely long structure. This type of farmstead as represented in Cumwhitton (Plate 7) emerged in the early eighteenth century, but Brunskill has postulated that the ancestral roots of these long farmhouses, lay probably in the medieval longhouse. (9) (10)

Of the third variant upon the statesman plan, only the definite example located in Cumwhitton village was identified (S_3). The architecture of this (Fig. 7:2) farmhouse is noticeably more simple and stark than its parallels. No barns or outbuildings adjoin the dwelling, which in itself symbolises the loss of status (11) of a yeoman farmer. The example in Cumwhitton lends weight to Brunskill's hypothesis, for the lands of the farm were purchased in the early nineteenth century by the neighbouring tenant. The farmhouse however, continued in use.

This final category of early "statesman" farmstead concludes the first part of this discussion. But Brunskill in his study went on to identify a number of stages through which this early farmstead might structurally develop. One characteristic feature of the Cumbrian farmstead in the eighteenth century was the development of a symmetrical, double fronted elevation (Fig. 7:2). Again Cumwhitton manor affords examples of this structural development. A rear outshut was often added in the mid eighteenth century - a positive response to the demand for more living space. There are good examples of these at Scarrowhill and Tombank (Fig. 7:2).

At this stage the writer is justified in stating that the landscape of Cumwhitton has afforded a great deal of scope in the study of the evolution of the small farm-house from the seventeenth century onward. Principle^d guidance in the identification of these landscape elements was derived from the research of Brunskill, in conjunction with field observation and the 1603 survey information. But there is one more category of farmstead which is of particular interest to the study of landscape change. Farmsteads in this category represent the final stages of farm evolution which took place in the early and mid nineteenth century in Cumwhitton. By this time all traces of a locally nurtured building style had disappeared, (12) in a period characterised by a marked upsurge in building activity between 1820 and 1850. (13) These farms possessed a well-developed complex of ancillary buildings grouped usually around a courtyard. Interestingly enough the farms which today make up the north-western row of Cumwhitton village nearly all belong architecturally to this later period of farmstead evolution (Plate 6). Elsewhere, the more provincial farmstead has survived.

Before this review of the manifestations of change as expressed in some structural elements in the landscape of Cumwhitton concludes it is interesting to consider the third type of rural dwelling identified in the 1603 survey - the cottage. Surprisingly enough, the cottage is still a readily identifiable feature of the present landscape, both in Cumwhitton and Hornsby village especially (Plate 5 and Fig. 7:2). The cottage differed radically in size and degree of sophistication from the farmhouse proper, and unlike the farmhouse, the cottage remained single storeyed - for its occupiers represented the lowest social rung in Cumwhitton, and they apparently lacked the means to modify and improve their dwellings.

This section concludes the discussion of the Cumbrian farmstead as evidenced in Cumwhitton. It is interesting to review the spatial implications of this study, of the farmstead which has proved a particularly sensitive element to change in a structural sense. The writer believes that it is significant that the greatest rates of change were experienced in Cumwhitton village where examples of the most radical renewal and replacement of farmsteads was encountered. Elsewhere, even in close locational juxtaposition to these examples, the rural landscape affords evidence of earlier, more provincial forms of farmhouse design and lay-out. At the opposite end of the spectrum, Hornsby village symbolises in an architectural sense, little response to universal increasing social and economic prosperity which must have taken place during the nineteenth century. This intriguing state of affairs could be interpreted in terms of the economic success of the farm-unit - a success, which we have seen, was a function of the interaction of a number of variables - the size of the farm-

unit, the contrasting types of tenure - to identify a few. In this light, the spatial differences observed in farmstead form throughout Cumwhitton gain deeper significance.

The physical structure of the farm and the lay-out of the holding are but a physical framework within which farming took place. In the section which follows an attempt will be made to approach a reconstruction of the functional systems of land management which band together the formal elements of the agrarian landscape observed so far. Where the historical record is inadequate, the dangers inherent in trying to extract functional detail from what is essentially formal data, will become evident. First, however, it is necessary to become better acquainted with the characteristics of Cumbrian agriculture at the regional scale so that the findings in Cumwhitton may be viewed comparatively.

Cumbrian Farming

The land utilisation survey of Britain undertaken in 1943 (14) for Cumberland and Westmorland reported that,

The Eden valley has long been known as a region of good farming devoted to the production of dual purpose shorthorns and to cattle breeding and rearing in general, based on a mixed farming system.

How applicable this modern appraisal is to conditions in the seventeenth century remains to be assessed; certainly Joan Thirsk (15) commented that in the period between 1570 and 1640 the lowlands of Cumberland

... supported a different system of husbandry and a different society - the husbandry was mixed.

Corn and livestock were even then variously combined. This contrasts strongly with agrarian practice in the north and eastern portions of the Barony which were large fell-like in character. Ramm (16)

has categorised some of the structural elements which were the hall-marks of a pastoral society, dominated by livestock rearing and transhumance - manifest in numerous sheelings. It is the complementary picture of agrarian practice in lowland Cumberland which is to form the central theme for the ensuing discussion.

In 1800, according to Smailes (17) the characteristics of lowland agriculture in Cumberland were still tinged with practices of considerable antiquity:

... in the lowlands of the Vale of Eden and the Solway Plain old practices still prevailed with little change, and it was usual to grow a succession of 3-4 corn crops, (oats, barley, bigg) and to leave the ground to recover for a period of 7-12 years.

Additional detail may be gleaned from the recordings of Bailey and Culley in 1797 (18), for they too noted that corn was cultivated each year. Representative rotations might be:

grass oats oats barley oats

or oats barley oats oats.

This pattern would continue for 9-12 years to be followed by a period of 7-9 years when the ground was left to grass. Arthur Young, observed the following crop rotations at High Ascot, nine miles south of Carlisle; (19)

barley, clover, wheat, oats

oats, barley, pease, barley

in accordance with findings elsewhere in Cumberland. But these crop rotations of old received severe criticism from agricultural improvers, and only a few farmers near Penrith, according to Bailey and Culley approached their standards of scientific farming. The complementary element which included cattle rearing and dairying were of economic importance likewise, but again Bailey and Culley emphasised a number of avenues for the general improvement of livestock.

The general agrarian scene in Cumberland is not difficult to envisage, but there are few specific references to Cumwhitton. Houseman's notes compiled in 1792 and quoted by Hutchinson (20) provide the following information:

The tenements and farms are small not exceeding £50-£60 and some as low as £5 a year ... produce: rye, barley, oats and in parts wheat comes to pretty good perfection.

Beyond this sketchy guide additional agrarian information must be sought from a wide range of primary sources. The first source to receive attention and evaluation is again that vital survey of 1603.

Agrarian Characteristics and Problems in the Seventeenth Century in Cumwhitton

At the end of the second chapter it was concluded that the elements of the agrarian landscape as they were portrayed by the surveyors of Lord William, exhibited a staggering diversity in form. The problem which now confronts the historical geographer is to build into this information, the necessary functional dimension. The second problem concerns the relational difficulties of scale. Information amassed so far at a general level may not necessarily be in accordance with the findings at a much higher level of resolution in Cumwhitton, whilst the third problem, that of time must be borne in mind. Details were, after all recorded at a particular time of year (although the survey is unclear as to this) and moreover, had one survey been undertaken a month later, the seventeenth century picture might indeed have been very different. Clearly this must be borne in mind when any conclusions are drawn.

It is suggested that Fig. 2:1 be reconsulted so that the reader may become familiarised with this abstraction of landscape reality. This must then be viewed in conjunction with Fig. 7:3

Dilley briefly summarizes fascinating detail contained with the 1626 Rental for Gilsland. (21) The names of each tenement in Cumwhitton village identified in 1626 are located on the respective tenements. These are of extreme interest as they plainly describe compact farm-units, and yet are more akin to what is commonly called "open-field terminology". Dilley (22) has forwarded the following definitions of some of these common Cumbrian name elements to be found in Fig. 7:3,

- "rigg" - the same as a dale, a strip or division of land 40 perches long, 2 perches wide forming half an acre, often in "Townfields" in which two or more farmers had a share. A "rigg" is then a share of land between a "rean".
- "butt" - can be an individual strip or rig, shortened or triangular.
- "land" - often refers to arable land, or to a single strip or dale of arable land.

The usage of the above terms constitutes some problems. The tenements in Cumwhitton village only are named, and in an early seventeenth century context, the choice of terminology is seemingly discordant. In fact this Cumbrian name-elements are commonly encountered for much of southern Gilsland in the Field Book of 1603 - but for "open-field" arrangements, as Bouch has alleged (23)

... in this part of Gilsland we have something not altogether unlike open fields, divided into strips, common further south. The pattern was changing and it would perhaps be safer to say that what we have are substantial remains of an older system,

but in Cumwhitton village the pattern had changed dramatically, with the exception perhaps of that anomalous sector 2. The implications of this "mis-fit" information will be probed presently, but it does not seem unreasonable to suggest that the striking simplicity of the farm units in the village (Fig. 7:3) could imply that arable farming was practised on what may be termed an individual basis, where individual decision-making ruled the calendar of agrarian practice. (The case of the farm-units in sector 4, whose boundaries

seemed less permanent (Fig. 5:3) presents additional problems.) The management of the peripheral fields (Fig. 5:4) in contrast, seems to have been on a common and possibly cooperative basis - although the problems of interpretation become clear here. It is by no means easy to discern exactly how field-parcels were cultivated from the form and underlying pattern of land-ownership. (23) The question of farming on a communal or individual basis in Gumwhitton village constitutes the first problem.

A second category of information recorded within the 1603 survey was identified in Chapter 2. Fig. 7:4 summarises the translation of land-use information into spatial terms, although it must be stressed that the data is (a) incomplete and (b) recorded for the village only. The first feature to note concerns what appears to be a roughly circular core of what were termed arable lands, immediately adjacent to the village nucleus. Encircling these lands is a peripheral discontinuous girdle of "pasture". The spatial lay-out of these two land resources, arable and pasture, with common pasture and waste beyond is reminiscent of the model whereby land-use is differentiated on the basis of the limiting factor, economic distance. (24) But the surveyors employed the term "arable and pasture" to describe land-use for a few tenements (Fig. 7:4). How is this term to be interpreted in a functional sense? The surveyors may be describing a system of "ley" farming, where in one tenement a mosaic of arable alternating with pasture was encountered. The rotation of "white" and "ley" crops, a fairly advanced cropping pattern for the seventeenth century, may thus be inferred. Notice that the Demesne Farm is labelled in this way. In 1768 (25) a map of the same

farm illustrates quite clearly the intermixture of arable fields with pasture, and again some portions are labelled arable or pasture. A lease for this farm dated 1770 is more instructive, and has been quoted in full in the footnotes. (26) Here, the terms of the lease explicitly refer to the laying down of some proportion of the arable to pasture every year. But it is not possible to ascertain how far agrarian practice on the Demesne Farm applied to other tenements in the village also labelled "arable and pasture".

Returning to Fig. 7:4, one category of land-use remains to be discussed. This is the class "grass-grounde", an infuriatingly vague term. These areas, like similar encircling enclosures of pasture, presumably represented a distinctive form of pasture ground, as opposed to the unimproved common pasture which lay beyond. Did "pasture" and "grassgrounde" radically differ in so far as they fitted into a dynamic system of agrarian practice? They are locationally distinctive, with the exception of tenements in sector 3 which are classed entirely as "grassgrounde" (Fig. 7:4). This sector is somewhat problematical. That a whole tenement should be "grassgrounde" is odd, and leads ultimately to the recurrent problems - communal or individual farming. In an agrarian system controlled by a community, an entire tenement put over to "grassgrounde" would not be out of place, presumably compensated by production elsewhere. Returning to "grassgrounde" and "pasture", spatial distribution and location may be of significance - but first, it is important to identify some differences between the two terms. The "pasture" term is relatively simple - but whether or not it was permanent cannot be ascertained.

"Grassgrounde" is an interesting term, and it is believed that the two entire tenements labelled thus, could provide the key to its interpretation. Remember that time in a seasonal sense could be important. It is not inconceivable that the "grassgrounde" represented the reversion of the stubble after the harvest of an arable crop, for grazing purposes. It must indicate a temporary state in the agrarian calendar, as no tenement could be permanently laid down to pasture - for white crops were too valuable a means for subsistence. The survey in 1603 could then have been undertaken after the harvest of winter-sown cereals in these tenements. Elsewhere in the village the harvest of say spring-sown crops had not apparently taken place. There was no reason why some farmers should not follow different calendars, if it is agreed that the farm-units seem to have been managed on an individual basis. All this is, however, somewhat speculative and open to criticism. Suffice to say that the implications of the areas designated "pasture" and "grassgrounde" cannot at this stage be fully understood. The importance of the economic resource pasture, in whatever form, whether temporary, permanent, or meadow cannot be overemphasised. Incidentally, there is no indication of meadow being held in common. (27) The Field Book for Cumwhitton illustrates that only four privileged tenants of Cumwhitton village possessed meadow on the Carne River (Fig. 2:1).

Having reviewed some problems underlying the interpretation of land-management systems, the discussion will return to an earlier observation in Fig. 7:3. The intriguing name-elements here merit further examination. It is the writer's contention that this terminology represents in fact the verbal fossilisation of an

older order of field arrangement - an order which antedated a consolidating and enclosing process, but an order which had more in common with field patterns elsewhere in southern Gilsland (28). The writer proposes that in Cumwhitton village at some time prior to 1603 open field parcels characterised the field pattern - probably with intermixed ownership. Can this statement be carried further? Is it possible to identify what type of former system of land-management underlay this type of arrangement? In order to approach this objective three features must be viewed together:

- a) the spatial location of each tenement, so labelled
- b) the land-use information provided
- c) the patterns which emerge together with any additional "extra survey" information of relevance.

Consider initially the terms "Tinland" and "Tinly" in Fig. 7:3. Is there not a close resemblance to the word "inland" detectable, in both these instances? They could represent a corruption of the word "inland", and if they do, then the tenements to which they refer belong to that distinctive arable core of the township which may in fact be located in part of the permanently cropped and heavily manured "infield". Gray observed that in Cumberland township fields were often arranged so that there was a definite distinction between infield and the second important element, the "outfield". He cites Hayton, located only a few miles to the north, as moreover a case in point. (29) Elliot more recently has reviewed the old systems of cultivation in Cumberland under this type of infield/outfield arrangement, (30) noting that

the firmest evidence relating to outfield cultivation is from Cumberland

and that this, was subject to a form of long ley farming until the

nineteenth century. Holme Cultram and Arlecdon be included as case examples. (31) By the seventeenth century in Cumwhitton, was it possible to detect whether there were any vestiges of an outfield remaining? Or were these swallowed up when the older order was reorganised? None of these problems can be conclusively answered, but it is worth while forwarding two hypotheses:

i) If sector 2 represents the type of arrangement which characterised the older order, then the locational juxtaposition of "grassgrounde" shares with open arable field parcels may be of significance.

It was noted previously that all the tenants who possessed field-parcels in "Bottomlands"(Fig. 7:3), had markedly smaller arable tenements than those elsewhere in the village. These are tabulated below:

Tenant	Arable Shares	Grassgrounde Shares
J. Weller	$6\frac{1}{2}$ acres	$7\frac{1}{2}$ acres
A. Rea	$6\frac{1}{2}$ acres	$6\frac{3}{4}$ acres
R. Watson	$3\frac{1}{2}$ acres	6 acres

The arable acreages above were hardly sufficient for subsistence and it is here that the grassgrounde assumes importance. The latter could be interpreted as a part of the outfield which was brought into cultivation periodically, swelling the white-crop output and bringing these tenements more in line with the 15 acre husbandland unit. After an agreed length of time these portions would revert to grassgrounde, or pasture. In other words, these partible grassgrounde areas (Fig. 7:4) could represent the location of a type of "outfield". This hypothesis it must be stressed is highly speculative, but there may be some value in an observation of Gray.

Gray noted that in townships of Northern England the "fold"

name element could be significant. (32) The "fold" was usually located at, or near the edge of improved lands and usually represented a division of the outfield which was brought under crops for a number of years and then allowed to revert to pasture. The location of Stonefold in Fig. 7:3 would certainly lend weight to Gray's observation, but one must beware of interpreting information in terms of experience elsewhere. But, again the peripheral location of the grassground, transitional between improved land and common pasture, is of interest.

ii) The second hypothesis does not entirely contradict the first but may merely be an extension of it. It focusses upon the curious name in Fig. 2:1, "Tanrigge" which described a portion of the common pasture to the east of Cumwhitton township. The "rigg" element reappears, and if in fact it was synonymous with "cultivated ridges of barley", then the implications are fascinating. On the other hand, this definition could be totally undermined if Eckwall's definition of "Tanrigge" (in a non-Cumbrian context) (33) is accepted. He translates this as "swine pastures on the ridge". Initially then, the significance of the rigg element faded somewhat, until some of the field names of the 1840 Tithe Survey were scrutinised. At this very location which in 1603 was generally labelled "Tanrigge" no less than 40 acres in 1840 which were then divided into fields had retained the name Tarn Rigg. This is illustrated in Fig. 7:3. It became clear that the "Tan" was in fact "Tarn", (referring to that water body Y Terne in Fig. 2:1) and that the "rigg" element was retained, presumably to indicate ploughed strips. In the light of this new evidence, the writer proposes that the area in Fig. 7:3, which directly adjoins the limit of improved lands in 1603, could indeed represent the

location of ground periodically ploughed, beyond the township fields.

Neither hypothesis is mutually exclusive, and if Cumwhitton did at one time possess an outfield, either or both of these locations would seem likely candidates. But once again, it must be emphasised that there are many dangers inherent in trying to fit the status quo of a single township (which would appear to have been an anomaly anyway) into a preconceived framework or agrarian system. What makes the hypotheses even more questionable, is that a shadowy older order, not that which was directly recorded in 1603, has been under scrutiny. The information has been inevitably incomplete, but it is hoped that the findings at Cumwhitton have provided fascinating insight into the interpretation of agrarian dynamics, and above all change in the agrarian scene, which seems to have been experienced at an earlier stage in Cumwhitton than elsewhere in the manor, and the rest of the Barony.

Inevitably, the question of the agrarian landscape in the remainder of Cumwhitton manor, neglected hitherto, must now be reviewed. But the reason for this neglect are apparent if the information in the 1603 Field Book (Appendix 2:1) is examined. Not only, (as was discovered in Chapters 2 and 5) was morphological detail relating to field patterns absent from the map (Fig. 2:1), but also, land-use information was totally omitted. It was concluded that the agrarian arrangements at Low Northsceugh, Carnbrighnoll, Mcorthwaite and Hornsby were in all probability similar - comprising small open field parcels in a single Common Field. (34) A glance beyond the 1603 survey to Bowman's survey

in 1820 provides additional insight in this context.

Fig. 7:5 (see also Plate 2) portrays in an albeit highly generalised form, the type of field arrangement which survived at Moorhwaite in the early nineteenth century, at Hornsby and at Low Northsceugh. The pattern of field parcels, especially in the portions labelled "Common Field" were omitted visually, but strangely enough were included verbally in the Field Book. For this reason, the field names of parcels within Moorfootfield have been tabulated in Fig. 7:5. Again "dale" and "butts" are instructive terms. Notice also the pattern of field-parcels, strip-like in form which had by 1828 become enclosed and fossilised. Similar features are detectable in Hornsby townfields. At Low Northsceugh however, Bowman's survey is more complete. Here all the fields were enclosed by 1828, but in noticeably narrow, attenuated fields (most of which again bore the name "dale"). What is more interesting is that landownership, shaded differentially in Fig. 7:5 to ease identification, was clearly intermixed between the three tenants. In 1603, at Low Northsceugh we learn that

... land (was) divided equallie between three tenants.(35)

One wonders whether the tenements were at that time compact units, or whether they were then too intermixed. Three tenants held land there in 1603, and in 1828, there were still three tenants. If, in fact no change in field arrangements was experienced between 1603 and 1828, the hamlet of Low Northsceugh and its tiny cultivated common field may have "fossilised" at enclosure (the date of which is entirely obscure) the older order of open-field morphology.

In the cases of the settlements of the manor, beyond Cumwhitton village, there is a frustrating ^{lack} ~~status~~ of evidence with respect to the manner in which the fields were cultivated. No records, be they from the Court Leet or the 1603 survey were able to lift the veil of darkness from the agrarian situations there. One cannot be sure to what extent the fields were cultivated on a communal (village) or individual basis, nor whether the small field-parcels which made up the common fields were permanent, or were reallocated periodically. Nor is there any clue as to the whereabouts of an outfield, if there indeed was one, in any of these instances. So, this section of the discussion must inevitably be drawn to a close, and a consideration of radically different source materials will follow. This will focus upon the contribution of information derived from a series of probate inventories to the agrarian picture conceived so far. It is hoped that this source may shed light upon a number of problems which have been raised in discussion.

The Utilisation of Inventories for Cumwhitton for Agrarian Purposes

A number of inventories (lodged in Carlisle) all of which relate to tenants in Cumwhitton, have been selected as an additional source of agrarian information. As will become evident, information afforded by inventories enables a reasonably sound, detailed picture of agriculture within separate farm units, to be built up. Details missing in the 1603 and subsequent surveys, as for example the type and range of crops cultivated; the economic value of the farm units (remember that in the survey of 1603, rents were omitted); the size of livestock herds and their composition; and finally occasional glimpses of agrarian practice and the farming calendar

are supplied. So that an indication of the type of data to be evaluated can be gained, several "sample" inventories have been included in the Appendix. Many of these contain interesting fragments of agrarian information.

There are, however, problems inherent in evaluating inventories, some of which should be mentioned at the outset. The first concerns the number of inventories available (37) for a study of agriculture in the seventeenth and eighteenth century. Each will, and in particular the inventory is of value "per se". If, however, the aim is to examine a number of inventories so that an overview, or some general statements can be formulated -- then the eighteenth century is problematical. In comparison with the period 1603-1670, in which over thirty were analysed, the eighteenth century afforded only fifteen. The number of wills with an inventory decreases rapidly as the eighteenth century proceeds. The problem is not, however, insurmountable for these fifteen wills available for the eighteenth century cluster closely in a chronological sense, curiously enough between 1720-1740. A reasonably accurate picture of agriculture can thus be constructed over this short period of time, whereas seventeenth century source material has a much wider scatter. Additional value of the two sets of agricultural data lies in a comparative field, in which agrarian change may be reflected in a number of ways.

Attention is drawn initially to Fig. 7:6 which visually summarises data of agricultural and economic value. Each farm-unit, its respective economic value, and the range and value of "economic product" recorded in the inventory, is diagrammatically represented. A feature of note is the relatively uniform value

of the farm-units analysed, falling within the range £20-£30. Even the domestic farm was valued accordingly. The larger farms appeared to be at Cumwhitton and oddly enough at Hornsby - there being no distinction it would seem between the total economic value of a compact or a fragmented farm-unit. Extremes in size of farm-unit are mirrored in economic value, as those units, less than £5 in total value refer to farm-units which were in reality cottages.

The economic breakdown of the components of the farm-unit is also of interest. Fig. 7:6 illustrates this breakdown into the two broad crop and livestock components. The most valuable component was undoubtedly the livestock element (36) even in Cumwhitton village where arable acreages were large. Cattle, and oxen took first place and sheep second. In one or two instances this dominance is deceptive. The value of the respective components varied enormously depending upon the season in which the will was compiled. The months December and January usually meant the least value per unit, although in a few cases, stored hay or fodder was taken into account (see sample wills, App. 7:1). The first two wills illustrate this point, and also indicate that the winter white crop, whether it was rye, barley or corn, was sown by December. The range of crops cultivated was not always recorded (except in a few cases in Fig. 7:6) and instead arable crops were grouped under the blanket heading of "corn and fodder". One farm at High Northscough in 1617 (see App. 7:1) cultivated minor field crops - flax, hemp and linseed (37) and, like a farm in Cumwhitton village produced white crops of considerable value, which compared favourably against the economic value of livestock.

Quite often the size of sheep^{flocks} or cattle herds is included in the inventory, but again seasonal fluctuations must be taken into account. March and April were the peak months for sheep^{flocks} herds after the lambing season, although some inventories meticulously record the number of ewes, lambs and "old" sheep of which a^{flock} herd might comprise. Livestock may be similarly broken down into young bulls or "stots", cattle or "kyne" and heifers. Three economic activities are revealed; livestock rearing, dairying, and the rearing of cattle for draught beasts. The size of herds varied from farm to farm, but generally an "average size" may be detected. These are tabulated for livestock for each farm by settlement from seventeenth century wills only (App. 7:2). Eighteenth century wills were not included because of the small sample size and because there was little significant variation in comparison with seventeenth inventories. A general observation must be that overall, size of cattle herds throughout the manor were small - although their economic value far outstripped that of sheep - the herds of which were considerably larger.

Fig. 7:6 representing a similar breakdown of inventory information, when viewed with Fig. 7:7 provides an interesting contrast. When it is considered that many of these eighteenth century inventories represent the same farm units as in Fig. 7:6, the apparent increase in total economic value is an inescapable feature. The wills between 1720-1740 indicate that a farm-unit of total value between £40-£50 was much more the norm, but there are notable extremes. The small economic value of the cottage element at Hornbury and in Cumwhitton is again detectable, whilst at the opposite end of the spectrum is the highly valued domestic

farm (Fig. 7:7). The inventory for the latter, valued at over £100 has been included for reference in the Appendix. The increase in value and economic composition of this individual unit between 1616 and 1731 is of interest. In 1616, it will be recalled the tenant was the same as that recorded in the 1603 survey. Presumably, as there was no mention in the survey that this was a demesne farm, regardless of its size, the estate was simply an undistinguished farm-unit. Yet by 1626, according to the Rental (38) the lord had taken over this farm, and one Richard Fisher was to farm the estate thereafter:

Richard Fisher for land of the lord there formerly in the tenure of Francis Scarfe called Sicklands - £20 and for his tenement called Gaultholme (meadow) -3s 4d.

Not only had the size of livestock herds swollen considerably by 1731, but so also had the diversity of crops produced (Appendix). The value of the "crop growing" although it is not disclosed exactly what this was, was considerable. One is tempted to view these dramatic changes in output and structure of the farm-unit, as a response to the intervention and management of, if not Lord William Howard, his stewards and advisors.

Although the economic value of the Demesne Farm is outstanding, at least three of those consolidated farms in Cumwhitton which likewise increased their value should not be overlooked. Attention is drawn to one farm-unit in particular, for which there was no corresponding seventeenth century will available. This farm, Fell-end (Fig. 7:7) is located at the junction of upland and lowland within the manor. Notice the dominance of the livestock element, particularly in herd size (App. 7:1). The importance of pastoralism in the farming economy emerges markedly in this instance, particularly as it is located at the northern end of King Harry Common, a vital

reservoir of pasture and herbage.

Having reviewed the type of information which may be gained from an analysis of inventories, it now remains to evaluate the findings from this source material in the light of more general descriptions of agriculture for Cumberland as a whole. Overall, the two complementary activities - the cultivation of crops and the rearing of livestock (in the main for subsistence, but in the larger more wealthy farms presumably for Brampton market) emerge indisputably as the key-notes of "mixed husbandry". Farming in Cumwhitton was practised on a small-scale in what may be regarded as small family-run units, but there were one or two exceptions, as noted. The demesne farm it was discovered, belonged in reality to an entirely different class of estate in terms not only of physical size, but economic output, diversity of product, and product value. Incidentally, William Morley by whom the demesne farm had been farmed prior to 1731, also possessed over £100 capital in savings. Clearly, potential for capital investment in farming stock etc. could be realised here, whereas most other farmers in the manor left rarely in excess of £10 in savings. In the period between 1603-1670 and 1720-1740 there are changes in both economic output and economic value to be discerned throughout the manor, but in the former the basic agrarian components changed little. Cumwhitton in the seventeenth and eighteenth century was still an area characterised by small scale mixed farming.

In general, the contribution of inventory analysis has enabled a good deal of detailed information to be added to the agrarian picture constructed from diverse sources. It has been possible to

through a closer understanding of a Cumbrian rural community at the "grass-roots" level. Yet there are still vital sections of agricultural information which are virtually absent. Very rarely was it possible to ascertain exactly what system of land-management bound all the agrarian elements - fields and farmsteads examined in this chapter; what cropping courses were employed; whether husbandry was practised on an individual or communal basis; whether in fact there was any regulation of the farming calendar. For these reasons the writer was able only to speculate upon the dynamics of agriculture, on the basis of an examination of the morphology of the agrarian landscape and from more indirect historical sources.

R.S. Dilley has outlined the scope afforded by an analysis of Court Leet records, in gaining a fuller understanding for just some of the above problems - but, following an analysis of the presentments available for the Hayton quarter, it was decided that information derived from this source, could add little to an understanding of the dynamics of agriculture. One of the main problems encountered with this source was one of interpretation. It was not always easy to assess the significance of numerous presentments on hedge disputes for example, without becoming too subjective. Hedge disputes, reported by the constables for the manor usually involved either trespass, or the non-regulation of cattle movement along the drove-ways of the manor - and in all cases damage to field crops was the outcome. In many of these presentments the impression is given that a great deal of control was necessary to separate the livestock from the crop elements. No presentment discloses the way in which the two resources might be integrated

seasonally, nor does any throw light upon a body of constraints or byelaws within which framework the organisation of agriculture took place. For these reasons, the analysis of Court Lect records beyond this cursory review, will cease.

Before the discussion of agriculture closes, it is necessary to glance beyond the seventeenth century, the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. Any changes which may have taken place within Cumwhitton, for example, the adoption of new techniques, the diffusion of new crops - all instigators of change and spearheads of agricultural improvement, must have proceeded slowly and silently. The historical record, however, does allow an occasional glimpse into the process of change, as the next section will attempt to demonstrate.

The Changing Agrarian Scene in Cumwhitton

Stamp and Beaver in the Land Utilisation of Cumberland (40) issued a provocative statement, which provides an interesting framework within which the following discussion may be viewed:

The agricultural revolution did not reach Cumberland until about the middle of the eighteenth century, when wheat, clover, turnips were introduced.

Diffusion of these crops, spearheads of improvement is often attributed, in part at least to the innovating activities of Philip Howard of Corby manor, between 1752 and 1755. Although the manor of Cumwhitton adjoins Corby manor to the south, mere proximity to the source of innovation did not necessarily imply that farmers in Cumwhitton adopted new cropping courses. A whole range of non-quantifiable variables must be considered in this respect - for example, individual behaviour perception and decision-making, although no

actual examples of farm-books survive for any farms in the manor. In addition, physical variables must be mentioned. The light sandy belt of soils (Chapter 2) running through the manor were admirably suited to the cultivation of turnips in particular. Lack of any suitable data, however, prevents any measurement of the diffusion of new crops, new ideas and new methods of cultivation. Kerridge (41) admirably conveys the way in which the agricultural revolution reached remote Cumberland:

By 1756, field turnips had even reached the north-western lowlands (the Eden valley and Solway Plain)... and clover and seeds, twin innovations reached the north-western lowlands (last as usual) not until the middle of the nineteenth century.

The spread of these new cropping courses was then a slow, prolonged process and it is against this regional backcloth that change in Cumwhitton must be held. Some of the process of agricultural improvement on a larger scale is documented - the activities of T. Ramsday at the end of the eighteenth century, and his direction of extensive drainage and liming near Naworth Castle. (42) In Cumwhitton, the reader must be prepared for agricultural change and progress on a much more modest scale. Houseman's notes of 1792 convey just a hint of these activities,

Cumwhitton: husbandry improving, so that the value of land is greatly increased 18s acre. (43)

The question of timing in terms of agrarian change within Cumwhitton is indeed delicate, especially if the impact of enclosure, discussed in Chapter 6 is recalled. To what extent headway had been made is again impossible to evaluate, prior to enclosure. But between 1603 and 1828, there had been some remarkable structural changes imprinted on the landscape.

Fig. 7:6 illustrates the nature of changes which had transformed the face of the "old, enclosed landscape", but the chronology of this dissection remains obscure. For the demesne farm only, it is possible to be more precise. Here, according to a map dated 1768, dissection of the estate was already completed at this stage. Dissection of these old enclosed lands proceeded probably slowly, but the process continued and became accelerated after enclosure, as far as dissection of newly enclosed land was concerned (Fig. 7:8).

It is the author's contention however, that by far the most far-reaching improvements were unleashed with the enclosure of the commons (Fig. 6:1). Thousands of acres of improveable lowland common were transformed into productive arable land - a remarkable contrast to that "sea of waste" in 1603. The Tithe Survey of 1840 testifies to the high percentage of arable land (nearly 75%) within the manor, - this percentage in 1603 was barely 25% of the total area of Cumwhitton. (44) Only the summits of King Harry Fell and a few isolated locations within the manor could be classified in 1840 as still "common" and "waste". There was yet another avenue of improvement, with respect to Fell country. Between the surveys of 1772 and 1828, (but most likely in the short period from 1801-1828) the practice of tree planting or afforestation had become well established. (45) The banks of the Eden in some places became likewise transformed. All the improvers in these cases were the owners of medium-small estates only.

The extension of farm-units at enclosure, which in some cases (App. 6:1) doubled or tripled the original unit, must have had profound economic effects, in a positive direction (although the author has reservations in a few cases, Chapter 6). Product output

would be markedly increased, and resultant profits, could be channelled back into stock and crop improvement, and the purchase of more efficient machinery and tools. This of course is a purely hypothetical process-model, but by 1840 (46) Cumwhitton was cultivating

... barley, oats, wheat and excellent potatoes. A portion of the moors has recently been bought into cultivation, but there still remains unattractive, uninviting waste from which the traveller recoils.

Before 1858, (47)

the soil here has been greatly improved by assiduous and skilful cultivation during the last twenty years ... barley, oats and turnips are important crops. (48)

Both directory extracts would imply that change in Cumwhitton seems to have been instigated during the early years of the nineteenth century. Beyond this secondary source material, the Naworth papers do illuminate the process of improvement within Cumwhitton in additional ways. By 1835 for instance, Cumwhitton farmers were leading over 1440 bushels of lime into their land (a marked contrast with a more primitive means of fertilising encountered in the court lect presentments:

1769 a practice in some parts of our pastures over the last 5/6 years of casting flacks of turf upon the said pastures of common, burning the same upon the common, and leading the ashes into their enclosed lands.

Thomas Moxley, the occupier of the demesne farm was one of the most notable farmers in the amount of lime consumed between 1820 and 1830. One wonders, in this light whether the demesne farm acted as a local centre in the diffusion of new ideas for the manor.

Tile draining was a further aspect of the improvement process preserved in the historical record. In 1834 and again in 1837,

extensive drainage was undertaken at the demesne farm. The farm at Searrow-hill had seventy acres drained, and at Whinney Hill farm similar activities were proceeding. (49) But, beyond these rather scanty references to agricultural improvement, change proceeded largely unrecorded.

In conclusion, the writer could seriously challenge the statement of Stamp and Beaver, which was quoted at the beginning of this section. In Cumwhitton, major agrarian changes, in turn just part of a complex process of social and economic change (Fig.6:5) ~~was~~^{are} instigated not it is believed in the eighteenth century, but in the first twenty years of the nineteenth century. In fact, according to Dickinson, improvement by many Gilsland farmers was still in progress when his report was compiled in 1852. (50) Clearly, the complex process of agricultural improvement was chronologically varied, throughout lowland Cumberland. Only additional studies of the experience of smaller areas within Gilsland can deepen our understanding of not only the rate, but the nature of agricultural change.

CHAPTER 7 - NOTES

1. Houston (1956) 110. See also for a general survey of the study of rural farmhouses Barley (1961).
2. Geol. Survey Sheet 18, 1"/mile (1932).
3. Brunskill in Bouch and Jones (1961) 112; Ancient* Monuments Vol. 10, Brunskill (1953) 160.
4. Waste Book D.P. H of N 1762; shelved, not catalogued.
5. Brunskill (1953).
6. Houseman in Hutchinson (1794) 176.
7. Court Lect Records, H of N C1-18.
8. See also the study of Calees (1972) a single farm which underwent a similar phase in architectural development, adding lofts in 1719.
9. Brunskill (1953) 180.
10. Examples of the ground plans of medieval longhouses can be examined in Beresford and Hurst (1971) 108-109.
11. Brunskill (1953) 175.
12. Farms created at enclosure e.g. Eden Banks support this assertion.
13. A large number of Naworth papers testify to this activity - broaching, walling, flagging, tiling, masonry activity and glazing, - a universal feature throughout Gilsland 1820-1850. D.P. H of N C612, 25-170.
14. Stamp and Beaver (1943).
15. Thirsk (1967) 27.
16. Ramm (1970) produced an excellent study of importance pastoral elements of the landscape - shielings, and defensive farmsteads, bastles.
17. Smailes (1963).
18. Bailey and Culley (1797) 219.
19. Young (1770) 119.
20. Hutchinson (1794) 176.

21. See also App. 5:2.
22. Dilley (1970) 192.
23. Bouch and Jones (1961) 90.
24. Chisholm (1962).
25. D.P. H of N Map 187.
26. Lease c129a/5 to William Graham from Frederick Earl of Carlisle to farm the demesne farm for 7 years (1770):

That the tenant not to plow or otherwise make in tillage above 60 acres of ground in his Farm and to lay yearly down in fallow 12 acres thereof to plough such fallow ground at least 4 times before it is sown first laying upon every acre of the said fallow land 35 Brampton bushels of lime. The tenant not to plough or otherwise break up any of the meadows or old pasture ground on his farm without leave from the Earl.
27. As Elliott (1973) alleged elsewhere in Cumberland in Baker and Butlin, 61.
28. See Elliott (1959) 92, Bouch and Jones (1962) 90, and more recently Elliott in Baker and Butlin (ed)(1973) 42.
29. Gray (1959) 229, 231.
30. Elliott in Baker and Butlin (1973) 63.
31. Holme Cultrum is also examined by Grainger (19⁰⁹~~61~~) who reviewed ancient agriculture, infield and outfield systems in Cumberland. In a wider context see Uhlig (1961), and particularly Butlin (1964) 99 for Northumbrian parallels. Youd (1961) in a Lancs. context discovered that spring sown cereals predominated.
32. Gray (1959) 232.
33. Ekwill (1967).
34. Refer back to Chapter 5 and the court leet evidence of field arrangements here.
35. Field Book extract Appendix, 130.
36. Elliott's finding (1973) in Baker and Butlin (ed.) was in accordance with the situation in Cumwhitton.
37. As above, these crops were cultivated regionally.
38. D.P. H of N C217.

39. Billey (1967) 125.
40. Stam and Beaver (1943) 317.
41. Kerridge (1973) 121.
42. Bailey and Culley (1797) 265.
43. Houseman in Hutchinson (1794) 176.
44. See Title Survey for these details of land-use. The high percentage of arable land in Cumberland in 1830's and 1840's has been commented on by Bainbridge (1943) 87.
45. Hughes (1965) 240.
46. Bulmer (1882) 230.
47. Kelly (1858) 155.
48. Again Parson and White (1829) testify to the recent improvements at Cumwhitton viz,

The soil is not very fertile but has been much improved
of late years.
49. D.P. H of N C612-155.
50. Dickinson (1853) 34.

CONCLUSIONS

Reflecting upon the problems discussed in the preceding pages, the writer has become acutely aware of the many possible approaches which could have been equally effective in treating the subject matter. It is important to stress, that the problems treated and the approaches adopted were framed within the necessary constraints of available time, the size of the study area and the character of the source materials. The approach adopted is best termed "descriptive-analytic". Much of the work has been based on primary sources and inevitably in a study on such a limited scale, it is difficult to assess the degree of success achieved as far as problem-solving was concerned. This thesis could not possibly have attempted to explain the patterns, the forms and processes which have been observed. This study it must be admitted may have raised more problems than it has solved, but this is inevitable in a pilot study of a little explored region.

It is fitting to review and perhaps synthesise some of the observations made in the course of discussion especially those which related directly to the primary objectives set out in the introductory chapter. The evolution of the landscape resolves itself into two basic components - namely change and stability. Is there any detectable spatial differentiation in the appearance of these conditions within the manor? Such a question is not easily answered, but before attempting this it is first necessary to review briefly the scope of this thesis.

The rural scene, as it was recorded at the onset of the seventeenth century had become quite dramatically transformed by

the early nineteenth century. The chapter divisions provide a working framework within which to examine the processes which led ultimately to change or stability as expressed in terms of structural landscape elements. The structural components of the landscape of 1603 were considered in chapter 2, and whilst a priority was to evaluate the quality of the source material, it was discovered that a surprising amount of the real substance of this landscape was sufficiently preserved as to be identifiable on the first edition of the Ordnance Survey map. The landscape of the early seventeenth century strikingly comprised islands of "inby" land, floating within a vast ocean of waste.

Chapter 3 traced the metamorphosis of settlement within the manor of Cumwhitton between 1603 and 1840. Several observations were made with respect to the manifestation of change and stability. The development of the cluster settlements within Cumwhitton was a many sided process. It included firstly growth or decay in actual size of these settlements, and secondly, the broad development of settlement morphology in terms of the establishment of ancillary structures. Cumwhitton village in general experienced considerable stability in terms of size, whereas both Moorthwaite and Hornsby, especially toward the end of the prescribed period were beginning to show signs of "shrinkage". Beyond the cluster settlements the slow creation of new farms on the fringes of the improved land and beyond was a process which continued slowly between 1603-1828. An attempt was made to view this changing settlement scene against a backcloth of population change, in order that a possible relationship between total population growth or decline, and the dynamics of settlement could be identified.

Chapter 4 broadened the limits of study and considered the morphology of cluster settlement in southern Gilsland. Interestingly, from an examination of seventeenth and nineteenth century surveys, little change in basic settlement morphology (of which the dominant type was found to be the two-row green village) seems to have taken place. At a higher level of resolution, the manifestations of change were examined particularly within Cumwhitton village, which in terms of basic structural morphology changed little between 1603 and 1840. One of the notable exceptions to this statement concerns the intriguing development of private and public land in the village.

The complex conditions of Northern land tenure were reviewed in Chapter 5. It is obviously difficult to measure rates of change in this circumstance although the writer has reason to believe that the gradual breakdown of an ancient body of land rights which had probably changed little for centuries was probably accelerated by the enclosure of the commons. New conditions of tenure were introduced and an upsurge in estate sales must have been contributory factors. The second objective of Chapter 5 was to examine the spatial expression of seventeenth century landownership information. This proved particularly fascinating in the case of Cumwhitton village, where this pattern assumed a strikingly radial form. Translation of landownership information had revealed an intriguing arrangement of farm-units which was to remain essentially unchanged throughout the study period. The extension of rights beyond the improved lands of Cumwhitton to the open pasture lands was examined in addition. These essentially invisible and largely obscure forces were seen to be translated into landscape terms upon the enclosure

of the commons, although sporadically between 1603 and 1790 a number of conflicts concerning rights over the common were discovered. Some of these succeeded in changing the face of the common by enclosure - others failed.

The links between Chapter 5 and 6 which examined the processes of change related to enclosure have already been outlined. Enclosure of the commons undoubtedly changed the face of the unimproved common quite dramatically, and what is more important, within an astonishingly short period of time. Beyond structural change, a number of related processes were identified. These were essentially none visible - social and economic, but were none the less of importance.

Chapter 7 finally, examined the manifestations of change at a number of levels. Firstly the farmhouse was seen to be an element which surprisingly mirrored the variable pace and pulse of change within the manor - from the total replacement of provincial architecture in parts of Cumwhitton village (possibly reflecting the growth of economic prosperity here) to the opposite extreme reflecting "unchange" - as evidenced in the cottages at Hornsby and Moortheaite. A second objective endeavoured to probe and piece together the functional aspects of the seventeenth century agrarian landscape. The hiatus of evidence rendered the evaluation of change in farming systems throughout the period 1603-1840 difficult. As regards the arrangement of fields within which farming was practised, that encountered at Cumwhitton village changed little between 1603 and 1840. Elsewhere structural change was more variable, much piecemeal enclosure proceeding unrecorded. At Moortheaite, however open field parcels survived unconsolidated

until the early twentieth century. Consolidation at Cumwhitton village in contrast was undertaken long before the seventeenth century survey. It is believed that a key factor underlying this variability not only in the rate, but the nature of agrarian landscape change lies in the subtle differences in land tenure which existed within the manor. In terms of farm output a gradual increase in prosperity was identified. As regard its crop and livestock components, farming in Cumwhitton changed little between the seventeenth century and the land utilisation survey of the twentieth century. There was sufficient information to suggest that in the early nineteenth century, Cumwhitton was to witness considerable changes in agriculture - which involved improvement, the extension of arable lands, the processes of afforestation and land drainage.

From this cursory summary of the findings of the respective chapters of this thesis, in terms of change and stability, a number of specific problems have emerged.

The first relates to Chapter 3 and the question of encroachment. It would seem that these important activities were peculiar to Cumwhitton manor where land hunger seemed particularly pronounced. In a similar context, the writer would question Thomas Ramsbary's Map of 1771 as an accurate source of information on eighteenth century settlement.

Chapter 4 posed the tantalising problem of the origin of what appears to be one markedly regular row in Cumwhitton village, whilst in a broader context, the striking similarity of settlement forms in southern Gilsland surely merits further research. In a related vein the entire lay-out of Cumwhitton village, fascinating though

It is, cannot be understood in terms of any seventeenth century processes which can be detected from the source material. The whole problem raises the central issue of the ultimate origin of settlement, not only in Cumwhitton village itself, displaying as it does an unmistakable regularity, but also in the rest of low-land Cumberland. In the case of Cumwhitton it was proposed that at some distant stage in history (possibly the fourteenth century?) the village was laid-out according to some plan which seems to reflect the principle of equal rights in the allocation of land resources.

Clouding much research into patterns of landownership and changes in this framework, was the scanty information which related to details of Cumbrian land-tenure. Clearly much more research must be focussed upon this little understood and in geographical terms a highly variable problem. Bowman's survey of 1828 provides some basic information but his categories serve to complicate the matter rather than to supply additional information. The writer believes that Cumbrian land tenure even as late as 1828 possessed distinctive characteristics, probably of some antiquity.

The final set of problems refers to the functional components of the agrarian landscape. No amount of piecing together the jig-saw of varied sources - from the examination of the significance of place names, to the spatial arrangement of land resources, could reveal the type of agrarian system which could have bound together the elements of the seventeenth century landscape, its farms and fields and encircling open pastures. The crucial problem centred upon the extent to which individual management and decision-making superseded (particularly in Cumwhitton village) communal

decision-making. In the case of the open common fields of Moor-
thwaite and Hornsby the latter rather than the former was probably
dominant. It was proposed in addition, that at Cumwhitton village
alone, the shadowy vestiges of an older agrarian order may underlie
the seventeenth century patterns, and may to some extent explain
some of the contradictions in the lay-out of farm-units, cropping
patterns and land-use, and finally the curious assemblage of name
elements which were encountered here.

In conclusion, the writer must stress that the Naworth
Collection offers a good deal more scope than this study was
regrettably able to justify. It is hoped, however that this
thesis intended as it was as a pilot study, will prove valuable
to those concerned with broader studies within the Cumbrian scene,
(work which is currently in hand at Durham). This study above
all has shown, that a key word in the understanding of patterns
of human geography in seventeenth and even nineteenth century
lowland Cumwhitton must be variability.
