

Durham E-Theses

Farm field and fell in Upper Teesdale 1600-1900: a study of historical geography

Jennifer M. Britton

How to cite:

Britton, Jennifer M. (1974) Farm field and fell in Upper Teesdale 1600-1900: a study of 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/9934/> 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.

FARM FIELD AND FELL IN UPPER TEESDALE, 1600-1900:
A STUDY IN HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY

JENNIFER M. BRITTON

SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

JUNE 1974

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

ABSTRACT

The historical geography of Upper Teesdale may best be traced through three inter-related topics: enclosures, land use and lead mining.

By 1600 enclosures already stretched high up the dale. Around Middleton, the dale's main village, were large fields, subdivided into strips. Most of these lay 'open', but some were being enclosed, thus fossilizing the strip patterns. Higher up the dale were islands of enclosed land, surrounded by a sea of waste. Between the 17th and 19th centuries both piecemeal and organized intaking from the waste went on until enclosed land stretched continuously from Middleton to the very head of the dale, at over 2,000 feet.

Before 1600 the 'open' fields around Middleton were given over to subsistence arable production. At this time, however, there was a changeover to permanent grass, to support the sheep and cattle increasingly bred for commercial reasons. This changeover led to the enclosure of the open fields. Higher up the dale, an area not suited to arable crops, the land had probably always been under grass. The story here is one of increasing intensity of land use, the enclosure of the commons eventually resulting in the strict limitation in the number of beasts which could be pastured there.

Lead mining has had a profound influence upon the historical geography of the area. It grew in importance through the centuries, reaching a peak in the 19th century. Tenant farmers spent much of their time mining, clearly deriving a large proportion of their income from it. It seems unlikely that enclosures would have reached so high up the dale, had the miners not been 'land hungry'

attempting to create farms as close to the mines as possible.

The fall in the dales' population, and the recession in enclosed land following the decline in lead mining bears witness to the industries importance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people to whom I must express my most grateful thanks for their help, so much so that only a few can be mentioned here. Firstly, Lord Barnard for his kind permission to use the archives in his Estate Offices at Middleton in Teesdale and Staindrop, without which this study could not have been contemplated, and the Teesdale Trust for providing the generous grant which enabled me to spend a year in Durham to carry out this work. Secondly my supervisors, Dr Brian Roberts and Dr Ian Simmons, without whose constant encouragement, interest and kindness I would have been completely lost, especially in my early days at Durham. Thirdly, all the people who helped me collect my information, both in and out of Durham, especially the staff of the Department of Palaeography and Diplomatic in the University of Durham, who patiently instructed me in the art of reading Probate Inventories, for which I will be eternally grateful. Fourthly, the Pickering family of Woolpitts Hill Farm in Ettersgill, who let me stay with them for a fortnight while doing field work, and whose wonderful hospitality and patience in answering all my questions I shall never forget. Lastly I owe a special debt of gratitude to my parents for a great deal of help and encouragement.

I am aware that I have omitted many names which I should have included, and I hope that everyone I should have mentioned and have not, will accept my thanks for the assistance they gave me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Man in the Dale before 1600	
	Man in the Dale after 1600	
	The Sources	
2.	SETTLEMENT	19
	Settlement in the Forest of Teesdale	
	Middleton in Teesdale	
3.	THE FARMS	34
4.	ENCLOSURE PATTERNS	54
	An Overview	
	Ettersgill Enclosure History	
5.	LAND USE: AN OVERVIEW	84
6.	FARM STUDIES: A HISTORY OF LAND USE	101
7.	THE COMMONS	119
8.	LEAD	133
9.	CONCLUSIONS	149
	Summary	
	Further Research	
	APPENDICES	155

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1.	Population of the Forest of Teesdale, 1801-1851	27
2.	Farm structure in Middleton and Newbiggin, 1612	35
3.	Farm structure in the Forest of Teesdale, 1612	37
4.	Farms in the Forest of Teesdale, 1612-1847	46
5.	Farm buildings in Middleton and Newbiggin, 1612	50
6.	Farm buildings in the Forest of Teesdale, 1612	50
7.	Repairs on Forest of Teesdale Farms, 1847-1864	52
8.	Subdivided fields in Middleton and Newbiggin, 1612	58
9.	Parcels, Enclosed Parcels and Closes in Middleton and Newbiggin,	59
10.	The cost of walling in Upper Teesdale	68
11.	Enclosed land in the Forest of Teesdale, 1612-1847	69
12.	Land in lieu of stints on Ettersgill Pasture	79
13.	Land Use in Middleton and Newbiggin, 1612	
	a) The open fields.	85
	b) The land outside the open fields	86
14.	Land Use in the Forest of Teesdale, 1612	87
15.	Common rights in the Upper Dale, 1803	124
16.	Common rights in the Upper Dale, 1847	127
17.	Duty Ore rendered in 1848	142

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE TEXT

- M.E.O. Raby Estate Office, Middleton in Teesdale.
- S.E.O. Raby Estate Office, Staindrop.
- P.R.O. Public Record Office.
- C.R.O. County Record Office, Durham City.
- Pal & Dip. Department of Palaeography and Diplomatic, University
of Durham.
- P.G. Durham University Library, Palace Green, Durham City.
- a.s.l. Above sea level.

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

A tourist coming up the valley would describe it as a place where sterility had planted its first footsteps, where the habitations were becoming a class scarcely worthy of the name of cottage, where the inhabitants had to contend with an unfruitful soil and a harsh climate, where the whitened fields of grain had given place to black boggy fields of tough grass or perhaps of rushes; where the rich loamy soil had been superseded by black spongy peat moss, and so on. On the contrary a tourist having crossed the wilds of Yad Moss or come over Crossfell would welcome a macadamized road, and a country intersected with walls and hedges bearing signs of cultivation ... and as he came in sight of the distant meadows woods or cornfields, his thoughts would turn with exquisite pleasure from the wilds he had crossed to those comfortable cheering scenes ... a very oasis in the desert.

- Francis Cockshott, 1848¹

The landscape of Upper Teesdale is perhaps the most distinctive of all the Pennine Dales. Crossing the watershed from Weardale into Teesdale, one is immediately conscious of the contrast between the two dales, perhaps typifying the contrasts between Teesdale and many of the other Pennine Dales. In Teesdale one is struck by a sense of remoteness and solitude rarely encountered elsewhere, and by a completely distinctive environment. The scene is essentially pastoral, comprising fields of meadow and pasture divided by dry stone walls, stretching high up the dale to 2000 feet a.s.l. Surrounding the improved farm lands are the fells, and the point where the two meet - the head dyke - is perhaps the most fundamental division which can be made, forming a contrast of which one is always aware, although the two units are at the same time

inextricably intertwined in the agricultural life of the Dale. This contrast was noted by Cockshott in 1848, when he remarked that "The scenery here is capable of two widely differing delineations, and the line of demarcation is drawn between the moorland waste and the comfortable cottage homes of the peasantry. This is not far from being the boundary between a garden and a wilderness."² The area is made yet more distinctive and unified by the characteristic whitewashed farms and cottages of the Raby Estate. The landscape, especially higher up the Dale is remarkably bare of trees, so that when the dale is viewed from a suitable vantage point, one is aware of a very clear-cut, simple environment, uncomplicated by industry and non-agricultural production such as exists in Weardale. This contrast is amply revealed by study of the two dales as they appear on the one inch Ordnance Survey map of the area.³

Upper Teesdale (that part of the dale above Middleton) is distinctive in terms of geology and relief, climate and vegetation. In terms of relief the dale may be best described as an inlier cut into gently tilted, eastward dipping sedimentary rocks of Carboniferous age, which form the bedrock to most of the region (Fig. 2). The Upper Dale lies entirely above 700 feet a.s.l., the River Tees flowing from northwest to southeast (Fig. 1), and the cultivated zone, with which this thesis is most concerned, lies in a fairly mature and open valley, the watersheds rising to an average altitude of 2000 feet a.s.l. (Fig. 1). The fells have broad flattish tops, and the alternation of resistant and non-resistant beds of rock in the geological sequence is reflected by shelves and edges on the valley sides. The Whin Sill outcrops extensively in Upper

Teesdale (Fig. 2), and gives rise to the waterfalls of High Force and Cauldron Snout. The Dale was glaciated during the Quaternary, and unconsolidated glacial drift was deposited, much of which was later removed by erosion during deglaciation.⁴ Drift still, however, blankets much of the valley bottoms, and, more thinly, the hill slopes up to and between 1,400 and 1,700 feet a.s.l.⁵

The climate of the dale is characterised by heavy rainfall, combined with cold winters and cool summers. Precipitation ranges, on average, between 50 and 70 inches, increasing up dale. On average the wettest month is December and the driest June, but from year to year the distribution may vary quite considerably.⁶ In addition to the heavy rainfall long spells of high humidity are characteristic, but at times the humidity may be very much lower than in the lowlands. Winters can be severe, especially higher up the Dale, and snow may lie for up to 80 days at 1,800 feet a.s.l., and for longer at higher altitudes. The growing season (the period during which the mean temperature rises above 42° F) is about 165 days at Moor House (1,840 feet a.s.l.) and thus extends from May 5th to September 28th, although it must be proportionately longer down the Dale. The duration of cloud and the frequency and amount of precipitation also affect the growing season. In an enclosed lowland such as Upper Teesdale temperature inversions may frequently occur, increasing the risk of frost. Air frost may, in any case, occur at any time throughout the year.⁷

The combination of climate, geology and relief has enabled a distinctive type of vegetation to exist. The Upper Teesdale plant communities represent a vegetation which is closely related to that of the late-glacial period, and this gives a record of the

late glacial flora of Britain which is unique and irreplaceable. Many are rare, and some taxa have their only British locality here.⁸ Although the factors which have preserved this vegetation here are not yet fully understood, it seems that the "overall combination of altitude and climate is peculiarly favourable to the northern and sub-alpine nature of the vegetation."⁹ The high humidity and low mean temperature is considered to be of importance, as is the composition of the rock. Many of the Teesdale rarities require an unshaded habitat and base rich soils for their survival. It seems likely that the instability of many of the limestone scars and areas subject to continual erosion, together with the effect of wind, has precluded the development of woodland in certain places, and thus encouraged the survival of the plants. The Teesdale hay meadows also show a variety of herbs, and these are possibly derived from the field layer of herb-rich birch woodland. It is considered that these plants have survived because the meadows have been excluded from intensive grazing. Other habitats are thought to have been created by the trampling effect of cattle, fragmenting the turf into isolated hummocks, which are colonized by certain plants. In another case a type of limestone grassland is thought to be perpetuated through heavy grazing by sheep and rabbits.¹⁰

This distinctive and important vegetation provides the raison d'etre of this thesis: how much has man influenced the vegetation? How has enclosure, grazing, tilling, burning, quarrying and mining had an effect on the habitat of the rare species? This thesis seeks to create a framework within which the botanists questions may be answered. An attempt is made to solve such problems as the chronology of enclosure within the dale, the history of land use, the various uses to which the commons have been put,

the effect of lead mining upon farming, and so on. The result is not to provide the answer to the problem posed, but to give information which may help give some kind of answer; for instance details of land use over the last 170 years, together with less concrete, but no less useful evidence dating back almost to 1600, and a basic framework for assessing the length of time land has been improved, in terms of maps of enclosure patterns dating back to 1769, together with information of a more general nature dating to 1612.

Man in the Dale before 1600

The evidence available from scattered finds, such as flint weapons and axes, and hut-sites, suggests that there was colonization in Teesdale by Mesolithic times. It has, indeed, been suggested that the Stone Age settlers moved into Teesdale from the Edem Valley, thus colonizing the higher parts of the Dale, such as Harwood, before the lower parts around Middleton.¹¹ By the time of the Roman invasion it seems likely that Teesdale was a thinly occupied marcher zone between the Votadini in the north and the Brigantes in the south. The existence of a Roman road from Eggleston in Teesdale to Stanhope in Weardale reveals that there was some expansion into Teesdale at this time, but the area seems to have been intermediate between the Roman Wall zone in the north and Stainmore in the South. It is suggested that the Romans exploited the lead mines in the Upper Dale, but once again there is no concrete evidence. Proof exists that the Roman Generals used parts of Weardale as a forest for hunting deer, and it seems more than likely that parts of Upper Teesdale were used for the same purpose.¹²

Place names in Upper Teesdale are mainly of Celtic, Anglo-

Saxon and Viking-Danish origin,¹³ and would suggest that between the time of the Roman colonization and the Norman invasion the area was a frontier zone of colonization, with improvement and settlement gradually pushing up the Dale. It is suggested in Chapter 2 that the agricultural settlement of Middleton in Teesdale (Fig. 2) was created perhaps by the 9th century, and we must imagine that settlers were moving on up the Dale at this time, clearing the trees and improving the land. It should be noted, however, that Proctor suggests that the main movement at this time was down dale, from Harwood and Middle Forest (Fig. 2) which he considers to have been colonized earlier than the lower parts of the Dale.¹⁴ This is a problem which would repay detailed investigation.

The village nuclei of Middleton and Newbiggin were certainly well established by the 12th century;¹⁵ around and between the villages lay open fields, subdivided into strips, given over to the production of arable crops such as barley and oats, upon which the villages depended for their food. Some traces of these open or 'subdivided' fields still remain around Middleton in the form of strip lynchets, slight banks running along a hill slope, resulting from the downward drift of soil, following persistent ploughing along the slope. The existence of these fields is also confirmed by later documentary and map evidence.¹⁶

After the Norman Conquest, Upper Teesdale became a 'Forest' area, used for hunting, and kept under laws aimed at making it "a safe mansion for wild beasts."¹⁷ However despite this, colonization continued; a second stage began in the 13th century, when settlers began to move out from the main villages, pushing gradually up the Dale, and creating single farms.¹⁸ This must have reduced

the extent of the Forest, and one may perhaps imagine that, as in Weardale in the 16th century, there were "some little ferme holdes in this park."¹⁹ Disforestation and settlement were an important aspect of colonization in the 13th and 14th centuries.²⁰ It seems quite likely that the lead ores to be found in many places along the northern side of the Dale were an additional stimulus to expansion and colonization. This period of expansion, which continues into the time period covered by this thesis, was characterized by irregular enclosures, resulting from gradual piecemeal reclamation of the land according to the needs of each farmer. It should be noted, however, that there is also evidence in the Dale of the retreat of enclosed land sometime during this period of colonization. It is clear that the history of the colonization of the Dale is not a simple story of steady advance, but rather one of advance coupled sometimes with substantial retreats, creating a series of enclosure patterns overlying and discordant to one another (Chapter 4).

By the 16th century, settlement must certainly have been established throughout the Dale from Harwood to Middleton, and although the Forest must still have been in existence, colonization must have reduced its extent substantially by this time. In the mid-16th century Leland observed that "Yad Moss hath the hedde of the Tese, then it taketh a course among rokkes, and resyving divers other small hopes of bekkes and cometh much by wild ground for a 8 or X miles to Aegleston ... the king hath a forest of redde deere yn the more land at Midleton."²¹ The lead mines were also of importance at this time, for in 1550 a royal grant was made to Bowes of all the lead mines in the Forest of Teesdale,²² and we may once again imagine this as creating some sort of stimulus to the advance of settlement.

It remains only to note that Teesdale has been held by many land-owners before it came into the hands of the present owner. The area originally belonged to the See of Durham. It was taken away by William II and given to Guy Balliol. The Balliols forfeited the estate in 1296, and in 1307 they were granted to the 10th Earl of Warwick. It remained in this family, eventually passing to Richard III through his marriage to a member of the family, the Nevilles. In the early 16th century the area passed to the Raby Nevilles who had become Earls of Westmorland. This family forfeited the estate after being associated with an uprising in the reign of Elizabeth I. By the early 17th century the estate had come into the hands of Sir Henry Vane, through whom it has descended to the present Lord Barnard, also a member of the Vane family.²³ This family has held various titles in the past such as Duke of Cleveland, Earl of Darlington, and so on, and wherever a title of this nature is mentioned in the text, the title used is the one referred to in the source material. Throughout the entire period covered by this thesis, however, the Estate has remained in the hands of the Vane family.

Man in the Dale after 1600

The historical geography of the Upper Dale between 1600 and 1900 is best seen in terms of certain problems, which will be briefly explained here, and examined in detail in the various chapters. The first of these is settlement, the basic problem being the chronology of settlement from 1600 to 1900. It is possible to produce maps of settlement at certain periods between these two dates, showing the gradual extension up the Dale. Within what limits was settlement confined? What was the effect of lead mining upon the pattern of settlement? Once a basic framework of the history of settlement has been established, it is possible to turn in more detail to the farms

in an attempt to answer such problems as the different types of tenure, sizes of holding, numbers of holding at different times, and so on. Together the two topics of the farms and settlement create a framework within which the two main problems of the thesis can be viewed: enclosure and land use. The information available on enclosure patterns is used to try and answer three basic questions: (1) what is the chronology of enclosure from 1600 to 1900? (2) what form did the enclosures in all parts of the Dale take at various times during this period? (3) what were the causes of any changes which took place in the enclosure patterns of the Dale during this period? Once a general survey has been made of the enclosure patterns throughout the Dale, a detailed study is made of the history of enclosure in Ettersgill (Fig. 2) in order to exemplify some of the main trends.

The history of land use is treated in much the same way as the enclosure patterns, and in terms of questions the most important are the following: (1) what is the history of land use in Upper Teesdale between 1600 and 1900? (2) what methods of farm management have been used during this period? (3) what has been the relationship between the enclosed land and the fells during this period? Following a general survey of the land use of the Upper Dale is a more detailed study, using examples from various farms at certain points in time.

The role of the commons in the historical geography of the Upper Dale is also examined, not only through its contribution to farming, but also for recreational purposes, notably shooting and hunting.

A final and all-important question to be posed is what was the effect of lead mining upon the Upper Dale? How has mining affected the extension of enclosures and the farming practices of the Dale? It will be shown that the influence of lead mining has been very great, and indeed it might be suggested that had lead mining not occurred in Upper Teesdale then man might not have penetrated so far up into the area.

Although it is possible, up to a point, to view the many problems of the historical geography of Upper Teesdale as separate units, it is most important to recognize that they are all interconnected and intertwined. This is why this thesis is entitled 'Farm Field and Fell', since it emphasises the unity of the subject. The central unit is the farm, surrounded in turn by its enclosed fields or in-bye, and by the fells or out-bye. As already noted, and emphasised many times in the text, these latter two factors are completely interdependent, and the farm is in turn dependant upon both for its livelihood. 'Farm, Field and Fell' therefore basically encompasses all the subject matter dealt with in this thesis, even lead mining, which was carried out on the fells, and which was intimately connected with farming.

The Sources

The main sources upon which this thesis is based come from five record offices, which are listed below, together with the material which they provided. Other less important sources are listed in the bibliographies.

The Raby Estate Offices.

Most of Upper Teesdale, and all of the Forest of Teesdale^{*}

* Unless otherwise noted the term Forest of Teesdale refers to the administrative area comprising Harwood, Middle Forest and Ettersgill.

belongs to the Raby Estate of Lord Barnard. The two estate offices at Middleton in Teesdale and Staindrop both have a great deal of information relating to the Upper Dale, especially in the 18th and 19th centuries.

-Middleton Estate Office-

1) Plan of Ettersgill Farms, 1763, by Jeremiah Dixon. This is the earliest map in any detail of any part of Upper Teesdale. It is beautifully executed, showing in detail every enclosure, however small, and every farm building. Each field is named, together with its exact acreage, and is also numbered, presumably for use with a farm book which, however, cannot be found. This map is of great interest since it depicts a series of enclosure patterns which now no longer exist.

2) Plan of the Manor of Middleton ...1769, by John Greenwell. This map is of fundamental importance in a reconstruction of the historical geography of Upper Teesdale. It shows the position of the head dyke in 1769, and depicts all the enclosure patterns in Harwood, Middle Forest and Ettersgill, together with the newly made enclosures on Newbiggin Common. It also details the owner of each field and the acreage of each field, thus aiding immeasurably the reconstruction of the history of settlement and the farms themselves. In addition to this all the lead mines of the Dale are shown in detail, and the boundaries of the Commons are mapped.

The limitations and problems presented by this map are as follows. Firstly none of the enclosures in Middleton or Newbiggin are shown (except for those mentioned above). This makes it very difficult to give a complete account of the enclosure patterns throughout the entire dale, although later sources would indicate

that less fundamental change went on here than higher up the Dale. Secondly, it is difficult to say whether the enclosure patterns are accurately depicted or not, although detailed investigation would suggest that they are. Thirdly, no details of land use are given, a major limitation, since information on this would provide an invaluable link between the 1612 survey and the 1848 Farm Books.

3) The 1847-1864 Farm Books and Maps. These constitute a series of farm books and corresponding maps. The books, running from 1847 to 1864 give the number of each field (to correspond with the map), the acreage of the field, and the use to which it was put over a certain period. The farm books used in this study are the following: Harwood 1847-57; Ettersgill 1847-64; Middle Forest 1847-57; Newbiggin 1847-57. The limitations imposed by time meant that the Middleton farm book and map could not be copied, and that the coverage of the other Townships had to be limited. These farm books and maps enable three sets of maps to be made (1) Enclosure patterns in the Upper Dale, (2) Farms in the Upper Dale and (3) Land use in the Upper Dale, all excluding Middleton. They thus form an invaluable link with the earlier surveys. The farm books also give other useful information such as the number of stints each tenant had, details of the rebuilding of some of the farms and so on. Also connected with the maps are a series of plans of the Commons, made in 1847.

There are three problems presented by these maps: (1) The Estate did not own all the land in Newbiggin at this time, so that the maps of this area are incomplete. (2) No mention is made in the books of the actual numbers of stock on the farms. (3) Lack of coverage of the Middleton area is a limitation, but Tithe map coverage

can make up for this.

-Staindrop Estate Office-

1) Valuation of the Manor of Middleton, 1803, Alexander Calvert.

This valuation forms a most useful link between the surveys of 1769 and 1847. The book gives details of each field in each of the five townships in the Upper Dale, and includes the name of each field, its acreage, the value per acre, yearly value and the use to which it was being put in 1803. In this way it is the most complete survey to be made of the Upper Dale. The valuer also made many useful comments upon the state of the farms at this time.

As pointed out in the text the main drawback of this valuation is that no map accompanies it, and it is therefore impossible to locate the new intakes which it notes in great detail. It is, however, of great importance in revealing the extension of enclosed land between 1769 and 1803, and the increase in the numbers of farms during this period. As with the 1847 farm books there are no complete details of the stock on each farm.

2) Map of Upper Teesdale lead mines 1732, by Thomas Jones.

Lord Barnard's leadmill account 1739-40. Grant book of mines by the Duke of Cleveland, 1833-45. Regulations for the payment of Duty Ore, 1853. These sources help to give a very clear picture of the state of the lead industry over a century. The map, although somewhat crudely drawn, is nevertheless very clear, and depicts all the lead mines in the Dale at this time. The accounts are of very great interest, since they reveal very clearly the state of organization of the industry at this time. The grant book gives details of the mines which were being worked in the first half of the 19th century,

and also of the men who were working them.

3) Abstract of rents on the Teesdale Estate, 1866-99; Sundry leases for the late 19th century; Account Book for the Upper Dale 1848; Valuation of the Upper Dale 1864. These varied sources provide useful information on most aspects of the historical geography of Upper Teesdale, as will become clear from the text.

The County Record Office, Durham

1) Middleton in Teesdale Enclosure Award. This comprises a plan of the new enclosures, written details of the land and stints allotted to each tenant and details of the common services such as quarries and watering places which were allocated. The plan is perhaps the most useful part of the Award, since it is typical of Parliamentary Enclosures on moorland, and contrasts strongly with the enclosure patterns lower down the Dale. Details are also given of new roads and so on.

2) The 1851 Census Returns. These are invaluable in two respects: (a) they give complete details of every dwelling in the Upper Dale, and thus form the basis of the only truly representative settlement map of the Upper Dale; (b) they give details of the occupation of every person, and so are most important in assessing the occupational structure of the Dale at this time, especially in relation to lead mining. The entries may also be correlated with the Raby Farm books to gauge the relationship of mining and farming.

3) A Journey through Teesdale, 1848, by Francis Cockshott. This is a manuscript account of a journey on foot through Teesdale from Cross Fell to Middlesborough. The part of the journey dealing

with Upper Teesdale gives many useful insights into the state of the Dale at this time, although all in a very general sense. It does however, help to give a fuller picture of the Dale at this time.

The Department of Palaeography and Diplomatic, University of Durham.

1) Probate Inventories, 1600-1900. Probate Inventories are basically detailed lists of the 'goods chattels and cattle' of deceased persons. From the point of view of this thesis the most important factor is that they give a clear insight into the Upper Teesdale Farms in the 17th century, since all the beasts - cattle, sheep and horses - were listed in detail and valued. Crops were also noted, as was farming equipment and so on. The inventories are most valuable in this respect, although they do have many drawbacks: (1) the material they provide is so detailed that it is difficult to generalise from it, although with caution a few conclusions may be drawn about the state of farming at this time; (2) The nature and bulk of the material, together with the fact that many of the farms are not accurately located, makes it very difficult to map, although some attempts are made in this thesis; (3) In many cases no will accompanies the inventory, and in most cases no details are given as to the nature of the relevant farm, with the result that no truly complete picture of farming can be given through the inventories.

They are nevertheless a very important source of information on farms in the 17th century, and do give some important pointers as to the trends in farming at this time. The inventories are tabulated in detail in Appendix 4, and a glance at the material represented there will reveal the difficulties of dealing with them and also the wealth of information they represent.

2) Middleton in Teesdale and Newbiggin Tithe maps, 1843.

The main purpose to which the Middleton map was put was to examine the form of the village and to make deductions as to its origin and development. It was also used with reference to the enclosure patterns in this part of the Dale and their development. The Newbiggin map was used with reference to the enclosure patterns around the village.

The Public Record Office

The Jacobean Survey, 1612 (on microfilm). This is a survey of the Manors of Raby, Barnard Castle and Brancepeth, and the part dealing with Upper Teesdale is a most important source of information. Basically it lists the following facts about the various tenants in the area in 1612: how much land each man held, where he held it and to what use it was put. It also noted how many houses, stables, barns and so on he held, and whether he had the right of common. The survey is thus most useful from a variety of standpoints:

- (1) It enables some sort of picture to be created of the enclosure patterns at this particular time, since the land is described as lying in strips or closes;
- (2) It enables analysis of the types of landholding, from the man who held all his land in strips, to the 'sub manors' of the Forest of Teesdale, who leased out parcels of land to sub-tenants;
- (3) It gives a good picture of the land use at this time, and reveals that the lower parts of the Dale were undergoing a change in land use at this time.

The limitations of the Survey are as follows: (1) The survey of Middleton and Newbiggin is obviously incomplete. Only $\frac{1}{2}$ an acre of land is recorded for Middleton East Field which undoubtedly had well over 100 acres at some stage, as revealed by

the Middleton Tithe map. The amounts of land and number of houses recorded for the Forest of Teesdale would indicate that this part of the Survey is complete. It is possible that the Lord of the Manor of Barnard Castle did not own all the area around Middleton and Newbiggin, which thus was not recorded; (2) Terms such as 'parcel' used to define units of land are not defined, and thus cause some confusion. This is described in more detail in Chapter 3, but study of the Survey would seem to indicate that the term 'parcel' covers two different forms of landholding; (3) Although giving a clear picture of the state of the Forest of Teesdale at this time, the Survey does not give any of the names of the farms there, except for the three main ones. This makes it impossible to construct a settlement map for this period, and also makes it impossible to locate with any accuracy the enclosed zones.

However, despite these limitations the Survey is of great importance and is used as a source throughout this thesis, and also in conjunction with the Probate Inventories. Because of its detailed nature, the Survey is tabulated in detail in Appendix 1.

These, then, are the main sources used throughout this thesis, and are cited in detail in the bibliographies. There are a few primary sources which have not been mentioned here, because they are only cited very briefly in the text, and their origin can be found in the relevant bibliographies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. C.R.O. Cockshott, Francis. A Journey on Foot through Teesdale, 1848. (Manuscript)
2. C.R.O. Cockshott, op. cit.
3. Ordnance Survey Map Sheet 84, Teesdale, Scale of One Inch to One Mile, Seventh Series, 1964.
4. Smailes, A.E. North England, (London: Nelson, 1960), pp271-273.
5. Hornung, M. Soil Patterns in Upper Teesdale, Unpublished paper read to the Teesdale Symposium, Durham 25-26th March 1970.
6. Millar, A. Upper Teesdale - Climate, Unpublished paper read to the Teesdale Symposium, Durham 25-26th March 1970.
7. Smailes, op. cit. pp. 52-55 *passim*.
8. Pennington, W. A History of British Vegetation, (London: English Universities Press, 1969), pp. 107-108
9. Piggot, C.D. The Vegetation of Upper Teesdale in the North Pennines, *J. Ecol*, 44, 1956, pp. 545-586.
10. Pennington, op. cit. pp. 108-109
11. Proctor, H.G. Mankind, in The Natural History of Upper Teesdale, ed. by D.H. Valentine, (Newcastle: Tyne Printing Works, 1965), pp. 5-6
12. Roberts, B.K. & J.M. Crudass, Man and Land in Teesdale: An Overview, Unpublished paper read to the Teesdale Symposium, Durham, 25-26th March, 1970.
13. Macmurtrie, D.A. Upper Teesdale-Langdon Beck to High Cup Nick, in Durham Field Studies, ed. B.B. Hartop et al. (University of Durham Institute of Education, 1968), p. 67.
14. Proctor, op. cit., p. 8
15. Roberts and Crudass, op. cit.
16. For instance the Jacobean Survey, and the 1843 Tithe Map.
17. Proctor, op. cit., p. 8.
18. Roberts and Crudass, op. cit.
19. Smailes, op. cit., p. 97
20. Ibid, p. 97.
21. Toulmin Smith, L.; ed. The Itinerary of John Leland in or about the Years 1535-1543, (London: Geo. Bell & Son), pp. 76-77.
22. Smailes, op. cit., p. 127.
23. Proctor, op. cit., pp. 8-10.

CHAPTER 2

SETTLEMENT

The settlement pattern of the Upper Dale consists of one large village (Middleton in Teesdale), two small hamlets (Bowlees and Newbiggin), and a wide scatter of farms and dwelling houses extending up the Dale as far as Ashgill Head in Harwood (Fig. 2).¹ Since information on settlement for the whole of the Upper Dale is rather scanty, the first part of this Chapter will be primarily concerned with the development of settlement in the Townships of Harwood, Middle Forest and Ettersgill, which together comprise the Forest of Teesdale (Fig. 2). This will be based upon information obtained from the 1612 Jacobean Survey, the 1769 Map and Farm Book, the 1803 Valuation and the 1851 Census Returns, combined with the 1847 Farm Books. The two Farm Books and the Valuation do not give complete coverage of all the dwellings in the Forest of Teesdale, since they are concerned only with the farms and not with houses which did not hold any land. It is fortunate that the 1847 Farm Books can be combined with the 1851 Census Returns, so that at least one of the maps gives a completely true picture of the settlement pattern. Although inaccurate to a certain extent, maps derived from the 1769 Survey and the 1803 Valuation do at least serve to give some impression of the settlement pattern at these two dates. The second part of the Chapter will deal with the origin and development of Middleton in Teesdale, based mainly on the map of 1769 and the 1843 Tithe Map, together with some contemporary writings.

Settlement in the Forest of Teesdale

It proves impossible to make an accurate map of settlement based upon the Jacobean Survey of 1612, since only three of the

farms in the relevant area are named. The main fact which can be established is that Thomas Bainbrigge of Brigge House owned fourteen houses, Guy Bainbrigge of Hendfelloe House owned seventeen houses and Thomas Bainbrigge of Vallance Lodge owned eighteen houses, totalling 49 houses in all.² The areas where these houses were situated can be identified as Ettersgill, Harwood and Middle Forest respectively, as discussed in more detail in Chapter Three. The only two houses which can be accurately located from the Survey alone are Vallance Lodge and Brigge House, which feature on later maps (Figs. 8 & 9), while Hendfelloe House, since it does not appear on any subsequent map of the area, is impossible to locate. Certain other sources such as Probate Inventories³ and a Glebe Terrier for Middleton in Teesdale in 1663⁴ indicate a few more of the farms by name, such as Langdon Beck, Cocklake and Forcegarth (Appendix 4 Part 1). Other farms are mentioned, but not by name, i.e. they are described as being in 'the Forest' or in 'the High Forest'. In such cases as these accurate location is, of course, impossible. It is, however, possible to construct a general map showing some of the farms in existence in the Forest of Teesdale between 1600 and 1700, and although obviously not complete, this helps to give some very general idea of the broad outlines of settlement at this time (Fig. 3a).

This map shows that, by the end of the 17th century, settlement already extended high up the Dale as far as Grass Hill Farm, at 2,000 feet a.s.l. In Middle Forest, the area in which the largest numbers of dwellings can be accurately located, the broad framework within which later settlement developed was already apparent. This was a broad band running from Vallance Lodge on Langdon Beck at the north western end, to Forcegarth on the Tees at the south eastern end, the Tees forming the southern boundary to the zone of settlement. In

this area there were already farms such as Under Hurth (Fig. 8), at about 1,500 feet a.s.l., forming the northern boundary to the zone of settlement, which must at this time have been very near to the frontier of improvement, between the enclosed lands and the waste. Few farms in Ettersgill can be accurately located from 17th century sources, but the few which can be found indicate that settlement had also extended to fairly high altitudes here. For instance, Woobus Hill Farm (later known as Woolpitts Hill Farm (Fig. 9)) at almost 1,500 feet a.s.l. must have been situated very close to the frontier of improvement. Thus, although this map is far from complete it is valuable in indicating that the framework within which later settlement developed was already present, and that settlement already extended high up the Dale.

The 1769 Map of the Upper Dale reveals that there were twenty-one farms in Harwood, twenty-two in Middle Forest and fourteen in Ettersgill.⁵ This shows an increase of eight in all over the 1612 total, and it therefore seems very probable that the pattern of farms in 1612 must have been very similar to that shown on the 1769 map (Fig. 3b). The latter shows that Grass Hill Farm was still the highest in the Dale. In Harwood there were five farms on the southern side of Harwood Beck, situated at between 1,440 and 1,500 feet a.s.l., between the enclosed lands and the commons. Similarly on the northern side of the Beck were four farm situated at the same altitude, on the southern edge of Langdon Common, with easy access to both the common and the enclosed lands. The remainder of the farms were situated in the land between Harwood Beck and Trough Beck. As might be expected the majority of the farms were situated within the main zone of enclosed land; Grass Hill Farm and Mill House and Close Farm, in the north-west, were at this time completely isolated from

the main block of enclosures, as was the farm of Margaret Oliver in the south east (Fig. 10). Already apparent in Harwood was the gathering together of farms into groups bearing the same name: eg. two farms named Bowes Close, belonging respectively to Thomas and William Toward (father and son?). Similarly there were two farms at Stoney Hill owned by Thomas Watson and William Watson, and two at Marchgill, owned by Thomas Raisbeck and his son. In this we see a hint of the mechanism by which farms multiplied, sons acquiring land, possibly new land, adjacent to the fathers holding, and then building a farmhouse, bearing the same name as the fathers farm.

The farms in Middle Forest at this time were equally scattered (Fig. 3b). Some, such as Whey Sike, Knott Hill and Watgarth were situated on the tract of land which extended along the River Tees from Langdon Beck to Forcegarth Pasture (Fig. 8). Others were much higher up on the edges of the fells at about 1,400 feet a.s.l., and probably had easy access to both the enclosed land and the commons. All the farms in Middle Forest were situated within the main block of enclosed land, with the exception of Sievy Hill Farm which was situated in a small island of enclosed land in Langdon Beck Common, between Harwood and Middle Forest.

In Ettersgill most of the farms show a definite grouping at this time along the western side of the Beck (Fig. 3b). As there were still fourteen farms here as there were in 1612⁶, it is most probable that this was the original settlement pattern created in Ettersgill as enclosed land extended into the area in the mid-15th century (Chapter 4). All the farms were situated in slightly sheltered positions on the western side of the Beck. Some were in the slight depressions created where a small syke entered the Beck,

and others were situated where the sides of the Beck afforded some protection, coupled with a suitable building site. The land tended to rise somewhat to the north and west of the main area of settlement in Ettersgill, and possibly gave some protection from winds and snow. In addition to this, the western side of Ettersgill is much more accessible than the eastern side; it seems possible that the first settlers in the area moved up the western side and settled along the Beck in the most suitable places, where they would also have the added advantage of a water supply nearby. It is interesting to note that all the farms in Ettersgill in 1769 lie within the area supposed to have been enclosed by 1612 (Fig. 23). Since the numbers of farms are the same as in 1612, then it does seem that the pattern of settlement was exactly as it was in 1612.

Turning to the map based upon the Valuation of 1803⁷, (Fig 3c) it is immediately clear that expansion of settlement took place within the framework apparent in 1769. For instance, in Ettersgill there were now fifteen farms as opposed to fourteen as in 1769. The pattern of settlement had changed somewhat, since three of the farms existing in 1769 had each split into two, creating three new units, while three other farms had been amalgamated into one (Chapter 3). However, settlement was still concentrated in the same area as before, along the western side of Ettersgill Beck. The mechanism by which the division and amalgamation of farms took place is difficult to assess, but it seems quite possible that some of the farms which had split into two had been divided between two sons or members of the same family. The fact that the settlement in Ettersgill was still concentrated in the same zone as in 1769 suggests that pressure upon the land had not yet begun to increase substantially, and that until it did the settlement did not begin

to move out of the established zone.

In Middle Forest there were now twenty-five farms as opposed to twenty-one in 1769. Figure 3c shows that the increase was within the framework seen in 1769, and that there was hardly any expansion out of the already established zone. The increase in the number of farms was mainly caused by a duplication of already existing units, eg. there were now two farms at Hangingshaws instead of one as in 1769. Similarly there were two farms at East Under Hurth instead of one as before. The result of this duplication was, as already noted, the concentration of settlement within the broad zone running north-west - south-east from Vallance Lodge to Forcegarth, (Fig. 8).

Very similar development went on in Harwood. The numbers of farms increased from twenty-one in 1769 to thirty-five in 1803, again most of the increase being within the broad zone outlined in Figure 3b. The trend towards the splitting up of farms is again noticeable here: there were now two farms at Clover Yard instead of one as in 1769, and three at March Gill instead of two. The numbers of farms around the head of the Dale and around Grass Hill had also increased. It is unfortunate that Census data for the Upper Dale does not begin until 1801, since earlier information would be of use, to indicate the relationship between the increase in farms and the increase in the population of the area, especially in Harwood, where the greatest rise in the number of farms went on.

Although there was an increase in the amount of available enclosed land between 1769 and 1803 (Table 1.), it seems likely that the major cause of the increase in the number of farms in the

Upper Dale, notably in Harwood, was the growing importance of lead mining, despite the fact that there was something of a slump during the Napoleonic Wars (Chapter 8). "The increase of population occasioned by the mines in both these extensive parishes, is very great; the landed property, could by no means support one third of the inhabitants, were it not for these mines..." said Joseph Grainger in 1794.⁸ In 1801 the population of the Forest of Teesdale was 460, comprising 239 males and 221 females in 97 families.⁹

The first source to give a true picture of the settlement in the Upper Dale is the 1851 Census Returns for the area.¹⁰ These recorded every dwelling in the district, unlike the 1848 Farm Books (and the 1769 Survey and 1803 Valuation) which only recorded the farms. The Census Returns can be usefully combined with the 1848 Farm Books, however, to show how many of the householders who worked in the lead mines also had smallholdings which provided a supplementary income (Chapter 8).

Comparing the map of settlement in 1851 (Fig. 3d) with those of 1769 and 1803 (Figs 3b & c), it is clear that although the numbers of houses and farms increased between these dates, settlement was still concentrated very much within the limits noted on the 1769 map, that is, in general concentrated below 1,500 feet a.s.l., apart from some farms in Harwood which were situated between 1,500 and 2,000 feet at the very head of the Dale. The number of farms in Harwood increased from thirty-five to forty-two, and the total number of dwellings at this time was sixty-one. The duplication of dwellings around an already established nucleus was very much in evidence in Harwood. For example there were now four farms at March Gill instead of three as in 1803, and two farms at Rigg Side

instead of one as in 1803(Fig. 10). It is significant, however, that settlement was still broadly confined within the limits established by 1803, the only exception to this being the tendency for settlement to spread slightly into the north-western part of the township around Grass Hill, as enclosed land increased in extent in that area.

A comparable increase in the number of farms went on in Middle Forest, where they increased from twenty-five to forty-five, and where the total number of dwellings was now fifty-seven. The settlement of the area was still concentrated in the broad zone running from Vallance Lodge to Forcegarth, settlement still being generally limited below the 1,500 foot contour. The tendency of settlement to concentrate around already existing centres is again emphasised in Middle Forest, where there were now three farms at Hangingshaws as compared with two in 1803, and three at Laggdon Beck as compared with one in 1803.

In Ettersgill the number of farms had increased from fifteen to twenty-four between 1803 and 1848 and the total number of dwellings was now thirty. There was by now a considerable amount of concentration of settlement in Ettersgill, especially around Beck Head and Bank Top (Figs 3d & 9). In addition to this there was an extension of settlement away from the zone along the western side of the Beck, and new dwellings had been created further away from the Beck, such as Birch Hill Farm and Ashdub Side. This must indicate a breaking away from the established zone of settlement, suggesting increasing pressure on the established zone.

The considerable increase in the numbers of farms in the

Forest of Teesdale, and in settlement generally, between 1803 and 1851, must be related mainly to the lead mining boom in this area which reached its peak in the mid-19th century. The 1851 census returns reveal how many of the householders in the area were lead miners, and also how many of their families were employed in the mines, as testified by Whellam in 1856 when he said that "Harwood has many lead mines in which great numbers of the inhabitants are employed." ¹¹ The increase in population between 1801 and 1851 can be seen in the following table:

Table 1

Population of the Forest of Teesdale, 1801-1851. ¹²

1801	460
1811	601
1821	723
1831	760
1841	884
1851	904

The rapid rise in the number of dwellings between 1801 and 1851 is clearly due to this increase in population, although how much it is due to a natural increase in the population, perhaps due to the prosperity gained from lead mining, and how much due to immigration into the area from outside is difficult to say without more detailed information. The lead mining boom must certainly have kept a large number of people in the area who would otherwise have moved away. The recurrence of typically Teesdale surnames in the Census Returns perhaps indicates that most of the population increase was natural. The extension of the amount of available enclosed land was obviously important in allowing the numbers of farms to increase, but here again it does not seem likely that enclosed land would have expanded so much in the 19th century, had there not been an expansion of population, due in the first place to lead mining.

Although in the years between 1612 and 1851 the amount of settlement in the Forest of Teesdale increased enormously, it did so mainly within the basic pattern established as early as 1612, as clearly indicated by study of Figure 3. Only in a few places did settlement extend very far from these limits, the main area being at the head of Harwood. Otherwise it tended very much to concentrate within the established limits, with an especial tendency to gather around already established centres. The many farms bearing the same name in the later Surveys bear witness to this fact. As Smailes has pointed out: "The development of lead mining has not changed the pre-existing pattern, but has merely multiplied and extended the scattered settlement ... the mining population was concentrated in the cultivated regions from which the mines were accessible and has therefore not led to any appreciable extension of settlement beyond this limit." ¹³

Middleton in Teesdale

Middleton is the main village of the Upper Dale, and so it is of interest to study its physical form and development. Middleton is, of course, mentioned in many of the documents relating to the Dale between 1600 and 1900, the first of these being the Jacobean Survey of 1612. ¹⁴ At this time it must have been composed mainly of farmsteads, whose owners held land in the open fields around the village. In the Survey seven of the landholders had tenements in Middleton itself. Most of the rest are unaccounted for.

The first map in any detail occurs in the 1769 Survey by Greenwell, and even here it is depicted in a rather impressionistic manner. ¹⁵ This map shows that Middleton consisted mainly of two parts: a section running north-south, consisting of two rows of houses on

either side of a road, and a section running east-west again composed of two rows of houses on either side of a road. The latter section joined the former at its southern end, thus forming a right angle (Fig. 5). The northern row of the east-west section is depicted as a continuous line of dwellings, joined to one another, while the southern row of this section is much more irregular and discontinuous. The north-south section, as depicted on this map is very irregular and ill-defined. It is perhaps wrong to read too much into a map which is clearly rather impressionistic, but the form of the village as depicted by Greenwell might suggest the following conclusions: (1) that the east-west section of the village, being better developed and defined than the north-south section is the older of the two, and (2) that the north row of the east-west section being better developed than the south row is the older of these two rows. It might therefore be feasible to suggest that Middleton began life as a 'one row village', based on the open fields, which had an east-west trend, and that the south row of this section and the north-south section developed later. ¹⁶

This supposition is backed up by the evidence provided by a study of Middleton in Teesdale as depicted on the Tithe map of the area, dated 1843. ¹⁷ This shows that the two rows of the east-west section faced onto a central green. Behind each of these rows extended a series of what Roberts has termed 'long tofts'. These basically are the 'yards, garths, crofts, paddocks or backsides' which extend for some distance behind the houses to which they belong. ¹⁸ These tofts were all of fairly equal width, and much the same length, especially those on the northern side of the village. Study of the Tithe map shows that, in contrast to the long tofts behind the north-south section of the village, the tofts behind the east-west section

are very much longer. The buildings in the former section are also very irregularly placed. It is significant that the tofts behind the east row of the north-south section abut onto those behind the north row of the east-west section (Figs. 5&6). This is a strong pointer to the greater antiquity of the east west section, and suggests even more strongly that the village originated as a 'one-' or perhaps 'two-row' village with an east-west alignment, being later joined by another section, which resulted in its characteristic present day right-angled form.

The Parish Church is, significantly, situated in what is presumed to be the newer section of the village (Fig. 5). This perhaps indicates that no church was present or planned for in the original village, and that it was added on as the village grew. Middleton Church, however, has an arch which is probably Norman ¹⁹, indicating that building must have begun at least by the end of the 12th century. This in turn suggests that if a church was being built in the newer section of the village by the end of the 12th century, then the older section must be of much greater antiquity, possibly dating back to the 8th or 9th centuries.

The map of 1843 indicates some development of housing to the south of the main village (Fig. 6). This was the 'model village' or 'New Middleton' built by the London Lead Company for its workers in the early 19th century. "This consists of a number of extremely neat and comfortable dwelling houses built in several uniform rows in a spacious garden. The whole is the work of the London Lead Company ... under the direction of their manager Mr Stagg, whose exertions to promote at once the interests of the company and the comforts of the miner, cannot be too highly recommended." ²⁰ "These

cottages were first entered in 1822 ... let by the Company to those workmen who by meritorious conduct have gained their approbation." (Cockshott)²¹ Contemporary sources reveal that the London Lead Company did much to help in the development of the village in the mid-19th century, and as well as building houses they also built shops, schools, libraries, clubs and so on.²²

The map also shows that Middleton was of quite considerable extent by 1843. Its population was still growing, almost certainly due to the lead mining boom in the Dale, and especially as many of the most important mines in the Dale were situated to the north of it (Chapter 8). In 1801 the population of Middleton was 796. By 1821 it was 1,263 and by 1851 it had risen to 1,849. The peak was reached by 1871 when the population was 2,386, but by 1891 it had fallen to 2,008, again almost certainly as a result of the decline in lead mining after the mid-19th century, and the lack of employment resulting from this decline.²³

To summarise, the development of Middleton, as deduced mainly from maps is as follows: the village possibly originated as early as the 8th or 9th centuries, as a one-row settlement aligned east-west. At this time it must have been a purely agricultural settlement, depending upon the open fields around it for a livelihood. The village grew, and probably by the end of the 12th century had assumed the basic form which it displayed in the first map of the village, made in 1769. Until the late 17th century it seems most likely that it remained first and foremost an agricultural settlement, but after this time it must have become increasingly dependant upon the production of lead for its livelihood. It became a focal point for much of the lead industry in the Dale, its population increasing

rapidly as this industry grew more important. The London Lead Company contributed to the physical development of the village by creating houses for its workmen. After the decline in lead mining in the latter years of the 19th century the growth of the village was halted, and its population began to fall. Since then it has become a small service centre for the rural settlement higher up the Dale, but its importance as compared with the 19th century has declined, and its form is very much the same as it was over a century ago.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ordnance Survey Map Sheet 84, Teesdale, Scale of One Inch to One Mile, Seventh Series, 1964.
2. P.R.O., Survey of the Manors of Raby, Brancepeth and Barnard Castle, 1612. (On microfilm).
3. Pal & Dip., Various Probate Inventories of Middleton and the Forest of Teesdale, 1600-1700. Further details in Appendix 4 Part 1.
4. C.R.O. Strathmore Collection, Box 88 No. 130, A Complete Terrier of the Rectory of Middleton in Teesdale in the Bishopric of Durham, 1663. (Copy).
5. M.E.O. (Small map store) Greenwell, John, A Plan of the Manor of Middleton in the County of Durham ... belonging to Henry Earl of Darlington, 1769.
6. P.R.O. Survey, op. cit.
7. S.E.O. (Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate), A Particular and Valuation of the Manor of Middleton in Teesdale in the County Palatine of Durham belonging to the Rt. Hon. William Henry, Earl of Darlington. September 1803.
8. Grainger, Joseph, A General View of the Agriculture of the County of Durham, (London 1794) p. 21.
9. Bailey, J. A General View of the Agriculture of the County of Durham, (London: Phillips, 1810) p.332
10. C.R.O. 1851 Census Returns, (on microfilm), for the Forest of Teesdale.
11. Whellan, W. History, Topography and Directory of the County Palatine of Durham, (London; 1856) p.457

12. Whellan, W. op. cit. (2nd Edition, 1894), p. 571.
13. Smailes, A.E. The Lead Dales of the Northern Pennines,
Geography, June 1936, pp. 120-129.
14. P.R.O. Survey, op. cit.
15. M.E.O. Greenwell, op. cit.
16. Roberts, B.K. Timeless Villages from Medieval England, Geographical
Magazine, Vol. XLII, No. 8 (1970), p. 601.
17. Pal & Dip., Middleton in Teesdale Tithe Map, 1843.
18. Roberts, B.K. The Green Villages of County Durham: A Re-appraisal,
Discussion paper presented to the Agrarian Landscape
Research Group of the Institute of British Geographers,
Dec. 1968-Jan 1969.
19. Roberts, B.K. Personal communication.
20. Sopwith, T. The Mining Districts of Alston Moor, Weardale and
Teesdale, (Davison, 1833), p. 157.
21. Cockshott, Francis, A Journey on Foot through Teesdale, C.R.O.
22. Ibid.
23. Whellan; op. cit. p.571

CHAPTER 3

THE FARMS

In Upper Teesdale the isolated farm must be regarded as the basic unit of settlement, as noted in Chapter Two, apart, of course, from the main villages of the Dale, Middleton and Newbiggin. In turn, these villages must have originated as groups of farms, based upon the subdivided townfields around them (Chapter 4). It is therefore of great importance and interest to trace the development of the farm in the Upper Dale, as a basic framework within which the broad trends of enclosure and land use can be viewed. The Chapter will be divided into two sections: the first deals with tenure and the development of the farm unit, and the second with farm buildings etc. It is based, as are the majority of other Chapters, on three main sources: the 1612 Jacobean Survey, the 1769 Survey of Middleton by John Greenwell and the 1803 Valuation and the 1847 Cleveland Farm books and maps. A very large amount of additional information is used, such as rentals, leases, accounts and so on, to give as continuous a survey of the farms as is possible.

The Jacobean Survey of the farms in the Upper Dale ¹, although it is not complete, is nevertheless very useful in indicating the various types of tenure, sizes of holding, and also some details of farm buildings in the Townships of Middleton and Newbiggin. Thirty-seven landholders were accounted for in the Survey. These held land in various parts of the Townships, in the subdivided fields, in enclosed strips, closes or parcels. As indicated by Table 2 the patterns of tenure were complex, and although many of the landholders held land only in the subdivided fields, others held land both in these fields and elsewhere.

Table 2

Farm Structure in Middleton and Newbiggin, 1612²

Location of land	Individual holdings
Newbiggin Field	14
Newbiggin Field & Scarlett Field	1
Bowleys Field	3
Scalbank Field	3
Newbiggin Field & parcels	2
Newbiggin Field & closes	5
Newbiggin Field, closes & enclosed parcels	1
Middleton East Field & parcels	1
Middle Side Field & parcels	1
Closes	4
Parcels	1
Garth only	<u>3</u>
Total number of holdings 39	

It should be pointed out that although there were only thirty seven landholders, one of these had three separate holdings, listed individually in the Survey, which are, therefore, treated individually here.

It is interesting to note that many tenants held 'parcels' of land which were not assigned to any particular field, which might therefore be assumed to be outside the subdivided fields. This is difficult to understand since a parcel is usually taken to define a 'bundle' of contiguous strips belonging to one man, lying within the subdivided fields. It seems very likely that in the context of this Survey the term 'parcel' may have had two meanings. In terms of the subdivided fields it meant a bundle of contiguous strips belonging to one man. When no reference was made to any field it perhaps refers to a unit of land held by one man, let out to a sub-tenant. This is perhaps confirmed by the following evidence: the inventory of Peter Bainbrigg of Stanigill Head in the Township

of Middleton, who died in 1637, records that he held "...one parcell of Raiph Natis farme and another pcell of Raiph Soakes farme at the yearly rent of six shillings." These were valued at £3 6s 8d.³

This must serve to some extent to confirm the supposition made above, and the subject is discussed further with reference to the Forest of Teesdale. The existence of parcels within the subdivided fields must imply that although most of the fields lay open, the process of consolidation was taking place, leading on gradually to the enclosure of the parcels at a later date (Chapter 4). The Survey does not indicate the exact numbers of strips held by each man, but only the total acreage of land in each parcel. It will be noted that most of those who had land in the Townfields held two parcels only, one of meadow and one of arable (Appendix 1). This must suggest that consolidation was well advanced at this time.

The sizes of holdings in Middleton and Newbiggin varied as widely as did the types of holding, from over 100 acres at Friar House (see below), to a parcel of one acre in Newbiggin Field.⁴ Figure Seven indicates that most of the holdings fell between one and fifteen acres, the average size of holding being twelve acres, excluding the land in the garth. These figures also exclude the land held by Friar House, which by nature of its size would distort the average figures.

Friar House farm, held by Roger Bainbrigge, was exceptional in that it held a very large amount of land, 120 acres in all. This was held in five closes, four of meadow and one of pasture. It also held twenty-six acres of land and a house in Middleton. This particular farm must be identified with the present day Friar House Farm which is situated at the southern end of Ettersgill Beck, just

within the bounds of Newbiggin.⁵ This farm was much more similar in structure to the farms of the Forest of Teesdale, and can be regarded as transitional between the smaller holdings of Middleton and Newbiggin and the very much larger holdings further up the Dale.

Only three farms are mentioned in the part of the Survey dealing with the Forest of Teesdale. These were as follows: Brigge House 'in the eastern part of the Forest of Teesdale', Hendfelloe House 'in the middle part of the Forest of Teesdale', and Vallance Lodge 'in the south part of the Forest of Teesdale'.⁶ Each of these farms had particularly large amounts of land attached to them.

Table 3

Farm Structure in the Forest of Teesdale, 1612⁷

Farm	Parcels	Closes	Total (acres)
Vallance Lodge	508	46	554
Brigge House	435		435
Hendfelloe House	693		693

Here again the problem of land lying in 'parcels' is met with. It seems unlikely that subdivided fields developed in this part of the Dale, for two reasons: (1) The nature of the land in the Forest of Teesdale would seem to preclude the development of subdivided fields, in that there are few tracts of level land large enough to be converted into large unified open fields, and (2) such fields originated as largely arable producing fields, even in Middleton and Newbiggin, where they were at this time in the process of conversion to meadow (Chapter 5). In view of the nature of the climate of the Forest of Teesdale it seems most unlikely that many arable crops could have been grown here, thus

precluding the development of subdivided fields to any extent. The Survey itself makes no reference to such fields, despite the fact that it frequently refers to 'parcels', and in view of this it seems likely that the term 'parcel' must be viewed completely differently, and the state of organization of the farms in this area gives a clue to the answer.

The Survey states that each of the three landholders held very large numbers of houses: Brigge House fourteen, Vallance Lodge eighteen and Hendfelloe House seventeen.⁸ The Survey does not give any clue to the location of these, but it must be assumed that they were scattered about the inhabitable zones of the Forest of Teesdale, mainly below 1,500 feet a.s.l. (Chapter 2). Taking into account the large amounts of land which each of the main farms held (Table 3), it seems most likely that small amounts of land were let to each of the smaller farms who were tenants of the three major ones. In this context then, the term 'parcel' probably means the smaller units of land into which the three major farms were divided. In this way it links up with the use of the word in Middleton and Newbiggin, as discussed above.

In view of the large numbers of houses and amounts of land which each of the major farms held, it seems probable that we are dealing here with three large 'sub-manors' within the Manor of Barnard Castle, of which Upper Teesdale was a part. Each of these 'sub-manors' held 'demesne' land of its own, and tenant holdings, represented by the many houses which each of them held. Probably the 'lords' of the 'sub-manors' were direct tenants towards the 'chief' Lord of the Manor, and paid him rent. The tenants of the 'sub-manor lords' were probably obliged to the 'chief' Lord as

as well as to their direct 'lords'.⁹ The inventory of Guy Bainbrigge of Hendfelloe House, made in 1620, notes that he held "a lease for one and 30 years of the Middle part of the Fforest of Teasdale. Whereof there are yet to come thirtie years of thereabouts."¹⁰ This must confirm the supposition that he held a 'sub-manor', and would indicate that the two other major landholders had similar leases.

Clearly there were three main units: (1) Brigge House in the eastern part of the Forest, probably representing the present day Township of Ettersgill, (2) Vallance Lodge in the south part of the Forest, which must represent that part of the area today called Middle Forest (it was still called South Forest in 1758)¹¹ and (3) Hendfelloe House in the Middle of the Forest, which, by a process of elimination must represent the present day Township of Harwood.¹² It is impossible, in the absence of a map of the Dale at this time, to locate accurately the land which these three farms controlled, but the matter is investigated in more detail in Chapter Four.

A Rental of the Lordships of Barnard Castle and Raby belonging to the Rt. Hon. Henry Vane in 1641, gives the total annual rent of those lands in the Upper Dale belonging to Mr Vane as £41 8s 8d as compared with ~~£~~42 3s 8d in 1612¹³, together with an increased rent of £22 15s 8d, giving a total rent of £64 10s 11d.¹⁴ Many of the tenants had their rents increased (Appendix 3 Part 1), possibly as a result of the intaking of land, and consequent increased value of their farms. It will be noted that two of the tenants paid rents of ~~£~~14s each, the same amounts as paid by Hendfelloe House and Vallance Lodge in 1612.¹⁵ It seems quite probable therefore that these amounts represent the rents paid by

these two farms, and it will be noted that both of them had had their rents increased, one by £2 6s and the other by £6, which may well represent additional rent for newly intaken land. ¹⁶

Another survey of the Upper Dale, made in 1670,¹⁷ gave the yearly values of all the lands in the area, not only those belonging to the Vane family (Appendix 3 Part 2). The total annual value of lands in Middleton was £92, in Newbiggin £56 and in the Forest of Teesdale £51. Much of the land at this time appears to have been held by the Vanes, but many people are listed separately as if they owned their land, especially in Middleton and Newbiggin. The Forest of Teesdale appears to have been largely owned by the Vanes at this time. This is probably the reason for the incomplete nature of the 1612 Survey, since only the land owned by the Lordship of Barnard Castle, ie. the Vane family was surveyed, and any other land was omitted. It is difficult to say whether there was any rise in the rents between 1641 and 1670 because of the incomplete nature of the earlier Surveys, but it seems most probable that there was a rise due to further intaking of land.

The first picture of Upper Dale farms in the 18th century appears in a Rental of the Earl of Darlington's Highland Estate in 1758. ¹⁸ The most interesting point of this rental lies in the numbers of farms, rather than the rents which the various tenants paid, although it should of course be noted that the yearly rents in the Forest of Teesdale had risen quite considerably to £99 for Ettersgill, £122 for the South Forest and £118 for the Middle Forest, as compared with £51 for the entire area in 1670. In addition to this there was a payment of £25 for the Great Common (Appendix 3 Part 3). These amounts reflected the rising value of land at this.

time, and also the increasing amounts of improved land in this area (Table 12). In Ettersgill at this time there were fourteen tenants; if the numbers quoted by the Jacobean Survey were correct, the numbers of farms here had not altered in almost 150 years. In the 'South Forest' there were thirteen tenants as compared with eighteen in 1612, and in the 'Middle Forest' there were sixteen as compared with seventeen in 1612. In addition to this there were five tenants in the 'Great Common', which appears to have been a part of the Middle Forest.¹⁹ The discrepancy in the figures must be accounted for by the fact that some of the farms which were actually in the South Forest were listed under the Middle Forest. What is most significant, therefore, is that the total number of farms in the South and Middle Forest and Great Common was thirty-four, a drop of one on the 1612 total. In view of the numbers of farms in 1769 (see below) one might suggest that this survey did not account for all the farms in the Forest of Teesdale, although this omission is difficult to explain.

This same Rental also names the tenants of the Earl of Darlington in Middleton and Newbiggin. It is clear from this that only a few of the total population of these two Townships were tenants to the Duke. Only eleven landholders in Middleton were tenants to the Duke, paying £70 17s rent per annum, and nineteen in Newbiggin, paying £136 15s rent per annum.²⁰ The limited numbers listed in this Rental make it difficult to generalise about the nature of the farms here at this time, but from the evidence of this source it would appear that much of the land was held in severalty, rather than in common. That is, the trends towards consolidation noted in 1612 had continued, resulting in the ownership of individual blocks of enclosed land by each tenant, rather than

strips and parcels of land scattered about the subdivided fields and elsewhere.

In the 1769 Survey, details are given of the farms in Harwood, Middle Forest and Ettersgill, the rest of the Dale being under 'ancient enclosures', not described in any detail. In Harwood there were now twenty-one farms, and in Middle Forest twenty-two. The total of forty-three compares with thirty-four in 1758, ie. an increase of nine in eleven years, which seems to be a rather rapid increase in such a short time. This might seem to suggest that there were some omissions in the 1758 Rental, as previously noted, although this is difficult to account for. The total number of farms in Ettersgill remained stable at fourteen. ²¹

Farms varied very much in size and shape in all three areas: in Harwood the sizes of individual farms varied from seven acres at Cow Hill Syke Farm to eighty-seven acres at Stoney Coom (Figure 10). In Middle Forest Lane Side Farm had ten acres and Forsgarth Farm 421 acres (Figure 8). The shapes of holdings varied very widely, from neat blocks of land such as Egg Pot and Harwood Head (Figures 8 & 10), perhaps representing more recent intakes, to very irregularly shaped units such as Knot Hill and Stoney Hill in Middle Forest and Harwood respectively (Figures 8 & 10), perhaps representing older enclosures (Chapter 4). The numbers of fields belonging to each farm ranged from two at Mill House and Close Farm to twenty-two at Forsgarth Farm (Figures 8 & 10). Some farms consisted of two or three separated blocks of land: for instance Sievy Hill Farm consisted of two blocks of land, separated by Harwood Beck, and surrounded by Common lands (Figure 8). In Ettersgill Tim Tarn's farm (not named) consisted

of one block of land around the farmhouse, and another completely separate block some distance from the first (Figure 9).²²

Another interesting feature of some of the farms is the fact that some were jointly held. For instance, in Harwood Riggside Farm was held by 'Wm. Watson and Teward', and Ruff Rigg Foot Farm by 'Mr Dowson and Isaac Robinson'. Some of these people seem to have held their own farms elsewhere, for instance Stoney Hill Farm was held by a Mr Watson and Bowes Close Farm by Teward. These two could possibly have been the executors of the will of the deceased tenant of Riggside Farm, and were tending it until a new tenant was found. Another feature of the farms at this time was that some of the tenants shared certain large fields. For instance Thomas and William Teward together held the eighty acre 'Ling Pasture' in Harwood (Figure 10). This feature of sharing seems to have been most important in Ettersgill, where Dirt Pit Pasture was shared by three tenants, Great Out Field by six tenants and Little Out Pry by three tenants (Figure 9).²³ Finally, it should be noted that at this time the average size of farm unit was thirty-six acres in Harwood, seventy-eight acres in Middle Forest and fifty-four acres in Ettersgill.

The 1803 Valuation of the Upper Dale farms²⁴ gives details of all the farms in Harwood, Middle Forest and Ettersgill, and those farms in Middleton and Newbiggin which were owned by the Earl of Darlington. In addition it gives details of the value per acre of each field and the annual value of each farm, and thus forms a very complete survey.

The most important feature about the Forest of Teesdale

is the increase in the number of farms between 1769 and 1803. There were now thirty-five farms in Harwood (twenty-one in 1769), twenty-five in Middle Forest (twenty-two in 1769), and fifteen in Ettersgill (fourteen in 1769). The total number of farms had increased by eighteen in thirty-four years.²⁵ The changes which took place in Ettersgill would seem to be fairly indicative of those which went on in the Forest of Teesdale as a whole. Noughtberry Hall (Figure 9), held in 1769 by Edmund Garget, was now split into two units of almost equal size, both called Noughtberry Hall, one held by William Anderson and the other by Edward Gargate. It is impossible to say exactly how the farm had been divided. It seems evident that one of the new tenants was a relative of the previous tenant, and it is feasible to suggest that the other was a son-in-law. In a similar fashion the farms held by Isaac Raine and Tim Tarn in 1769 (Figure 9) had also been divided. The former which previously had a total of 73 acres was now divided between Mark Tarn (29 acres) and Tim Tarn (43 acres). The latter which previously had a total of 59 acres was now divided between William Tarn (31 acres) and Matthew Anderson (28 acres). In contrast to this splitting up of farms, the farms held in 1769 by Joseph Bedale (105 acres), Joseph Garget (31 acres) and one other (not named in the Survey, holding 26 acres), had been amalgamated into a single unit of 183 acres held by John Hutchinson, which included a new intake of 20 acres.²⁶ The mechanism by which farms multiplied was obviously complex, and would repay a great deal of further study.

Similar divisions and amalgamations went on in the two other Townships of the Forest of Teesdale between 1769 and 1803. In addition to this, many new farms, especially in Harwood, were created out of the waste. The average size of farm unit in Harwood at this

time was thirty-seven acres (thirty-six in 1769), and in Middle Forest seventy-nine acres (seventy eight in 1769). These figures reflect the fact that at this time the increase in the numbers of farms was keeping pace with the increase in the amount of enclosed land. In Ettersgill the average size fell slightly from fifty-four acres in 1769 to fifty-two acres in 1803.²⁷

Much of the increase in the numbers of farms must be attributed to the rise of lead mining in the Upper Dale at this time (Chapter 8), since many of the miners found it necessary to take a farm in the area to supplement their income. In 1794 Grainger had observed that "... (the mines) do more than double the rents of all the small farms contiguous thereto, as the miners take these farms at extravagant rents..."²⁸ This is reflected by the rise in the annual rents paid by the two townships between 1758 (the last recorded Rental)²⁹ and 1803. The rent in Harwood had risen from £118 to £437, in Middle Forest from £122 to £632 and in Ettersgill from £99 to £345.³⁰ This must reflect the rising value of the land in this area as well as the increase in enclosed land.

In Middleton in 1803 only nine people appear to have been tenants to the Earl of Darlington, as compared with eleven in 1758. The total rent paid had however risen from £70 17s per annum to £161 18s per annum. In Newbiggin the number of tenants had risen from nineteen to twenty-three, and the rent per annum had risen from £136 15s to £685 1s 9d.³¹ The limited amount of evidence on these farms would suggest once more that the changeover to the holding of land in severalty was continuing, as noted previously. However without more detailed evidence and more complete details of all the farms in these two Townships it is rash to make any generalisations.

The maps of ownership derived from the 1847 - 1864 Farm Books indicate that in the Forest of Teesdale the ownership patterns again changed considerably between 1803 and 1847. This was due to two main causes: firstly the increase in the number of farms between 1803 and 1847, which obviously led to some changes in the patterns of ownership, and secondly the marked change in enclosure patterns throughout the area which took place between these two dates (Chapter 4). Despite the further increase in the amount of available enclosed land, especially in Harwood and Middle Forest (Table 12), the average size of farm unit decreased considerably, to thirty-seven acres in Harwood, thirty-nine in Middle Forest and thirty-four in Ettersgill, as compared with thirty-seven, seventy-nine and fifty-four acres respectively in 1803.³² The figure for Harwood indicates that in this case the rise in the number of farms kept pace with the increase in enclosed land, resulting in the same average figure. The increase in the numbers of farms is now best indicated by a Table:

Table 4

Farms in the Forest of Teesdale, 1612-1847 ³³

Location	1612	1758	1769	1803	1847
Harwood	17	} 34	} 21	35	42
Middle Forest	18			22	25
Ettersgill	<u>14</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>24</u>
Total	49	48	57	81	111

The increase in the numbers of farms between 1803 and 1847 must once more be attributed to the importance of lead mining at this time, which grew from the early and mid-17th century onwards to a peak in the mid-19th century (Chapter 8). The 1851 Census Returns indicate that the majority of tenant farmers in Upper

Teesdale were also lead miners, and that very few of the tenants were full time farmers (Appendix 2).³⁴

As in 1769 the farm units varied in size and shape. The ownership maps (Figures 8,9 & 10) reveal, however, that the farms were by now a far more uniform shape and much more compact throughout the entire area than they had been in 1769. Units varied in size from ten acres at Thomas Anderson's farm, Stoney Coom, in Harwood, to 164 acres at William Bayles' farm, Harwood Head, and to 4,158 acres at Vallance Lodge, held by Joseph Currah in Middle Forest (Figures 8 & 10). The number of fields per farm varied between two at Unthank Farm in Harwood, held by Robinson Dowson, and twenty at Hutchinson's High Beck Head in Ettersgill (Figures 9 & 10).³⁵ Farm units were, however, of a much more uniform shape than they were in 1769, and the changes in the three townships can best be seen by comparison of the maps shown on Figures 8, 9 and 10.

Comparison of the rents paid throughout the Forest of Teesdale in 1847 with those paid in 1803 reveals once again a sharp rise. In Ettersgill the total annual rent was now £401 (£345 in 1803), in Harwood £580 (£437 in 1803) and in Middle Forest £801 (£632 in 1803).³⁶ This must be linked, of course, to the increase in the numbers of farms between these two dates, and to the fact that, as Grainger noted in 1794, the lead miners were willing to take the farms at very high rents.³⁷

It is unfortunate that the material on Newbiggin and Middleton at this period is limited (Chapter 1). The Newbiggin Farm Book indicates that there were now forty-five tenants to the Duke of Cleveland in this Township, compared with twenty-three in

in 1803. The annual rent had risen from £685 to £920 between these two dates.³⁸ The evidence of this Farm Book is that all the land held by the tenants of the Duke of Cleveland was held in severalty, rather than in common. The evidence of the Newbiggin Tithe Map would serve to back this up.³⁹ The lack of coverage of the Middleton Farm Book is a severe limitation in discussing the history of the farms in this part of the Dale, but once again the evidence presented by the Tithe Map would indicate that the vast majority of the land here was now held in severalty, only a few fields still being held in common (Figure 12).⁴⁰

There are no details about the Upper Teesdale farms apart from the Rent Abstracts for the Teesdale Estate which run from 1860 to 1898.⁴¹ These show that in all the townships belonging to the Duke of Cleveland the number of rent payers increased, except in Ettersgill, where the numbers decreased slightly. It has already been noted that the Estate did not own all the land in Middleton and Newbiggin, and the increase in these two townships may well represent the Estate acquiring more land and tenants, as well as new tenants moving into the area. The increase in the number of tenants in Harwood and Middle Forest was fairly slow, as compared with Middleton and Newbiggin, and of course this increase need not necessarily represent new farms, but merely new dwellers in the area who had to become tenants of the Estate. Rents increased uniformly throughout the Estate, even in Ettersgill, where the number of tenants decreased. (Appendix 3 Part 5).⁴²

Little is known about the conditions of tenancy of the Upper Teesdale farms between 1600 and 1900, or of the mechanism by which farms changed hands, although in 1848 Cockshott remarked that

"...the tenancy of these farms is scarcely less hereditary than the proprietorship, several of them having been transmitted from father to son from many generations." ⁴³ One of the first available leases for the Estate is that for Rumney Farm in Harwood in 1875, which is written out in full in Appendix 3 Part 6. This gives some indication of the agreements to which the tenants had to subscribe and the conditions to which they had to subscribe. ⁴⁴

To conclude this section on the farms, in the Forest of Teesdale it seems clear that the land has always been held in severalty, although a complicating factor here in the seventeenth century was the existence of the three sub-manors. From the mid-18th century onwards the numbers of farms in the area increased rapidly, associated with changes in the size of unit, and also with the shapes of the units. As the numbers of farms increased, so the amount of rent per annum increased quite substantially. Numbers continued to rise into the last decade of the 19th century, since when there has been a gradual decline in the numbers of farms, although there is little information on this. Although information on farms in Middleton and Newbiggin is abundant in the 17th century, it is much scarcer in later years, and it is difficult to talk with such certainty about the development of the farm in this part of the Dale. The main change, however, seems to have been from the holding of land in common to the holding of land in severalty, a process which had probably already begun by the time of the Jacobean Survey. The numbers of tenants to the Duke of Cleveland have increased, together with the rents payable per annum.

Although the Jacobean Survey does not go into details about the actual form of the buildings in Upper Teesdale in 1612,

it gives some information about the numbers of buildings held by each tenant, which are of interest.

Table 5

Farm buildings in Middleton and Newbiggin, 1612 ⁴⁵

Type	Numbers
House and barn	17
House, barn and stable	7
House, barn, stable, and dovecote	1
House, barn, stable and ox-stall	2
House only	5
Barn only	2
No house or barn recorded	<u>2</u>
	36

The most frequently recorded type of farm building was a house and barn, and after this the house with a barn and stable. In these cases we may perhaps imagine that the buildings were joined together to form the typical 'longhouse' ie. the house, barn and stable were all under one roof and interconnected. The barn is probably synonymous with cowhouse or byre for wintering cattle. ⁴⁶ Probably the buildings themselves were made of local stone or even turf, perhaps roofed with local slates or heather. The household possessions enumerated in many of the Probate Inventories of this time would seem to indicate that a large number of the farmers here were very poor, and their dwellings probably reflected this.

The same situation was probably repeated in the Forest of Teesdale:

Table 6

Farm Buildings in the Forest of Teesdale, 1612 ⁴⁷

Name	Houses	Barns	Stables	Oxstalls	Dovecotes
Brigge House	14	1	1	1	1
Hendfelloe House	17	6	2	2	2
Vallance Lodge	<u>18</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
	49	15	6	5	4

Once more there are no details of the nature of the houses and other farm buildings in this part of the Dale, and it seems most likely that they took the same form as those in Middleton. Despite the importance of farming in this area even at this early date, the poor soil and hard climate meant that the 'yeoman farmer' class did not develop here at this time so strongly as in the Yorkshire Dales, and as a result none of the fine Jacobean houses characteristic of the latter area are to be found in Upper Teesdale. 48

Little is revealed by the 1769 Survey of the Upper Dale by Greenwell about the nature of the houses, since most of them are represented by a stylised symbol.⁴⁹ However the 1763 map of Ettersgill, showing the same enclosure patterns as the 1769 map,⁵⁰ gives the farm buildings in far more detail, with the shape in plan of all the farmhouses as well as the outbuildings. One point of great interest is that many of the farms have a very pronounced rectangular shape, suggesting that in these cases the house, barn and byres were all under one roof, as in the typical longhouse (Figure 18). Certainly many of the farms with a pronounced 'longhouse' shape had no other buildings in their farmyards. Others had what must have been byres and outhouses in their yards, while many of the farms had small hay barns in the fields, so that the hay from the surrounding fields could be stored there, and the cattle foddered there in winter. This would also facilitate the spreading of manure.⁵¹

The first available comments and observations on the Upper Teesdale farm buildings were made by Alexander Calvert who valued the Estate in 1803: "...there is no valuation for any building in any part of the estate because of such bad repair."

He said of Widdybank Farm that "...this farm is in every part in ruins", and of Vallance Lodge that "...the above farm is in want of proper buildings. If they were built it should have let for 100 guineas per annum." In his General Observations at the end of the Valuation he remarked that "...with respect to the buildings they are nearly all in ruins and so they will remain if they are to be supported by the tenants." He went on to recommend that Lord Darlington should provide wood to repair the houses, for which the tenants should pay poundage, or additional rent.⁵²

Study of the 1847 Farm Books confirms that many repairs were being made to farms throughout the Upper Dale at this time, probably connected with the comments made by Mr Calvert. The following table shows the repairs which were carried out at this time.

Table 7
Repairs on Forest of Teesdale Farms, 1847-1864 ⁵³

Year	Name	Farm	Improvement	Add. rent
1854	John Gargett	Outberry Bat	New dwelling house	£3 10s
1854	John Hutchinson	Scar End	New dwelling house	£4 10s
1854	Henry Parmley	Birch Tree House	New byres	£2 5s
1856	Mark Tarn	Bank House	New byres & stables	£2 10s
1860	John Thompson	Dirt Pit	General repairs	£1
1860	Thomas Scott	High Force	Unspecified	£1 10s
1862	Thomas Scott	High Force	Unspecified	£1
1862	Widow Scott	Walker Hill	Unspecified	£2
1856	Henry Bainbridge	Moss	New byres	£1 8s
?	Jonathon Barker	Langdon Beck	Stable	£2 15s
Z	Jonathon Barker	Langdon Beckn	Smith shop	£2
?	Geo. Gibson	Widdy Bank	New dwelling house	£6 3s
?	Isaac Robinson	Force Garth	New cattle shed	£1 10s
1856	Eliz. Dixon	Marches Gill	New dwelling House	£4

It seems most likely that the new farms being built were

in the form which they possess today. The existing farms of Upper Teesdale are all very similar, perhaps indicating that they were all built at about the same time. The form of the houses is typified by that of Woolpitts Hill Farm and Egg Pot Farm (Figure 11). These farms are rectangular in plan, with the byres, hay barn and stables being connected to each other. The byres at Woolpitts Hill were of fairly modern construction, but those at Egg Pot were older with wooden rafters and beams. Most of the houses are made of limestone rubble which is whitewashed every year. Many of the farms also have hay barns in their fields, which are very similar in form, and are also used for byres (Figure 11).⁵⁴

The tradition of whitewashing the Upper Teesdale farms belonging to Lord Barnard was commented on by Francis Cockshott in 1848 who said that "...The houses are for the most part rude in their construction, but their being whitewashed partly redeemed the poverty of their aspect, and this operation is said to be always performed, with becoming loyalty, on the approach of the Duke to the moors in the hunting season."⁵⁵ The tradition of whitewashing the farms appears to be quite an old one, and towards the end of the 19th century the following clause was written into all the leases: "...and will at his own expense once in the spring of every year whitewash in a proper and thorough manner the outsides of the dwelling house and buildings, proper and sufficient lime being provided by the lessor or his agent."⁵⁶

It is difficult to say by what date the Teesdale farms were all rebuilt, as they obviously have been, especially in view of the comments made by Alexander Calvert. Varying amounts of money were spent on buildings throughout the estate in the later

years of the 19th century, as revealed by the Table 7 of Appendix 3. These payments would seem to indicate that rebuilding went on for a considerable time. 57

What evidence there is about the farms indicates that there were two main phases in their development: the first from 1612 until 1803, by which time they were reported to be in a very bad state of repair, and the second from 1803 until the end of the century, when the farms were gradually rebuilt to create the type of farm which is typical of the Upper Dale at the present time.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. P.R.O., Survey of the Manors of Raby, Brancepeth and Barnard Castle, 1612. (On microfilm).
2. Ibid.
3. Pal & Dip., Probate Inventory, Peter Bainbrigg/Middleton in Teesdale/1637.
4. P.R.O. Survey, op. cit.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.
9. Kosminsky, E.A., Studies in the Agrarian History of England in the Thirteenth Century, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1956) pp77-80.
10. Pal & Dip., Probate Inventory, Guy Bainbrigg/Middleton in Teesdale/1620.
11. S.E.O. (Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate), Rent Book of the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Darlington Highland Estate from Lady Day 1757 to Lady Day 1758
12. P.R.O. Survey, op. cit.
13. Ibid.
14. P.G. Mickleton and Spearman Mss., Volume 6 A Rental of the Lordships of Barnard Castle and Raby...belonging to the Rt. Hon. Henry Vane, 5th March 1641.

15. P.R.O. Survey, op. cit.
16. P.G. Mickleton and Spearman Mss., Volume 6, op. cit.
17. P.G. Mickleton and Spearman Mss., Volume 8, The yearly value of all the lands of the County Palatine of Durham, 1670... Middleton in Teesdale Parish.
18. S.E.O. (Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate), Rent Book, 1757-1758, op. cit.
19. Ibid., 'One year rents' for Middle & South Forest & Ettersgill.
20. Ibid., 'One year rents' for Newbiggin and Middleton.
21. M.E.O. (Small map store), Greenwell, John, A Plan of the Manor of Middleton in the County of Durham...belonging to the Rt. Hon. Henry, Earl of Darlington, 1769, Farm Book for the Forest of Teesdale.
22. Ibid., Farm Book and Map of the Forest of Teesdale.
23. Ibid.
24. S.E.O. (Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate), A Particular and Valuation of the Manor of Middleton in Teesdale in the County Palatine of Durham belonging to the Rt. Hon. William Henry, Earl of Darlington. September 1803.
25. Ibid. Harwood, Middle Forest and Ettersgill Abstracts.
26. Ibid. Ettersgill Farm Book.
27. Ibid. Harwood, Middle Forest and Ettersgill Farm Books.
28. Grainger, J., A General View of the Agriculture of the County of Durham, (London, 1794), p.21.
29. S.E.O. Rent Book, 1757-1758 op. cit.
30. S.E.O. Valuation of 1803, op. cit., Harwood, Middle Forest and Ettersgill Abstracts.
31. Ibid. Middleton and Newbiggin Abstracts.
32. M.E.O. (Bookshelves of small map store), Field Book of the Township of Harwood, 1847-1857, Field Book of the Township of Forest and Frith, 1847-1857, and Field Book of the Township of Ettersgill, 1847-1864.
33. Ibid.
34. C.R.O. 1851 Census Returns, (on microfilm), for the Forest of Teesdale.
35. M.E.O. Harwood, Forest and Frith and Ettersgill Field Books and Maps, op. cit.
36. Ibid.
37. Grainger, op. cit.

38. M.E.O. (Bookshelves of small map store), Field Book of the Township of Newbiggin, 1847-1857,
39. Pal & Dip., Newbiggin Tithe Map, 1843.
40. Pal & Dip., Middleton in Teesdale Tithe Map, 1843.
41. S.E.O. (Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate), Rent Abstracts for the Teesdale Estate, 1860-1898.
42. Ibid.
43. C.R.O. Cockshott, Francis, A Journey on Foot Through Teesdale, 1848.
44. S.E.O. (Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate), Sundry Leases in the Upper Dale, late 19th century, early 20th century.
45. P.R.B. Survey, op. cit.
46. Hartley, M., and J. Ingilby, Life and Tradition in the Yorkshire Dales, (London: Dent & Sons, 1968) p. 29
47. P.R.O. Survey, op. cit.
48. Raistrick, A.E., The Pennine Dales, (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1968), p.163 .
49. M.E.O. Greenwell, op. cit. Map of the Forest of Teesdale.
50. M.E.O. (Cupboard at rear of back office), A Plan of Ettersgill Farms in the Manor of Middleton and County of Durham belonging to the Rt. Hon. Henry Earl of Darlington, surveyed by Jeremiah Dixon, 1763.
51. Hartley and Ingilby, op. cit.p. 29.
52. S.E.O. Valuation of 1803, op. cit. 'General Observations' and comments in the Farm Books.
53. M.E.O. Harwood, Forest and Frith and Ettersgill Farm Books, op. cit.
54. Crudass, J.M., Personal Observations.
55. C.R.O. Cockshott, op. cit.
56. S.E.O. Leases, op. cit.
57. S.E.O. (Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate), Sundry payments on the Teesdale Estate, 1860-1880.

CHAPTER 4
ENCLOSURE PATTERNS

An Overview

Study of the current Ordnance Survey maps of the Upper Dale shows that enclosures extend from Middleton in Teesdale, at about 700 feet a.s.l., up the Dale to Harwood, ending at some 2,000 feet a.s.l. at Grass Hill Farm.¹ This pattern of enclosure (Figure 22) has many component parts, including, for instance, former head dykes, relics of subdivided fields, 18th and 19th century piecemeal intakes, and large scale organized enclosures of the commons. To bring some order to a complex subject the enclosure patterns of the Upper Dale will be treated in terms of three main 'cross sections' in time, with comments indicating the main trends. These trends will then be investigated in more detail with specific reference to Ettersgill. The bases for these three cross sections are as follows: (1) the Survey of 1612 of the Manor of Barnard Castle, of which the Upper Dale was a part, (2) the Survey of the Upper Dale by Greenwell in 1769 and (3) the 1847 Farm Books and Maps. Each of these three will be supplemented by quotations from contemporary observers to try and make the broad picture somewhat clearer.

The Jacobean Survey of 1612 indicates first of all the basic contrast which existed at this time, in the area from Bowlees to Middleton (Figure 2), between the subdivided 'open' fields or townfields around the main settlements, and the open moorlands, the latter being used as unstinted common grazings.² According to the Survey there were six subdivided fields, i.e. fields whose land was divided into strips, which are listed below. As noted in Chapter One, however, the minute entries for some of the fields

make it certain that the Survey was incomplete, and the Figures must therefore be regarded as inaccurate. This fact does not, however, reduce their interest and significance.

Table 8

Subdivided fields in Middleton and Newbiggin, 1612 ³

Field	Acreage (Recorded)	Parcels		Enc. Parcels		Closes	
		No.	Ac.	No.	Ac.	No.	Ac.
Newbiggin Field	199 $\frac{1}{2}$	38	196 $\frac{1}{2}$	1	1	1	20
Bowleys Field	22 $\frac{3}{4}$	6	22 $\frac{3}{4}$	-	-	-	-
Scalbank Field	32 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	32 $\frac{1}{2}$	-	-	-	-
Scarlett Field	10	1	10	-	-	-	-
Middle Side Field	5	1	5	-	-	-	-
Middleton East Field	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	-	-	-	-

The enclosure patterns to the east of Middleton on the Tithe Map, which must surely represent the former Middleton East Field, (Figure 12), clearly indicate the presence here of subdivided fields at some time in the past, since the former strips have been preserved in the enclosure patterns of the present day landscape, for example the fields numbered 148, 154 and 162. ⁴ Former furlongs or blocks of contiguous strips aligned in one particular direction. ⁵ are also in evidence. The fact that some of the strips still lay open in 1843 (eg. numbers 222 and 223), ⁶ together with the clear strip patterns preserved in the enclosure patterns is perhaps indicative of the fact that piecemeal enclosure of the strips went on from the 17th century to the mid-19th century, indicating a "...change from semi-communal uses to a system of severalty under which each individual tenant or owner could cultivate his specific plot in such a fashion as best pleased him." (Tate) ⁷ Table 8 shows that two strips in Newbiggin Field were enclosed in 1612, and here perhaps we see the very beginning of this piecemeal enclosure. ⁸ It should, however, be noted that there are at present no traces

of former strips around Newbiggin,⁹ which is perhaps indicative of later reorganization of the enclosure patterns in this area. It is, however, this piecemeal enclosure which has preserved the clear strip patterns in Middleton East Field and also in Middle Side Field.¹⁰ The conversion of arable to meadow in the subdivided fields which began in the 17th century (Chapter 5) was clearly an innovation which led on to enclosure, the beginnings of which can be seen in Newbiggin. There is indeed "a close association between the rise of a pastoral economy and the first wave of Durham enclosures." (Hodgson)¹¹

The Survey records that some of the farmers also held closes (enclosed fields) outside the subdivided fields, although their locations are not given. The total of twenty closes, amounting to a mere 199 acres (120 of them belonging to one farm) must surely emphasise the incomplete nature of the Survey.¹² In some cases farmers also held 'parcels' of land, the location of which is not given; they are therefore assumed to be outside the subdivided fields, although this may not necessarily be the case (Chapter 3). These fields, which are assumed to be outside the subdivided fields are listed below.

Table 9

Parcels, Enclosed Parcels and Closes in Middleton and Newbiggin.¹³

Parcels		Enc. Parcels		Closes	
No.	Ac.	No.	Ac.	No.	Ac.
12	75 $\frac{3}{4}$	1	25	20	199

Two Probate Inventories for this part of the Dale in the early 17th century give some evidence of the piecemeal intaking of land outside the townfields. The inventory of Roger Bainbrigge of Middleton in 1602 lists "Item: for taken ground £8." Similarly

that of John Castell of Newbiggin in 1612 noted "Item: intaken ground, £6 2s 4d." ¹⁴ The former amount (£8) comprised no less than 50% of the total inventory of Roger Bainbrigge, so it was clearly of very great importance on this particular farm. The latter amount was 18% of the total valuation of John Castell's farm. The affect of this intaking upon the enclosure history of the area and upon the gradual enclosure of the subdivided fields may have been considerable. "Often land reclaimed was added to the existing open fields...in other instances however...(it) was from the beginning held in severalty. It is reasonable to suppose that the evident advantages of this to the proprietors would tend to encourage a demand for the enclosure of other lands, nearer to the heart of the settlement, which had from time immemorial been in open fields." ¹⁵ Despite this intaking, however, the majority of the land in the Townships of Middleton and Newbiggin lay within the subdivided fields. The total recorded area of all the enclosed lands in this lower part of the Dale was 571 acres. ¹⁶

In the Forest of Teesdale most of the land is described as lying in 'parcels' which, as described in Chapter 3, probably represents a unit of ownership. ¹⁷ It must be assumed that the land here was already enclosed, as opposed to lying in strips. It is difficult to assess how far up the Dale the enclosures extended, since the Survey only gives details of the total acreage belonging to each of the three major farms. Further details of this are examined in Chapter 4, but the fact that the Survey notes Hendfelloe House as being in 'the middle part of the Forest of Teesdale' ie. in that area now known as Harwood (Figure 2) seems to indicate that enclosures already extended high up the Dale. This part of the Survey seems to be reasonably accurate, since the numbers of

of houses and acreages tie up well with those noted in 1769, and assuming that all the land belonging to Hendfelloe House was in Harwood (Chapter 3), then there must have been at least 690 acres of enclosed land in this area in 1612. Similarly there must have been at least 550 acres in the Vallance Lodge block, Middle Forest, and at least 470 acres in the Brigge House block, later termed Ettersgill (Figure 2), and these three areas will be used for the purposes of comparison with later sources.¹⁸ The Survey gives no hint as to the nature of these enclosures, but later sources (see below) would suggest that at this time the fields were small and irregularly shaped, the result of gradual piecemeal intaking over a long period of time. Presumably intaking was still going on at this time, the farmers creating new fields out of the waste, since at this time the amount of waste land for the grazing of beasts was abundant (Chapter 7), and there would be little objection to the intaking of land from it. "In pastoral districts the path for both the enclosing landlord and the enclosing peasant seems to have been smoothed out by the common assumption that enclosure was reasonable and not an anti-social improvement, and that so long as others were not injured thereby, an enclosure would normally be approved by the community..." (Joan Thirsk).¹⁹

The picture of enclosures in the early 17th century is this one of contrasts between the middle and upper Dale. In the lower part of the region, below Bowlees, most of the fields lay open and were subdivided into strips, but here and there were a few enclosed and consolidated bundles. Around and between these large fields lay some small closes, probably the result of direct intaking from the waste going on at that time. Higher up the Dale were extensive stretches of enclosed land, most of the fields being

probably small and irregularly shaped; the blocks of enclosed land were probably separated by broad swathes of common grazings, and extended up to Harwood, possibly already as high as Grass Hill at 2,000 feet a.s.l., where a Glebe Terrier confirms that there was a farm in 1663.²⁰ Around all the Upper Dale enclosures lay a great sea of waste, completely unenclosed, which provided a valuable resource, both as common grazing land and a supply of land which could be taken in and improved when the pressure upon the existing enclosed land became too great. "Land was abundant, even though the southerner might sneer at its poor quality. Good cornland was hard to win but there was plentiful common grazing and much land on the lower hill slopes promised to repay enclosure and improvement." (Joan Thirsk)²¹

Greenwell's Survey of the Upper Dale in 1769,²² upon which the next cross section is based, shows only the enclosures in Harwood, Middle Forest and Ettersgill, the rest of the Dale being under 'ancient enclosures', the boundaries of which were not mapped. The total acreage of enclosed land at this time in the Forest of Teesdale had increased considerably from the recorded totals of 150 years earlier, and clearly a great deal of intaking from the waste had gone on in the intervening years. Harwood in 1769 had 1,036 acres of enclosed land, Middle Forest 1,869 acres and Ettersgill 759 acres²³ as compared with 690 acres, 550 acres and 475 acres respectively in 1612.²⁴ One of the main features of enclosure patterns in the Forest of Teesdale at this time was their very irregular nature and the wide variations in their sizes. (Figures 15,16 & 17). The irregular shapes of the fields are perhaps indicative of enclosure direct from the waste, since one might expect random intakes to be of varying size and shape

according to the local topography and the needs of each farmer. However, the existence in Ettersgill, and perhaps higher up the Dale, of medieval enclosure banks (see the section on Ettersgill) indicates that the 1769 enclosures were in fact a second generation of enclosures, recolonizing areas which must have suffered a recession in late medieval times, probably due to a temporary decline in population and reversion of the area to waste.

In all three Townships of the Forest of Teesdale it is possible to distinguish two contrasting types of enclosure pattern: a central area of small enclosures and an outer area of larger enclosures (figures 15, 16 and 17). This is perhaps best seen in Ettersgill, where small enclosures extended along Ettersgill Beck, surrounded by very much larger enclosures to the north and west. Typical acreages for the inner area were five, seven and sixteen acres, whereas for the outer area twenty-seven and thirty-two acres were much more typical.²⁵ This feature perhaps points to two phases of enclosure, with the smaller enclosures being earlier in origin than the large ones, as is discussed in more detail in the second part of this Chapter. A similar pattern can be seen in Middle Forest and Harwood, and it might be suggested that the small enclosures in the centre of each Township represented the areas which were enclosed in 1612, the larger enclosures around them representing the area which were enclosed between 1612 and 1769 (Figure 20). At this time also a few enclosures were isolated from the main blocks of enclosed land by the commons: for instance Grass Hill Farm at the head of Harwood consisted of a block of three fields surrounded by common grazing land. Sievy Hill Farm in Middle Forest was a similar case, consisting of two isolated units again surrounded by common lands (Figures 15 and 17).²⁶

This Survey of 1769 also shows the allotments and enclosures on Newbiggin Common, which had been made in 1764.²⁷ 2,218 acres were enclosed into large regularly shaped allotments, contrasting strongly with the small older enclosures which existed lower down the valley sides. The allotments varied in size from seven acres up to over 1,000 acres on the very highest parts of the enclosed area. In addition to these new enclosures there were thirteen encroachments on the lower slopes of the common, which had a total area of 270 acres.²⁸ The irregular shape of these encroachments contrasts strongly with the regularly laid out allotments (Figure 13).

Although there is no information on Middleton and Newbiggin on this particular map, one must assume that enclosed land in this part of the Dale was increasing at the expense of the subdivided fields, judging from the trends seen in 1612 and from the evidence of later maps. Certainly no open fields were noted here by Arthur Young in 1770, and one might assume that if these fields had been particularly extensive, then Young would have commented on them.

The Survey of 1769, together with Arthur Young's account of the area in 1770 (see below) combine to give a fairly good picture of the state of the Dale and its enclosures at this time. Clearly, enclosures extended up the Dale from Middleton in Teesdale, in a broad sweep as far as Langdon Beck and Widdybank Farm, with perhaps some of the old open fields remaining lower down the Dale. Above was a great island of enclosed land in Harwood, with outliers at Grass Hill and Sievy Hill, all surrounded by unenclosed hill grazings (Figure 20). The enclosure patterns in the Forest area

of the Dale were very irregular, with little evidence of planned enclosure, but rather indicating haphazard enclosure of blocks of land of varying size as need demanded. In contrast to these were the large planned enclosures stretching high above Newbiggin Common. 29
Young says the following of the part of the Dale above Middleton:

"Nothing can be more pleasing than the numerous inclosures on the banks of the river, cut by clumps of wood. Pursuing your tracks through this delicious region you cross some wild moors, partaking much more of the terrible sublime than the pleasing or beautiful. I never yet travelled such a line of country so astonishingly fine, containing so noble a variety; a glorious range of black mountains, fertile valleys, beautiful inclosures. About Newbigil [sic] are many improvements of the moors by that spirited cultivator the Earl of Darlington: parts of the moors have been inclosed by that nobleman which used not to yield a farthing an acre rent, but on inclosing have been immediately advanced to 7s 6d an acre at which rent they now remain. To the north and west of this country there are vast tracts of moors covered some with ling, and others with a wild grass called white grass, greatly susceptible of improvement." 30

In 1794 Hutchinson made the following remarks on the same part of the Dale:

"The country from Middleton rises gradually; on the skirts of the hills for for four miles, there are scattered enclosures and good lands of a southern aspect. Newbiggin is the last village northwards - beyond the Tees Force the hills rise very quickly and there is not a tree to be seen. By planting and enclosing great improvements might be made in the lands." 31

The final cross section, based upon the Farm Books of the Estate for the years 1847 to 1864; indicate that one of the major trends in the enclosure patterns of the Townships making up the Forest of Teesdale was a considerable alteration in the patterns. It should first of all be mentioned that it is possible

that the cartography on the 1769 map was faulty, and the changes, far from being real are merely apparent, because of inaccurate methods of surveying. Perhaps the surveyors in 1769 made a traverse around a particular area, and filled in the enclosure patterns within this area by viewing it from a convenient vantage point, which would of course give an inaccurate picture of the enclosures. There is however a map of Ettersgill made by Jeremiah Dixon in 1763³² and comparison of this with Greenwell's map of Ettersgill, made only six years later, reveals that the field names, numbers and acreages are all identical, so much so that it seems likely that the map of 1769 is a copy of that of 1763. The 1763 map gives the impression of being a very accurate survey, especially in view of the very great amount of detail given on it (Figure 18). It is, of course, impossible to say categorically that it is accurate on this evidence alone, but it and other maps by Jeremiah Dixon have a strong stamp of authenticity about them. Bearing in mind the similarities between the two maps, there are some grounds at least for arguing that the 1769 map must be accurate. Some confirmation of this is gained from the fact that most of the fields noted in 1769 are repeated once more in the Valuation of 1803,³³ names and acreages being identical, although in Harwood and Middle Forest many new fields were added to the Survey, consisting of land taken in from the waste between 1769 and 1803. The fact that the 1803 Survey repeats that of 1769 adds weight to the idea that the 1769 Survey was accurate. However, comparison of the Surveys of 1803 and 1769 and that of 1848 reveals a complete change in enclosure patterns. Field names and acreages were different and on the map many of the enclosure patterns had changed completely, giving a much more regular and organized pattern of enclosure, not at all reminiscent of piecemeal enclosure as were those of 1769 (Figures 15, 16 and 17). Some of the 1769

patterns were still present, but in many cases the boundary walls had been altered or straightened, so that although the basic shape of the field was the same, in detail it was quite different. In other cases the enclosure patterns had changed so completely that it is impossible to make any meaningful comparison at all of the two sets of patterns (Figures 15, 16 and 17).³⁴

It is difficult, from the material examined, to construct a hypothesis to explain these remarkable changes which occurred between 1803 and 1847. It is noted in Chapter Two that a considerable increase in population and in the numbers of farms took place between 1769 and 1847, linked mainly with the lead mining boom. Possibly the effect of this subdivision of farms brought about a need for greater efficiency which resulted in the re-arrangement of enclosure patterns. In addition to this Middleton Common was enclosed in 1804³⁵ (see below) and possibly the influence of this enclosure made landholders higher up the Dale realise the usefulness of more ordered patterns of enclosure and more compact farm units. The current trends towards enclosure in lowland England may also have had some influences on the Dale. "Correcting the outlines of fields is one of the most obvious sources of amelioration on many, perhaps most estates. In altering the shape and size of fields besides the advantages resulting from the improvement in form, a number of culturable acres may be added to the farm in proportion to the crookedness of the fences and their width."(Loudon)³⁶

However, it is difficult to visualise the farmers of the Upper Dale making such a great change, as most of them at this time were more concerned with mining, farming being only a secondary occupation. Stone walls represented invested capital and labour,

and one cannot visualise this change taking place spontaneously throughout the Upper Dale without some outside pressure having been brought to bear. For instance the 1848 Teesdale Accounts record that between 17th June and 17th July 1848 the following payments for walling were made:

Table 10

The cost of walling in Upper Teesdale ³⁷

Ewbank and Ritson for walling	£15 17s 0d
Dowson and Ritson for walling	£12 1s 0d
Henry Palmerly & Co. for ditto	£ 8 10s 6d
Isaac Tarn for walling for Tho. Dowson and Matt. Cousin	£ 6 13s 4d
Nichs. Scott & Co, for walling on sundry farms	£10 10s 3d
Ewbank and Watson for walling at the Middles Farm	£ 2 13s 0d
Chs. Dowson for walling in Ettersgill	£ 1 18s 6d

The uniformity of the change throughout Harwood, Middle Forest and Ettersgill as borne out by the 1847 Farm Maps surely points to the influence of the Estate and its landlord the Duke of Cleveland. In 1803 Alexander Calvert remarked of the houses of the Upper Dale that they would remain in a bad state of repair so long as they were to be looked after by the tenants alone. ³⁸ Possibly the same applied to the fences and walls of the area. With this in mind it seems quite feasible that although the reasons mentioned above may have had some influence upon the tenants, the influence of the Estate may well have been paramount. These improvements probably owe much to the landlord, who is known to have been very forward looking and influential, as illustrated by the following quotation: "The County of Durham owes no slight obligation to this first of her farmers for setting so noble an example...His experiments and improvements in agriculture are of

an important kind." (Arthur Young) ³⁹ It may well be that the changes in enclosure patterns were initiated by the 1803 Valuation, and it seems likely that they were carried out by the Estate, especially in view of the uniform nature of the changes throughout the three townships comprising the Forest of Teesdale.

The other principal trend revealed by this cross section is the considerable extension of enclosed land, notably at the head of Harwood, around Ashgill Head and Grass Hill, the latter now being joined with the main block of enclosed land (Figure 17). The result of this extension was that enclosed land now extended without a break from Middleton in Teesdale to Grass Hill at 2,000 feet a.s.l. (Figure 20). Since most of the level land had already been enclosed the majority of the new enclosures made between 1769 and 1847 were upon the lower slopes of the fells. Comparison of the maps on Figures 15, 16 and 17 indicates that in the Forest of Teesdale many new fields were created around the edges of the Townships, and these must represent piecemeal enclosures by the farmers concerned.

Table 11

Enclosed land in the Forest of Teesdale, 1612-1847 ⁴⁰

	1612	1769	1803	1847
Harwood	690	1036	1229	2035
Middle Forest	550	1869	1994	2189
Ettersgill	470	759	780	1039

Further down the Dale a considerable organized extension of enclosed land had been made in 1804, when Middleton had been enclosed by Act of Parliament. ⁴¹ As with Newbiggin Common, there is a very striking contrast between the small valley enclosures (see below) and the usually much larger planned enclosures on the Common. For instance on the Tithe Map there is a striking contrast between fields 487 and 424, and fields 511 and 512 on the newly enclosed

common. Many of the newly made fields were small, but in terms of enclosure patterns the most significant feature was the planned nature as contrasted with the older enclosures around Middleton. The head dyke (the limit of enclosed land at any particular time) which existed prior to the enclosure of the common is clearly visible running across the centre of Figure 14, an extract from the Tithe Map, and this clearly shows the contrast in enclosure patterns between the old and new enclosures.⁴² Sizes of enclosures and allotments in the Enclosure Award ranged from three acres on the lower slopes of the common to 500 acres high on the fells (Figure 13). Another striking contrast was presented by the old enclosed farms on the Common, Skeers and Turners, which were very irregularly shaped, and show up sharply against the new enclosures.⁴³

Study of the Middleton in Teesdale Tithe Map⁴⁴ shows that by this time most of the land which lay open in the subdivided fields in 1612 was now enclosed into separate fields. However, as already noted, many of the enclosure patterns around Middleton at this time still revealed the former open field patterns of strips and furlongs, fossilized by enclosure, except for a few strips which still lay open (Figure 12). It seems clear from the fact that the strip patterns were still preserved in the landscape, that the process of enclosure must have been very slow, probably carried out by individual landowners as their needs demanded. In Newbiggin by this time there was no trace at all of the former open fields which the 1612 Survey reveals used to exist around the village.⁴⁵ The fields were very regularly shaped (Figure 21), which must argue that perhaps a similar reorganization of enclosure patterns went on here as in the Forest of Teesdale.⁴⁶

By the mid-19th century, therefore, enclosed land stretched without a break from Middleton in Teesdale right up the Dale to Harwood. Enclosures also stretched high onto the fells on Middleton and Newbiggin Commons. With the exception of the fields around Middleton, the enclosures in the rest of the Dale were much more regularly shaped than they had been in 1769, and comparison of the maps on Figures 15, 16 and 17 reveal the very great changes which took place. The enclosures were still surrounded by very extensive common lands, but these had been reduced in extent by the enclosure of land between 1769 and 1847. Francis Coekshott, making a journey down the Dale in 1848 made the following observations on the state of the area, which very neatly sum up its character at this time. "Cauldron Snout seems to be very much the extremity of the fells, for on both sides of the fall the hills end perpendicularly, and appear to be the boundary between a civilized land and a wilderness. Down below, the land is partitioned off into grass fields, and above are the fells we have crossed." 47

Later maps of the Upper Dale indicate that there has been a substantial recession in the head dyke since the mid-19th century, especially in Harwood, and along the edges of the fells in Middle Forest and Ettersgill, where many of the former improved fields at the outer limits of the Townships, although still lying physically enclosed, have reverted to rough pasture. In a few examples some of the walls seem to have been removed, and one may wonder if they were ever built. This recession must be linked to the slump in lead mining after the mid-19th century, and the consequent drop in the population of the area (Figure 4), and therefore in the numbers of farms.

Three broad trends emerge in this general view of the enclosure patterns in the Upper Dale, between 1600 and 1900. The first is the gradual piecemeal enclosure of the open strips in the Middleton - Newbiggin area. The consolidation went on gradually from the time of the Jacobean Survey until the mid-19th century when only a few strips still lay open, and led to the fossilisation in many places of the former strip patterns. Next is the steady extension of enclosed land: the taking in and improving of the waste which went on, both by means of piecemeal intaking and organized enclosure, from the early 17th century until the mid-19th century, when a recession began. Lastly, rather more sudden than the other two trends, is the change in the patterns of enclosure in the Forest of Teesdale in the early 19th century, from irregular patterns to much more regular and organized enclosures.

Ettersgill Enclosure History

Ettersgill is a relatively small township within the Parish of Forest and Frith (Figure 2) comprising about 1,039 acres of enclosed land and about 1,027 acres of Common.⁴⁹ It centres upon Ettersgill Beck, which flows south-south-east to join the River Tees just below High Force.⁵⁰ It has been selected for detailed study because of its relatively small and compact nature and area, and also because of the existence in the area of an interesting series of medieval enclosure banks. At the present time enclosed lands, comprising meadow and pasture, extend from High Beck Head Farm at about 1,500 feet a.s.l., down the Beck to the River Tees, at an altitude of about 1,000 feet a.s.l. Most of the improved land is on the western side of the Beck, although there is a little on the eastern side around Ashdub Farm (Figure 29)⁵¹

However, the majority of the land on the eastern side is under rough pasture, and it would seem that in terms of soils and topography the western side of Ettersgill is better suited to improved meadow and pasture than is the east. ⁵²

As an opportunity was available for staying on a farm in the Township, a field investigation was made of a complex of enclosure banks underlying the present day enclosure patterns. These banks are clearly of great antiquity, since they bear no resemblance to the enclosure patterns which appear in Greenwell's survey of 1769. It is therefore almost certain that they pre-date the starting date of this survey (1600) and thus, in order to give as complete a picture as possible it was decided to include them. The banks are the earliest indication of enclosure in Ettersgill. They extend intermittently throughout the area, notably on the western side of the Beck (Figure 23). It is, at the moment, impossible to date these banks with any accuracy, and all that can be said of them with any certainty is that they are pre-1763 (the date of the first map of this Township) since none of them coincide with the boundaries shown on this map. The banks vary widely in size and shape at the present time: some are only very slight ridges running across the fields, whilst others have very pronounced ditches on one side, and in some cases on both sides (Figure 24). ⁵³ This may, of course, be due in part to the nature of their preservation and the treatment they have received since they were first built, and it should not be assumed that they are still in their original state. Several of these banks underlie the present day stone walls, ie. they form their foundations, whilst others run through the very centre of the fields, and in some cases may even be cut across by the present day walls (Figure 23). ⁵⁴ This indicates very clearly

the complete discordance of the two sets of patterns. Very many of the banks must have been removed or partially ploughed out, resulting in the interrupted pattern evident today. A point of interest is that a few of the banks are indicated on the 1847 map of Ettersgill ⁵⁵ as dotted lines, suggesting that they were possibly of some significance even at this late date. perhaps as the foundation for a fence or wall which has since been removed. The fact that they were represented as dotted lines rather than solid lines as were the rest of the walls, indicates perhaps that they were only of minor importance. Field mapping of these enclosure banks shows that at present they do not form any overall complete pattern. Further detailed field work may help to discover additional banks and possibly show a more complete pattern. It may well be, of course, that the original pattern was not complete, consisting of small islands of isolated fields surrounded by waste. However the fact that enclosure banks, either as fragments or longer stretches, can be found throughout the whole of Ettersgill, especially on the western side, does seem to point to the existence of a much more complete pattern at some time in the past. It is clear, however, that in this albeit fragmented pattern, it is possible to see the oldest existing evidence for enclosure, and perhaps the first enclosures to be made. Work currently in progress at Stewart Shield in the Parish of Stanhope in Weardale suggests that such enclosure banks or 'sod raines' are in fact medieval, and represent the pre-early 14th century high watermark of improvement.⁵⁶ Clearly in the 13th and early 14th centuries enclosed land extended into Ettersgill in the form of small fields bounded by earthen banks, some of which were perhaps topped by fences or hedges. The complete discordance of these banks with those revealed by the 1763 and 1769 maps of the Township ⁵⁷ must

indicate that there was a recession of the head dyke in the late 14th and early 15th centuries. Associated with the medieval enclosure banks are a series of features which might possibly be primitive dwellings in the fields, these having been abandoned when the recession occurred.⁵⁸ This recession must have been followed at a later date by another expansion of enclosed land, overlying the previous pattern and completely discordant to it. These later enclosures must be those represented on the 1763 and 1769 maps and the by the Jacobean Survey.

The 1612 Jacobean Survey⁵⁹ reveals that there were some 435 acres of land belonging to Brigge House, lying "in the eastern part of the Forest of Teesdale", which, as noted in Chapter 3, can be identified as Ettersgill. Some of the land belonging to Friar House Farm in Newbiggin almost certainly lay in Ettersgill: the forty acres of land known as Moier Riggs probably represents the land later known as Friar House Pasture (Figure 9), which lay very near to a farm called Moor Riggs. This land raised the total amount of enclosed land in Ettersgill to at least 475 acres. Since no map accompanies the Survey it is impossible to say where the enclosed land was situated. Using the Survey alone, all that can be visualised of the Ettersgill enclosures is a small island of enclosed land, probably consisting of small and irregular fields the product of gradual piecemeal enclosure, completely surrounded by common grazings (Figure 85).

Study of the 1763 and 1769 maps of Ettersgill⁶⁰ (which are identical) seems to provide some clue to the situation of the enclosed lands of 1612, and what they were like. It has already been noted in the first section of this Chapter that there appear to be

two distinct types of enclosure pattern in Ettersgill at this time. To the west of the Beck and fairly near to it were a series of irregularly shaped fields, generally small, varying between three and eight acres.⁶⁰ The diverse sizes and shapes of the fields seems to indicate that they may well have been piecemeal intakes from the waste. At this time all the Ettersgill farms were situated along the Beck (Chapter 2), and it seems quite likely that these small irregular fields might represent the original intakes of land around the farmhouses.

Around this central area the fields were very much larger, ranging from about fifteen to twenty-five acres. Two of the fields were held in common, the Great Out Field (sixty-five acres) and the Little Out Pry (thirty-eight acres). The fields in the northern part of the Township were also somewhat larger and more regularly shaped, as were a few on the eastern side of the Beck, in complete contrast to those in the central area (Figure 16).⁶¹

Without the evidence of the Jacobean Survey it might be feasible to suggest that these two patterns were the result of two phases of enclosure, the larger fields having been enclosed later than the smaller. Analysis of the Jacobean Survey makes this seem even more possible, for if the acreage of the large fields surrounding the central area is deducted from the total area of enclosed land in the Township at this time, one is left with a total of 484 acres for the central area. The total area of enclosed land in Ettersgill in 1612 was 475 acres.⁶² Thus it seems more than likely that the central area of small fields represents the Ettersgill enclosures of 1612 as noted in the Jacobean Survey. They must also represent the 'new' enclosures, overlying the medieval banks. The larger fields must therefore represent land taken in from the

surrounding waste between 1612 and 1769 (Figure 25).

Although no map accompanies the 1803 Valuation of the Upper Dale, ⁶³ comparison of the field names and acreages with those in the 1769 Survey reveals that there was no change whatsoever in the existing enclosure patterns between these two dates. The total acreage of enclosed land had increased from 759 acres in 1769 to 780 acres in 1803. This increase seems to have been mainly taken up in the 'New Intake' of twenty acres on Hutchinson's farm at High Beck Head. It is of course impossible to locate this intake exactly, since there is no map with the Survey, but the fact that it was on High Beck Head Farm suggests that it must have been in the northern part of the Township, and on its very edge. Calvert (the valuer) also noted the proposal at this time to create a New Pasture to be "taken out of the south part of the Common, about 200 acres!" ⁶⁴ Nevertheless, apart from the two new intakes mentioned above there appears to have been no change at all in the enclosure patterns of Ettersgill between 1769 and 1803.

By 1847 however a great deal of change had occurred. Although a first glance may suggest many broad similarities, in detail there are a number of differences between the enclosure patterns as shown on the 1763 and 1769 maps, which were repeated in the 1803 Valuation, and those patterns depicted on the 1847 Maps of the area.

A good example of what occurred can be seen in the enclosure patterns around Brigge House Farm (Figure 26). In 1769 and 1803 this farm consisted of 146 acres, with seventeen fields, ranging in size from half an acre to thirty acres, giving an average size of nine acres. The fields were generally very irregular

in shape, and there was no uniformity of arrangement within the farm as a whole.⁶⁵ By 1847 the same farm had only 105 acres, with twelve fields, again giving an average size of nine acres, although the diminution in the size of the farm masks the actual increase in average field size. The pattern of enclosure had changed completely and the fields were by now more regularly shaped and rectangular in form. A considerable amount of land had been lost to the new Plantation adjacent to the High Force Inn, amounting to some sixty-one acres. Brigge House had gained the Glebe land (formerly belonging to the Rector of Middleton), an estimated twenty to twenty-five acres. It had also lost a certain amount of land to the new road up the Dale which cut through some of its fields.⁶⁶ This indicates the type of change which occurred on one farm within forty years, and comparison of the maps on Figure 16 indicates that similar changes went on throughout Ettersgill during this time.

A second category of change occurred as a result of subdivision, and many of the large fields on the edges of Ettersgill were subdivided into smaller fields. The Great Out Field and Little Out Pry (Figure 26) had been divided, the former into three rectangular fields, the latter into three fields, plus a fourth which extended a little out of the area formerly covered by the Great Out Field. Also, the outlines of the fields had been straightened and made more regular, so much so that the former fields can hardly be identified.⁶⁷

In addition to these changes there was an extension of enclosed land onto the eastern side of the Beck, creating Ettersgill Pasture, an area of some 237 acres (as noted in 1803). New enclosures were drawn up within this, but the Farm Book does not reveal to

whom they belonged. There had also been a large intake of land from the common in the northern part of the Township, in the shape of the Great Pasture, belonging to High Beck Head Farm, but despite these new intakes it remains clear that the bulk of enclosed land still lay on the western side of the Beck. The total area of enclosed land, including the new stinted pasture was 1,039 acres.⁶⁸

Since 1847 an interesting tendency on Ettersgill Pasture has been the giving of land "in lieu of stints". Certain landowners who held stint rights on the Pasture were given enclosed land in exchange for their stints, to use as they wished, ie. to turn over to improved pasture, or to keep as rough grazing, as their needs demanded. There is a note on the Ettersgill Farm Map showing exactly how the land was allotted, and comparison of this with the Farm Book indicates how many stints those concerned formerly had.⁶⁹ The Provisional Edition of the Six Inch Ordnance Survey shows Ettersgill Pasture as being divided into large fields, this possibly being the result of the allocation of land in lieu of stints.⁷⁰

Table 12

<u>Land in lieu of stints on Ettersgill Pasture</u>		⁷¹
Amount of land	To whom allotted	
17. 0. 28 acres	J. Bainbridge for 4 stints	
8. 2. 14 acres	W. Brumwell for 2 stints	
7. 1. 14 acres	W. Palmerly for 2 stints	
7. 1. 14 acres	W. Bell for 2 stints	
7. 1. 14 acres	G. Garget for 2 stints	

There were also some changes in the enclosure patterns in Ettersgill between 1847 and 1900, although it is rather difficult to generalise about these. In some places boundary walls have been removed to make larger fields, occasionally leaving small portions

of the previous wall standing as a sheep shelter. In other places new walls have been built subdividing some fields. For the most part, however, the enclosure patterns seem to be very much as they were in 1847, and there has certainly been no radical reorganization as there was between 1803 and 1847. ⁷²

The enclosure history of Ettersgill can thus be seen as consisting of three main phases: (1) an early medieval phase, represented at present by the few remaining earthen enclosure banks which bear little relation to existing enclosure patterns. Then came a recession and probably a reversion of the land to rough moorland; (2) a re-advance of enclosed land, probably in the late 15th century, with completely different patterns from those in the previous phase, overlying the medieval banks, gradually expanding outwards into the waste. This phase is characterized by small irregular fields, surrounded by later larger intakes; (3) between 1803 and 1847 these irregular patterns were altered to give a very much more regular and ordered pattern, which, save for a few minor alterations has remained until the present day. Ettersgill's enclosure history is typical of the rest of the Upper Dale, especially the Forest of Teesdale, although whether or not medieval enclosure banks extend any further up the Dale is not known. Apart from this however it does seem that the changes examined in detail here went on in the rest of the Dale at much the same time, and that changes on individual farms much as they did in Ettersgill.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ordnance Survey Map Sheet 84, Teesdale, Scale of One Inch to One Mile, Seventh Series, 1964.
2. P.R.O., Survey of the Manors of Raby, Barnard Castle and Brancepeth, 1612, (On Microfilm).

3. Ibid.
4. Pal & Dip., Middleton in Teesdale Tithe Map, 1843.
5. Gray, H.L., English Field Systems (Harvard University Press: the Merlin Press London, 1915. Reprint 1959). p. 188.
6. Pal & Dip., Tithe Map op. cit.
7. Tate, W.E., The English Village Community and the Enclosure Movements, (London: Gollancz, 1967) p. 55.
8. P.R.O., Survey, op. cit.
9. Pal & Dip., Newbiggin Tithe Map, 1843
10. Pal & Dip., Middleton Tithe Map, op. cit.
11. Hodgson, R.I., The Progress of Enclosure in County Durham, (A discussion paper read at the symposium of the Agricultural Landscape Research Group of the Institute of British Geographers, April-May 1970).
12. P.R.O.; Survey, op. cit.
13. Ibid.
14. Pal & Dip., Probate Inventories, Roger Bainbrigge/Middleton in Teesdale/1602 and John Castell/Newbiggin/1612.
15. Tate, op. cit., p. 55.
16. P.R.O., Survey, op. cit.
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid.
19. Finberg, H.P.R., (Gen. Ed.) The Agrarian History of England and Wales, (Cambridge: the University Press, 1967), Vol IV, Joan Thirsk et al. p.246+6
20. C.R.O. Strathmore Collection, Box 88 No. 130, A Complete Terrier of the Rectory of Middleton in Teesdale in the Bishopric of Durham, 1663.
21. Finberg, op. cit., p. 24.
22. M.E.O. (Small Map store), Greenwell, John, A Plan of the Manor of Middleton in the County of Durham...belonging to the Rt. Hon. Henry, Earl of Darlington, 1769.
23. Ibid, Farm Book of the Forest of Teesdale.
24. P.R.O. Survey, op. cit.
25. M.E.O. Greenwell, op. cit., Farm Book and Map of Ettersgill.
26. Ibid, Farm Books and Maps of Harwood and Middle Forest.
27. Bailey, J.?, A General View of the Agriculture of the County of Durham, (London: Phillips, 1810), p. 88.
28. M.E.O. Greenwell, op. cit., Map of Newbiggin Common.
29. Ibid.

30. Young, A., A Six Months Tour through the North of England, (London, 1770, IV Vols.), Vol II pp. 194 - 201.
31. Hutchinson, W., History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham, (Carlisle, 1794, III Vols) p. 281.
32. M.E.O. (Cupboard at rear of back office), A Plan of Ettersgill Farms in the Manor of Middleton and County of Durham belonging to the Rt. Hon. Henry Earl of Darlington, surveyed by Jeremiah Dixon, 1763.
33. S.E.O., (Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate), A Particular and Valuation of the Manor of Middleton in Teesdale in the County Palatine of Durham belonging to the Rt. Hon. William Henry, Earl of Darlington. September 1803.
34. M.E.O. (Cupboard at rear of Back office) Map of the Township of Harwood, Map of the Township of Forest and Frith, and Map of the Township of Ettersgill, (Surveyed 1863).
35. C.R.O. Middleton in Teesdale Enclosure Award, with plan made in 1842.
36. Loudon, J.C., An Encyclopaedia of Agriculture, (London, 1825) pp. 683-684.
37. S.E.O., (Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate) Cash Account for the Teesdale Estate, Lady Day 1847 - Lady Day 1848.
38. S.E.O. Valuation of 1803, op. cit., General Observations.
39. Young, op. cit., p.450
40. Based on Jacobean Survey, op. cit., Greenwell's Survey op. cit., 1803 Valuation, op. cit., and 1847-1864 Farm Books, op. cit.
41. C.R.O. Middleton Enclosure Award, op. cit.
42. Pal & Dip., Middleton Tithe Map, op. cit.
43. C.R.O. Middleton Enclosure Award, op. cit.
44. Pal & Dip., Middleton Tithe Map, op. cit.
45. P.R.O. Survey, op. cit.
46. Pal & Dip., ~~Newbiggin~~ Tithe Map, op. cit.
47. C.R.O. Cockshott, Francis, A Journey on Foot through Teesdale, 1848.
48. Ordnance Survey Map, op. cit. Also the relevant 2½ inch and 6 inch maps.
49. M.E.O. Ettersgill Farm Book, op. cit.
50. Ordnance Survey Map, op. cit.
51. M.E.O. Ettersgill Map, op. cit.(1863).
52. Miss Elsie Pickering, Personal Communication.
53. Crudass, J.M., Personal Observations.

54. Ibid.
55. M.E.O., Ettersgill Map, op. cit.
56. Roberts, B.K., Personal Communications.
57. M.E.O. Jeremiah Dixon, and John Greenwell, op. cit.
58. Crudass, J.M., Personal Observations.
59. P.R.O. Survey, op. cit.
60. M.E.O. Jeremiah Dixon and John Greenwell, op. cit.
61. M.E.O., Ibid.
62. P.R.O. Survey, op. cit.
63. S.E.O., Valuation of 1803, op. cit.
64. Ibid, Ettersgill Farm Book.
65. M.E.O., Ettersgill Map, op. cit. (Greenwell).
66. M.E.O., Ettersgill Map, op. cit. (1863).
67. Ibid.
68. M.E.O., Ettersgill Farm Book, op. cit.
69. Ibid.
70. Ordnance Survey Sheets NY 83 NE, and NY 82 NE, Scale of Six inches
to One Mile, Provisional Edition, 1953.
71. M.E.O. Ettersgill Farm Book and Maps 1847-1864.
72. Ordnance Survey Six Inch Maps, op. cit.

CHAPTER 5

LAND USE: AN OVERVIEW

In the preceding Chapter it was noted that improved land in Upper Teesdale extends from Middleton as far as Grass Hill Farm at 2,000 feet a.s.l.¹ The nature of the area in terms of climate, physiography and soils (Chapter 1) makes it best suited to the raising of livestock, and for this reason the Upper Dale is almost entirely under permanent grass, the present economy of the area being based upon the rearing of cattle for milk and beef, and upon sheep which are sold to lowland farms for fattening.² The permanent grass is therefore used for two purposes: (1) as meadow to provide hay for winter fodder, and (2) as pasture for grazing the cattle. The earliest sources, notably the Jacobean Survey of 1612 and Probate Inventories, indicate the prevalence of this basic type of land use,³ and permanent grass has undoubtedly been an important constituent of the agrarian landscape in Upper Teesdale for at least four and a half centuries. However, the suitability of the area to the raising of livestock is not the only reason for the extension of improved land to 2,000 feet: had extensive lead mining not taken place here during the 19th century, it is improbable that enclosed and improved land would extend so far up the Dale (see below, and Chapter 8).

It is perhaps best to view the basic patterns of land use in the Upper Dale in the same way as the enclosure patterns, that is by means of broad cross sections through time. The first of these can be based upon the Jacobean Survey and the detailed Probate Inventories for the years 1600 - 1700. The second is based upon the Valuation of the Duke of Cleveland's Highland Estate in 1803 and the last upon the 1847-1864 Farm Books and Maps. As with

the Chapter on enclosure patterns, this basic information will be combined with some contemporary observations to emphasise some of the broad trends and features of land use.

The part of the Jacobean Survey dealing with the Townships of Middleton and Newbiggin emphasises the important contrast between the open townfields and the moorlands.⁴ It is also significant in indicating that these townfields were by this time in transition. The strips, which in former centuries must have been given over almost entirely to subsistence arable production, were being put down to meadow to provide hay, which would tide the farmers over the often difficult days of winter and spring when the common pastures were deep in snow. The result of this transition was that meadow predominated over arable to a great extent, rather than vice versa as must have been the case originally, and that meadow was "disposed here and there throughout the arable area rather than being segregated [beside] a stream or the river." (Gray)⁵ For instance in Newbiggin Field, which had $199\frac{1}{2}$ acres of land, there were already 149 acres of meadow and a mere $50\frac{1}{2}$ acres of arable.

Table 13

Land Use In Middleton and Newbiggin, 1612 ⁶

a) The open fields (in acres)

Field	open arable	open meadow	enclosed arable	enclosed meadow
Newbiggin Field	$50\frac{1}{2}$	146	-	3
Bowleys Field	$8\frac{1}{4}$	$14\frac{1}{2}$	-	-
Scalbank Field	$9\frac{1}{2}$	23	-	-
Scarlett Field	-	10	-	-
Middle Side Field	-	5	-	-
Middleton East Field	-	$\frac{1}{2}$	-	-

b) The land outside the open fields (or in no specified field).

Type	arable	meadow	pasture
Parcels	5	70 $\frac{3}{4}$	
Enclosed parcels	-	25	
Closes	2	207	15

This process of conversion was sometimes accompanied by enclosure (Chapter 4) but initially at least, seems to have been proceeding as the fields lay open and unenclosed. The significance of this change has yet to be assessed fully, since little detailed work has yet been done on it, but one must assume that increasing regional specialisation was encouraging the farmers to turn from subsistence arable cultivation to pastoral farming with an eye to the markets. Thus they increased the numbers of their stock. For this, well-filled hay barns were an essential preliminary, since a late growth of grass on the fells might well spell disaster for some poorly supplied farmers, and the survival of their beasts might well depend on a good supply of hay. The raising of stock is clearly better suited to the environment of the Upper Dale than is arable farming, even if the latter was only for subsistence, and it seems likely that this change in emphasis from arable to meadow went on in response to a "realistic appraisal of land capability."^{7a} As Gonner points out there must have been a "growing lack of suitability between the system and the circumstances"^b which prompted this change to take place.

There was very little enclosed pasture, since the majority of the farmers had 'Common sans stinte', ie. the right to put an unlimited number of beasts onto the fells during the summer months; we may assume that the cattle were wintered in the byres attached to the farmsteads or on the more sheltered lands of the townfields,

thus obviating the need for any enclosed pasture.⁸ It is possible that the townfields were commonable after harvest, although no mention of this is made in the Survey, and clearly if consolidation and enclosure were occurring then there must have already been a breakdown of the communal rules governing such grazings.⁹

Analysis of Probate Inventories for this part of the Dale gives some general idea of the numbers of sheep and cattle kept by the farmers.¹⁰ For instance during the period 1600-1640 the numbers of sheep owned by individual farmers in the Middleton area ranged between eight and 130, and cattle between four and forty. During the later period, 1660-1700, sheep numbers ranged between seven and 217 and cattle between one and forty eight. The average size of flock per farm rose from fifty-six to sixty-nine between the two periods, while the average numbers of cattle remained the same at fifteen. The composition of flocks and herds appears to have varied widely from farm to farm, and it is perhaps ill-advised to generalise about such detailed material (Appendix 3 Part 1). The inventories also indicate that the main arable crops grown were corn, oats and bigg. Wool from the sheep was evidently of importance on many farms, and the sheep were probably "sold at two or three years or thereabouts into the lowlands, where they were fattened for the butcher."¹¹

As might be expected, land use in the Forest of Teesdale was given over almost entirely to meadow within the enclosed lands, as follows:

Table 14

Land Use in the Forest of Teesdale, 1612¹²

	Meadow	Pasture	
Brigge House	400	35	(acres)
Vallance Lodge	502	52	
Hendfelloe House	87 619	74	

Grass Hill is securely documented in 1663, and it is possible that even by 1612 improvement extended to this altitude.¹³ Each holding had, of course, the right of common grazing within the common lands of the Forest, and there would be little need for much enclosed pasture in view of the abundant common lands which surrounded the entire area, on which the stock could be summered. Obviously a good supply of hay for the winters would be necessary, and some enclosed pasture would also be useful, since the beasts could be brought down onto it during the worst days of winter. It would in addition be used for calving and lambing, and for finishing prior to marketing. For instance the inventory of John Walton of Under Hurth Farm indicates that some of ^{his} land must have been used for the wintering of his sheep, since one of the entries reads: "for the wintering of 23 ewes, 23/-".¹⁴ No arable land is specifically recorded in the Survey, but significantly, Probate Inventories indicate that barley (bigg), oats, rye and corn were grown,¹⁵ and the 1612 Survey states that Vallance Lodge had a 'grain oven'.¹⁶ It is perhaps significant that in 1690 John Emerson of Brigge House and Charles Robeson of Force Garth refused to pay any more tithe corn to the Rector of Middleton, as they had done in former years.¹⁷ This might indicate that in former years more corn had been available, and that the same process of change was taking place here as has already been noted, ie. the change from subsistence arable to grass for stock raising. However, if such a change was taking place it was probably less significant than further down dale, in view of the nature of the climate of the Forest of Teesdale which must make the growing of any arable crops very difficult indeed.¹⁸ It seems most likely that the larger part of the land in this part of the Dale had always been under permanent grass, ever since it was reclaimed from the waste, or from the forest which had formerly

covered the Upper Dale, and parts of which might still perhaps have been in existence.

Large numbers of beasts were kept by the farmers of the Forest of Teesdale at this time, particularly sheep, whose numbers on individual farms ranged between twenty-three and 103 in the period 1600-1640, and between thirty-one and 336 in the period 1660-1700. The average size of flock per farm rose from thirty-five to eighty-five between the two periods. The numbers of cattle on individual farms ranged between eleven and thirty-one in the earlier period, and between thirteen and seventy-seven in the later period, the average size of herd rising from nineteen to twenty-seven between the two periods.¹⁸ The rise in the average figures must surely represent more intensive stocking on the Forest of Teesdale commons, partly as a result of the change in land use noted above, and partly, perhaps, as a result of an increased awareness of the potential of the area for stock raising.

In Chapter 1 it was noted that mapping of the information provided by the Probate Inventories is extremely difficult because of its extremely detailed nature, and also the very large amount of information it provides. However, in Figure 27 an attempt is made to show the differing values of stock and produce throughout Upper Teesdale in the two periods 1600-1640 and 1660-1700. The two maps make it very clear that although the farms chosen clearly depended on their stock for a livelihood, there was differing emphasis from farm to farm on different types of beasts, so much so that it is impossible to generalise here about the conclusions to be drawn, except perhaps to say that comparison of the maps would seem to re-emphasise the increase in the numbers and value of stock between

the two periods.

To summarize the 17th century cross section: in the Townships of Middleton and Newbiggin, open meadow and arable strips lay side by side in the townfields, although by this time meadow predominated over arable, and it is clear that at this time the emphasis in agriculture was changing from subsistence arable production to specialised stock farming. Most of the closes around the open fields were also under permanent grass by this time. Higher up the Dale, in the Forest of Teesdale, there were extensive stretches of meadow land, with some pasture, and perhaps a little arable, although contemporary evidence would seem to indicate that what arable there was, was being put down to grass. Sheep and cattle were kept, in increasing numbers, by farmers throughout Upper Teesdale. They were put out to graze over the common lands of the Dale during the summer months, while grass was grown for winter fodder in the enclosed lands of the Dale. During the winter they were probably brought down to the byres during the worst weather, or kept on the townfields after the harvest.

Unfortunately, although John Greenwell's Survey of the Upper Dale in 1769 gives a detailed plan of each farm, it gives no details at all of land use, and the inexplicable 18th century hiatus in Raby documentation makes this gap impossible to fill. In fact no detailed information on land use has survived, save for the general observations of people such as Young or Hutchinson. These do, however throw some light on the state of the Dale at this time. In 1794 Hutchinson made the following observations:

"The sheep and cattle of this part of the country are small, the cattle are fed to little more than ten pounds per quarter; ewes bred in the dale, when fat, weigh from seven to sixteen

pounds per quarter; some in the lower grounds are heavier. This country abounds in sheep; no less than 20,000 are said to be deposited on the common lands yearly." ¹⁹

Arthur Young in his 'Six Months Tour through the North of England in 1770 gives few indications in detail of the land use in Upper Teesdale at this time, but supplies some interesting details of the land use and methods of improvement used on Newbiggin Common, which had been enclosed and divided a few years earlier:

"Parts of the moors have been inclosed which used not to yield a farthing an acre rent; but upon inclosing and then paring, burning, and liming, sowing with turnips, oats and hard corn, and laying down with grass seeds have been immediately advanced to 7s 6d at which rent they now remain. The turnips they get in this manner are very good, but the oats their great crop and very considerable...The turnips they get in the first year, I found were generally reckoned to pay for paring and burning, and the oats which succeed are not only advantageous but profitable. Thus the improvement immediately repays the expense with interest." ²⁰

The 1803 Valuation of the Duke of Cleveland's Highland Estate gives a clear picture of land use, especially in the Forest of Teesdale, since it not only gives details of land use in each field, but also land values per acre for each field. ²¹ It is unfortunate that there is no map accompanying this Valuation; since it makes the task of mapping the land use data difficult. Many of the fields are those mapped by Greenwell in 1769, but in a few cases field names seem to have changed; or additional fields have been taken in from the waste; these are obviously difficult to locate with any accuracy, especially in view of the change in enclosure patterns and field names which went on between 1803 and 1847 (Chapter 4). However, the most important point brought out

by this Valuation is that the change over to permanent grass was by now complete in the lower part of the Dale, as indicated by the entry for Middleton and Newbiggin. Meadow and pasture now predominated over arable; there was still some arable left, but in much reduced quantities, and very little indeed higher up the Dale, as discussed in more detail in the following Chapter. The need in some places for more winter fodder to guard against bad winters was emphasised by the valuer, Alexander Calvert, who said of Widdybank Farm in Middle Forest (Figure 8): "There ought to be a quantity more of meadow ground which might be got from the commons, and part out of the east pasture, to guard against bad winters." He also pointed out the potential for improvement at Forcegarth Farm (Figure 8), saying of the In and Out pastures: "This field ought a part of it to be made good land." Of the Estate as a whole he observed that: "As little plowing as possible should be allowed, as it is in general improperly managed, and kept in that state it is laid to grass with bad seeds, the product of suchlike mismanaged lands, and it is of course a number of years before it will produce grass of any use." 22

On the other hand Bailey, writing in 1810 noted the good quality of the upland meadows which were on good soil, reserved from the plough and well dunged. He noted that:

"...heath sheep have long been inhabitants of this county; they are mostly bred in Teesdale and Weardale by the small farmers who adjoin the barren heathy districts that intervene between these dales. In summer they range over those barren heathy mountains without any attending shepherd; towards winter they are brought nearer the inclosed lands...The ewes are sold for breeding fat lambs, mostly into the eastern parts of the county. The wethers are sold to be fattened on turnips." 23

By this time the pressure upon the commons had reached the point where stinting was being imposed, unless, of course, as noted in Chapter 8, it was being imposed only as a 'fashion'. The 1803 Valuation provides the first evidence of stinting in the Upper Dale. Many of the tenants had both cattle and sheep stints (Appendix 5 Part 1),²⁴ and in such cases, as has already been suggested, the cattle would probably be brought into the byres during the winter, or onto the enclosed lands around the farm, while the sheep would either be left on the commons, or brought down in times of very bad weather. Bailey noted that in the Vale of Tees the hay was stacked out in the fields during the winter, and the cattle foddered all over the field during this time.²⁵ The imposition of stinting perhaps indicates that the trend of more intensive stocking, noted in the 17th century, had now reached the point where some sort of restriction upon numbers was essential to prevent overgrazing and a diminution in quality of the common pastures, which would have a detrimental effect upon the stock. It is clear, therefore, that by this time the trend in the Upper Dale towards more intensive stocking was complete, and that the agricultural basis of the Dale's economy was now firmly based upon the raising of sheep and cattle.

This same Valuation of 1803 also gives the value per acre of each field, and the annual value of each farm, which enables analysis of some of the contrasts between the five Townships making up the Upper Dale. The clearest point which emerges from these figures is that land values definitely increased down dale, the effect of a milder climate, better soils, and longer growing season. For instance, West Under Hurth, a sixty acre farm in Middle Forest was valued at £25 per annum, in contrast to Reveland, a twenty-eight acre farm in Newbiggin, which was valued at £39 per annum.²⁶

By 1803, therefore, one may imagine the whole of the Upper Dale as being under permanent grass, except for some arable land lower down the Dale, but only in very small quantities. The numbers of beasts kept by the farmers had increased considerably, and limitations were now being imposed upon the numbers which could be put onto the various commons. Both sheep and cattle were bred: sheep for sale to lowland farms either for fattening, or for breeding lambs, and cattle for sale as calves into lowland farms for fattening. Farming, although probably already combined with lead mining (Chapter 8), was now run on a commercial basis with an eye to local markets, and the change from subsistence farming which was well advanced in 1612 was by now complete.

Turning to the mid-19th century cross section, the most marked change to occur between 1803 and 1847 was the considerable extension of enclosed and improved land, which points to the continued pressure for land, and indicates the extent to which the former grazing lands could be improved, even at quite considerable heights²⁷. The detailed land use maps for Harwood, Middle Forest, Ettersgill and Newbiggin (Figures 28 and 29), show clearly the distribution of arable land throughout the area, and indicate once more the continued dominance of permanent grass in differing proportions in each Township. In both Harwood and Middle Forest meadow seems to have dominated on the land along the Becks where the soils were perhaps rather better and where a constant supply of moisture was ensured. The Harwood map shows clearly how the meadow gradually graded out into pasture on the lower slopes of the fells, where the soils were probably thinner and poorer (Figure 28). The map of land values in this area in 1863 shows how the highest values were to be found along the Beck, falling towards

the outer limits of the township, the meadow generally coinciding with the better value land. Perhaps the clearest picture of land use is seen in Ettersgill where the meadow emerges clearly as two large blocks on the western side of the Beck, on the better soils and more level land (Figure 29). The differing proportions of meadow, pasture and arable are examined in more detail in the following Chapter. Figure 30 shows more clearly the gradual increase downdale of arable land, although the amount of arable in all was still very small. In Harwood and Middle Forest very few arable crops indeed were grown. These were potatoes, with some turnips and oats. At present oats are rarely grown above 700 feet a.s.l., and it is said that often oats grown in the High Dale in the mid-19th century did not ripen because of the unsuitable climatic conditions.²⁸ The total area of arable in Harwood at this time was a mere two acres, and the same area in Middle Forest. In Ettersgill the same crops were grown, and there was one very large area of arable to the west of the confluence of Ettersgill Beck with the River Tees (Figure 29). The rotation practiced here was meadow, potatoes, turnips and wheat, in differing order each year. The total area of arable in Ettersgill was nine acres. In Newbiggin far more arable crops were grown (Figure 29), showing the effects of a fall in altitude and climatic improvement, together with some flat land along the banks of the Tees. The main crops were oats, potatoes, turnips, wheat and barley, in varying rotations, and the total area of arable land here was fifty-three acres.²⁹

The extension of improved land between 1803 and 1847 must be linked with the importance of lead mining at this time. Population increased steadily until the mid-19th century (Figure 4), as did the number of farms (Table 4), and the limit of

improved land was gradually extended. The Land Utilization Survey of 1941 noted that at the present time 1,100 feet a.s.l. is considered to be marginal for the growth of hay,³⁰ and so the extension of meadow land up to 2,000 feet a.s.l. in Harwood,³¹ must have been risky and speculative in the extreme. However, at the same time it obviously yielded the farmers some income additional to that which they received from the lead mines.

Unfortunately the 1847-1864 farm books give no details of the numbers of livestock kept on each farm, but only the numbers of stints and sheep on most of the commons (Appendix 5, Parts 1, 2 & 3). What is apparent is the fact that the process of restriction on the numbers of beasts to be put out on the commons was now almost complete, the only commons remaining unstinted being Harwood Common, Great Common and West Common.³² There was in fact a tendency to give land in lieu of stints, notably on Ettersgill Pasture (Chapter 4), and also on Hurth Pasture (Figure 8). For instance in 1863 William Tallentine of Hangingshaws Farm had 'a part of Hurth Pasture enclosed' where he had formerly had one stint.³³ By this means the tenants concerned could either turn their land over to improved pasture for cattle or keep it as rough pasture for sheep depending on their needs. There seems also to have been an increased amount of stall feeding of cattle during the winter at this time, a trend noted and encouraged by Thomas Bell, who commented that "by this method a great deal more stock can be fed on farms than by pasturing."³⁴ Some of the farm improvements noted at this time were for new byres (Table 7), possibly indicating the extension of this trend, rather than foddering the cattle out in the fields during the winter as noted by Bailey (see above).

Also to be noted at this time are a few plantations, which appear to have been planted since 1803. There were four acres of plantation in both Harwood and Middle Forest, forty-five acres in Ettersgill and sixty-seven in Newbiggin.³⁵ These plantations were possibly linked to the increasing need for wood in the lead mines, and also for maintaining the houses and other buildings on the Estate.

So far, no mention has been made of land use in Middleton since, as noted in Chapter 1 it was not possible to cover the Farm Books for this Township. However the Tithe Map coverage of Middleton would indicate that this area was now well established under permanent grass, with some arable, probably rather more than in Newbiggin.³⁶ Unfortunately there are no details of the stock kept in this part of the Dale, but one must assume that both cattle and sheep were bred, as in the rest of the Dale, for sale to lowland farms.

Mention should also be made of the extension of drainage in the Upper Dale, which must have led to the improvement of many waterlogged fields and facilitated the improvement of fields recently taken in from the waste. Despite this there would still probably be some problems of bad drainage, as there are today, because of the heavy rainfall in the area. Exactly when the first drainage schemes were undertaken in Upper Teesdale is impossible to say, but it seems likely that the bulk of the drains were laid in the early and mid-19th century. In 1856 Bell noted that a "large amount of drainage [has been] effected throughout the county by which the average produce of all crops has been increased."³⁷ There are few details of large scale drainage schemes in the Upper Dale

before the 20th century, apart from a map of drainage in Ettersgill in 1866, which indicates that most of this Township had underdraining by the mid-19th century.³⁸ In the same area between 1879 and 1880 five farmers had their rents increased as interest on money expended on drainage, to a total amount of £12 14s 2d.³⁹ Over the whole of the Upper Teesdale Estate during the same year £806 was added to rent charges as interest on draining.⁴⁰ The Teesdale Accounts of 1848 reveal that much draining was going on at this time. For instance William Scott was paid £3 11s 8d for laying a stone drain on Thomas Collinson's farm 'Under Hearth'. Shortly afterwards he was paid another £4 12s for laying pipe tiles on the same farm.⁴¹

A general survey of land use in the Upper Dale from 1600 to 1900 thus indicates that from the mid-17th century onwards the area has been subject, eventually, to the same system of land use. This was the maintenance of the land under permanent grass, linked to the raising of livestock. The major trend in land use was the gradual conversion of subsistence arable to grass, especially lower down the Dale. Linked with this was the advent of more specialized farming and more intensive stocking. This in turn led to increasing pressure of stock upon the common lands, resulting eventually in the imposition of stinting on all but a few of the commons. There was a gradual extension and improvement of enclosed land, linked very closely to the mid-19th century lead mining boom. The net result of these changes was to produce a landscape described rather colourfully by Francis Cockshott as one "...under the most improved system of agriculture, teeming with every variety of profuse abundance." ⁴²

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ordnance Survey Map Sheet 84, Teesdale, Scale of One Inch to One Mile, Seventh Series, 1964.
2. Smailes, A.E., The Lead Dales of the Northern Pennines, Geography, June 1936, pp. 120-129.
3. P.R.O., Survey of the Manors of Raby, Brancepeth and Barnard Castle, 1612 (On microfilm).
4. Pal & Dip, Various probate Inventories of Middleton and the Forest of Teesdale, 1600-1700.
5. P.R.O., Survey, op. cit.
6. Gray, H.L., English Field Systems, (Harvard University Press: the Merlin Press London, 1915. Reprint 1959), p.47.
7. P.R.O., Survey, op. cit.
- 7 a Hodgson, R.I., The Progress of Enclosure in County Durham, (A discussion paper read at the symposium of the agrarian Landscape Research Group of the Institute of British Geographers, April-May 1970).
- 7 b Gonner, E.C.K., Common Land and Enclosure, (London: Frank Cass & Co., 1966) p. 33
8. Kerridge, E., The Agricultural Revolution, (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1967), pp. 163-164.
9. Tate, W.E., The English Village Community and the Enclosure Movements, (London: Gollancz, 1967), p. 61.
10. Pal & Dip., Probate Inventories, op. cit.
11. Finberg, H.P.R., (Gen. Ed.) The Agrarian History of England and Wales, (Cambridge: the University Press, 1967), Vol. IV, Joan Thirsk, et al., p. 189
12. P.R.O., Survey, op. cit.
13. C.R.O., Strathmore Collection, Box 88 No. 130, A Complete Terrier of the Rectory of Middleton in Teesdale in the Bishopric of Durham, 1663.
14. Pal & Dip., Probate Inventory, John Walton/Middleton/1639.
15. Pal & Dip., Probate Inventories, op. cit.
16. P.R.O., Survey, op. cit.
17. C.R.O., Glebe Terrier, op. cit.
18. Stamp, L.D., (Gen. Ed.), The Land of Britain, The Report of the Land Utilisation Survey of Great Britain, (London: Geographical Publications, 1941), Part 47, County Durham, p. 198, 215.
19. Hutchinson, W., History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham, (Carlisle, 1794, III Vols)p. 281.

20. Young, A., A Six Months Tour through the North of England,
(London, 1770, IV Vols.), Vol II, P. 202.
21. S.E.O., (Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate), A Particular
and Valuation of the Manor of Middleton in the County
Palatine of Durham belonging to the Rt. Hon. William
Henry, Earl of Darlington. September, 1803.
22. Ibid.
23. Bailey, J., A General View of the Agriculture of the County of
Durham, (London: Phillips, 1810), pp175-176.
24. S.E.O., Valuation of 1803, op. cit.
25. Bailey, op. cit., .
26. S.E.O.; Valuation of 1803, op. cit.
27. M.E.O., (Bookshelves of small map store), Field Book of the
Township of Harwood, 1847-1857, Field Book of the
Township of Forest and Frith, 1847-1857, and Field
Book of the Township of Ettersgill, 1847-1864.
28. Stamp, op. cit., p. 197.
29. M.E.O., Field Books, op. cit., and Field Book of the Township of
Newbiggin, 1847-1857.
30. Stamp, op. cit., p. 197.
31. M.E.O., Harwood Field Book, op. cit.
32. Ibid.
33. M.E.O., Forest and Frith Field Book, op. cit.
34. Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society, Vol XVII, 1856, Report
Upon the Agriculture of County Durham, Thomas Bell, p. 119.
35. M.E.O., Field Books, op. cit.
36. Pal & Dip., Middleton in Teesdale Tithe Map, 1843.
37. J. Royal Ag. Soc., op. cit., p. 118
38. M.E.O., (Small Map store), Map of Ettersgill Drainage, 1866.
39. S.E.O., (Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate), Rent Abstracts
for the Teesdale Estate, Ettersgill, 1879-1880.
40. Ibid.
41. S.E.O., (Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate), Dash Account
For the Teesdale Estate, Lady Day 1847 -Lady Day 1848.
42. C.E.O., Cockshott, Francis, A Journey on Foot through Teesdale
1848.

CHAPTER 6

FARM STUDIES: A HISTORY OF LAND USE

In the previous Chapter a survey was made of the general history of land use throughout the Upper Dale from the 17th century to the end of the 19th century. A survey was also made in Chapter 3 of the general history of the farms during the same period. To throw more light on these subjects this Chapter will study certain farms in detail and attempt to show how farming has developed since the 17th century. Most of the sources from which this may be reconstructed are deficient in some respects. For instance the Jacobean Survey of 1612¹ gives full details of the land held by tenants in the Upper Dale, but no details of their stock. Conversely, the detailed Probate Inventories for the period 1600 - 1700² give full lists of the stock which tenants held, but no details of their land. In only one case does it prove possible to combine an entry in the Jacobean Survey with a Probate Inventory to give a complete picture of a 17th century farm. Similarly, the main 18th century source, the Valuation of 1803³ provides details of stint rights on the fells and land use, but no details of the numbers and types of beasts the tenants owned. The same can be said of the 1847 - 1864 Farm Books.⁴ However, despite their deficiencies these sources do provide a good overall picture of land use and the farms of the Upper Dale between 1600 and 1900.

To introduce the subject of the farm and land use in the Upper Dale in the 17th century the following quotation, derived from Joan Thirsk, is particularly suitable, since it summarises admirably the state of the area at this time:

"The characteristic settlement was the hamlet or single farm. The arable land was restricted to a few closes near the farmsteads, or, in larger settlements, lay in scattered parcels

in one or more fields which were commonable after harvest... For winter fodder men set most store by their common pastures and leys in the arable fields, and by their meadows which frequently equalled or exceeded the acreage of the arable... The highland farmers main business was the breeding of cattle, which were sold as stores into more southerly counties, and the keeping of sheep which were pastured on the hills and were kept mainly for their wool...The ordinary 'statesman' could make a living with 6 to 9 beasts, 2 horses, and 20 to 40 sheep, while a few richer farmers could compete with any southerner." ⁵

A typical farm of the lower part of the Dale (ie. the Townships of Middleton and Newbiggin) was that of Roger Newbye of the Powtree in Newbiggin, on the very banks of the River Tees. His inventory, made on 2nd February 1619 lists the following stock:⁶

two mares	£3 6s 8d
five kine	£7 3s 4d
three stirks	£0 14s 4d
sixteen ewes, one tup....		£4 5s
seventeen cowes*	61s 8d

No lambs and calves are noted in the inventory, and this is possibly because lambing time for that particular year had not yet arrived, and also because all the previous years' calves had already been sold into lowland farms. One of the vital factors influencing the numbers of livestock which could be kept was the provision of fodder during the winter. We may perhaps imagine that Roger Newbye had some parcels or strips of land in the subdivided fields near his farm (Chapter 3), some of which were laid down to arable, and some to meadow, the latter predominating over the former (Chapter 5). The meadow would provide the all important fodder to help the beasts through the winter, especially if the weather was bad, and the cattle

* The meaning of the terms listed here and in subsequent paragraphs are explained in appendix 4.

had to be confined to the byres. At this time Newbye had hay valued at £2 still left,⁷ and this would have to last his cattle and perhaps some of his sheep as well, until conditions were favourable enough for them to be taken up onto the fells. One can imagine that after a very long winter many of the cattle would emerge from the byres in a very weakened condition. It is indeed possible that if there was a lack of fodder for all the beasts some of them might have to be slaughtered, and the beef salted down for household consumption. For the rest of the year his sheep and cattle would be pastured on the fells above the enclosed lands (assuming of course that he had the right of common there) while the grass and arable crops were grown, in preparation for the following winter. He also had two horses, which must have been used for transport and also for ploughing his arable land in the open fields. At his death he left debts amounting to £7 14s 4d, his 'goods moveable and unmoveable' being valued at £23 16s.⁸ Study of the figures provided by the Probate Inventories (Appendix 4 Part 1) would indicate that Roger Newbye was fairly typical of farmers in the lower part of the Dale at this time, having both sheep and cattle, although rather less sheep than the average (Chapter 5). The value of his property, after deducting his debts would indicate that he was among the poorer farmers of this area, although probably nonetheless secure, since £16 2s 4d must have represented a considerable amount of money at that time.

It is instructive to turn to a farm in the same part of the Dale which is entered in the Jacobean Survey of 1612, but which has no Probate Inventory. A fairly typical example is John Allinson. The Survey does not indicate exactly where he lived, but the fact that he held land in Newbiggin Field does, of course, indicate

that he lived in the Township of Newbiggin. He held, by Letters Patent, the tenement whereupon he lived, and had a house, stable and barn, and the following amounts of land: ⁹

A close of meadow containing 2 acres 2 roods.

A parcell of meadow lying in Newbiggin Field, cont. 8 acres

A parcell of arable land lying in the same place,
cont. $1\frac{1}{2}$ roods

It is clear from this that his main concern must have been the provision of hay for his cattle, and that only enough arable land was kept to provide corn or rye for the personal consumption of his family. He probably at one time held all his land in the subdivided fields under arable, and relied upon the common pasture to provide fodder for his stock. By turning this over to meadow he was putting his land under a more suitable crop for this particular area, and was also helping himself to improve his stock and increase his chances of making a good living out of farming. A significant fact in this respect is that he also held a close of land outside the subdivided fields, which was laid down to meadow, obviously to supplement the supply he already held, which he could use as he pleased. This would have been difficult in Newbiggin Field which must have been subject to certain communal practices. ¹⁰ As Chambers and Mingay point out: "Taking in of land from the waste...enabled the open field farmer to carry a larger head of stock and so to enjoy an increased manure supply." ¹¹ The Jacobean Survey shows that many farmers had additional land in closes outside the subdivided fields, perhaps only recently taken in from the waste, which must have given additional security both in the short and long term.

John Allinson had the right of common (probably unstinted) on the fells in the Township of Newbiggin, and his beasts would

spend most of the year there.¹² The cattle would be brought down to the townfields, commonable after harvest, during the winter, when the supply of hay, as already noted, would be crucial. The close of meadow might be used during this time for pasturing the cattle, and must also have been a very great advantage during lambing and calving.

The only inventory which can be combined with an entry in the Jacobean Survey is that of Guy Bainbrigge of Hendfelloe House in Harwood (Chapter 3) in 1620. The Survey reveals that he held 693 acres of land, consisting of 619 acres of meadow and 74 of pasture.¹³ The fact that he also held seventeen houses reveals that much of this land was leased out to tenants (Chapter 3). Thus if all his land was divided equally each farm would have some forty acres of land, most of it meadow, with only a few acres of pasture. It is more likely, however, that Bainbrigge's farm would have been the largest and the others proportionately smaller. We may assume, perhaps, that he held some sixty to seventy acres of meadow and ten acres of pasture. The inventory of his stock runs as follows:¹⁴

Three kine with calf, one quye with a calfe,			
three kine to calf and two gelde kine	£18	0s	0d
Five younge stotts with one quye	£8	8s	
Four stirkes		53s	4d
Thirty three ewes, thirty late lambs, two to lamb			
and one gelde at 9s a piece	£13	4s	
Three tuppes and a weather		19s	
Thirty three sheepe hogges at 5s 8d a piece	£ 9	7s	
One bay bowsoned young meare	£3	6s	8d
One black paised meare	£3	6s	8d
One young grey colt of 4 yeare	£3		
One bay colt	£3		

Although the cattle were worth more than the sheep (£29 as opposed to £23)¹⁵ the numbers of sheep involved, and the fact that the prices of the sheep are given, but not those of the cattle, makes it seem rather more likely that his main source of income lay in the raising of sheep for sale to lowland farms for fattening. The inclusion of 'hogges' makes this seem more likely, since a hogge is a young sheep between the age of weaning and first clipping, which might possibly be being reared for sale the following year. This inventory was made in April, and it is clear that lambing was just coming to an end, as indicated by the entry of 'thirty late lambs, two (ewes) to lamb'.¹⁶ It seems probable, in view of the fact that calves were also being raised, that these were for sale into lowland markets at a later date. Guy Bainbrigge had the right of 'Common in the Forest of Teesdale',¹⁷ and it has already been noted that the common lands here must have been very extensive at this time. It seems most likely that, as noted in the previous two cases, his sheep would remain on the commons for most of the year, while the cattle would be brought down during the winter. The presence of a small amount of pasture is significant, indicating that some of the cattle may have been kept there for part of the year rather than on the fells. It would also be of use during calving and lambing.

The total value of Guy Bainbrigge's inventory amounted to £580 15s 10d, which at this time was a very considerable amount. It is interesting to note that at death he was owed £133, while at the same time he had debts amounting to £400,¹⁸ which indicates that he was very far from being a mere peasant. As well as indicating clearly the land use in the Forest of Teesdale in the early 17th century, the entries in the Jacobean Survey and Probate Inventory for Guy

Bainbrigge show very clearly that stock farming for sale into lowland farms and local markets was already well developed very high up the Dale, despite the very unfavourable climatic conditions.

For the next picture of Upper Dale farms in any detail we have to turn to the information provided by the 1803 Valuation of the Teesdale Estate.¹⁹ This gives details of the land which the tenants held and also of the numbers of stints they held on the Common Lands of the Dale. It does not, however, give any idea of the exact numbers of stock kept by the farmers, and interpretation of the data is somewhat limited by this fact.

A typical farm of the Forest of Teesdale in 1803 was Cocklake, in Harwood (Figure 10). This farm consisted of forty-one acres, divided into five fields, ranging in size from just over three acres to twenty-one acres as follows:²⁰

Land Use*	Acreage	Val. per acre	Ann. Val.
P Calf Garth	3 0 15	4/-	13s
M Intake	3 2 17	20/6d	£3 12s
M High Close	4 2 35	12/-	£2 16s 6d
M Low Close	7 2 25	8/-	£3 1s
M Fore Hill	<u>21 3 33</u>	4/-	<u>£4 7s 6d</u>
	41 0 5		£14 10s

It is interesting to note from these figures that this farm had only one small pasture field, all the rest being put down to meadow for the production of winter fodder. This is possibly very much the form that the tenant farms belonging to Guy Bainbrigge took, being predominantly meadow, with only a little pasture (see above). It is clear from the figures above that this farm relied on its enclosed lands for the production of hay, and kept its stock out on the commons for most of the year. No cattle stints are mentioned for this

* P = Pasture ; M = Meadow

particular farm, so any cattle it had must have been kept on the unstinted commons of the Township (Chapter 7), being brought down to the enclosed lands over the winter. The small pasture field was probably used for the cattle at this time, and probably also for the newly born calves, as its name implies. Cocklake Farm had the right of fifty sheep gates on the Harwood Commons.²¹ Whether or not this meant that the owner had only fifty sheep one cannot say, but the lack of pasture would seem to confirm this, unless, of course, some sheep were kept on the unstinted commons. Both the sheep and cattle were probably bred for sale into lowland farms,²² although the meat and milk must also have been consumed on the farm itself.

In contrast to this farm was one in Ettersgill which was characterised by the sharing of certain fields. The farm was at Dirt Pit (Figure 9), and was owned by Grace Bainbridge:²³

Land Use	Acreage	Val. per acre	Ann. Val.
House and garth	0 3 24		
M Dirt Pit Close	1 1 0	33/-	£3 10s 6d
M Grace Lodge Close	4 0 2	20/-	£4
M Bainbridge's Pry	21 0 16	5/-	£5 5s 6d
P $\frac{1}{3}$ Dirt Pit Pasture	13 3 25	4/-	£2 15s 6d
Part Great Out Field	0 1 24	4/-	1s 6d
Part Out Pry	<u>3</u>	5/-	<u>15s</u>
	44 2 13		£17 8s

This farm had more meadow land than pasture, as did Cocklake Farm, but it had considerably more pasture than many other farms in the vicinity. It is interesting to note that the pasture land was in Dirt Pit Pasture (Figure 9) which was shared with two other landholders. She also had a share in two other fields (see above), but the use to which they were put is not noted here. This farm had the right of thirty-five sheep gates on Ettersgill Common and thirty sheep gates

on the New Pasture; it also had five and five-sixths beasts gates on the Common, and five beast gates on the New Pasture.²⁴ This indicates that there were at least sixty-five sheep and sixty-five cattle on this particular farm. Whether or not this represented all the beasts on the farm is difficult to say. The pasture land in Dirt Pit Pasture may well have carried more cattle and sheep, or on the other hand it might have been used during the winter when the cattle were brought down from the Commons, where they would spend the summer. The details given in the Valuation do not clarify this at all. The land use on this farm indicates one of the main changes between 1612 and 1803 which was the increase in enclosed pasture throughout the entire Dale. In 1612 there were only thirty-five acres of enclosed pasture in the entire Township of Ettersgill,²⁵ and it seems likely that most of this belonged to Brigge House, the main farm (Chapter 3). With the increasing importance of stock farming (Chapter 5) and the growing numbers of sheep and cattle in the area, enclosed pasture would increase in extent, for a variety of reasons: firstly to enable the farmer to keep more stock, especially when the amount of stock he could put out on the Commons was being limited by stinting; secondly to help him through the winter, by providing more pasture land near the farm which would provide winter grazing, and thirdly by providing land near the farmhouse for lambing and calving, and also for finishing prior to sending the beasts to market.²⁶

In Chapter 5 it was noted that, in the lower part of the Dale, there was an increasing trend towards the turning over of subsistence arable land to grass for the raising of stock. Study of a farm in Newbiggin shows that this process was by now complete, and also that most of the land there was now enclosed, as opposed to

lying open as had been the case in 1612 (Chapter 4). Typical of the recorded farms in Newbiggin at this time was that held by

Thomas Collinson, High Riddings:²⁷

Land Use		Acreage	Val. per acre	Ann. val.
P	High Ridding	4	} 18/-	£6 6s
P	Low Ridding	3		
* A	Rye Close	1	42/-	£2 2s
p	Island	10	21/-	£10 10s
M	Long Bank	2	20/-	£2
A	Lodge Bank	2	40/-	£1
M	Little Bank	2 20	20/-	12s 6d
M	Gabriel Garth	1	40/-	£2
M	Ainsley Field	3	21/-	£3 3s
25 0 20				£27 13s 6d

There are some significant features about this farm which point out the contrast between this part of the Dale and the Forest of Teesdale, and also the contrast between this period and the early 17th century, discussed earlier in this Chapter. The first immediate contrast is that this farm had a small amount of arable land, totalling just over an acre, probably representing small closes of land near to the farmhouse. This is typical of many of the other farms in Newbiggin at this time, and is in contrast to farms higher up the Dale where there was hardly any arable land at all.²⁸ This indicates the effect of the somewhat lower altitude and more favourable climate in Newbiggin. A major contrast with the situation in 1612 is the significant increase in enclosed pasture belonging to an individual farm. In 1612 there was hardly any enclosed pasture recorded in Newbiggin²⁹ because there was abundant pasture available on the common lands where most of the beasts were kept. In addition to this, in 1612 the townfields were almost certainly commonable after harvest.³⁰

* A = Arable

With the gradual enclosure of the townfields (Chapter 4) and expansion of enclosed land, the amount of available common land decreased, and enclosed pasture became essential if the farmers were to maintain or increase the numbers of their stock, especially when stinting was imposed. This farm is typical of the Newbiggin farms in 1803 in having a small amount of pasture in contrast to 1612 when there was none. Another contrast with 1612 was that this farm, like the others in Newbiggin, now held all its land in closes, as opposed to 1612 when much of the land lay open (Chapter 4). This enclosure was the result of the turning over of arable land to meadow, (Chapter 5), which eventually led to the enclosure of the meadow land: "...farmers are beginning to turn to other sources of profit and require enclosure for that reason." (Gonner) ³¹ As well as being enclosed the land was probably by now consolidated into one unit, in contrast to the "small, intermingled, and inconvenient holdings of the open fields." ³²

This particular farm had the right to forty-seven cattle gates on the common pastures of Newbiggin.³³ However, no mention is made of any sheep gates on this farm or any other in Newbiggin, although many of the farmers must have had sheep. It is possible that the commons here were not yet gated for sheep, and that the farmers could put out as many as they liked: the Valuation gives no clues as to this. Thomas Collinson had both pasture and meadow land available, so the wintering of his cattle would have presented few problems, although the small amount of his land laid to meadow might suggest that winter fodder was not as plentiful as it could have been, a criticism levelled by Alexander Calvert against some of the Middle Forest farms (Chapter 5). ³⁴

The main changes in land use on the Upper Dale farms between

1612 and 1803 as seen through these examples are thus as follows: firstly the change in the areas around Middleton and Newbiggin from subsistence arable production to grass for stock farming. This was accompanied by enclosure and consolidation of holdings, which was very well advanced by 1803; secondly an increase in enclosed pasture on the farms themselves throughout the entire area, in response to an increasing limitation upon the common lands, and indicating a need for the farms to become more self sufficient as far as pasture was concerned. Comparison of the three examples cited in 1803 reveals many contrasts between them, for instance an increasing amount of arable downdale, and also an increase in land value, together with the sharing of certain fields, as in Ettersgill. However, the basis of land use was now firmly fixed upon permanent grass for the raising of sheep and cattle, despite the many variations in management from farm to farm.

Study of the Upper Dale farms in the mid-19th century reveals that little change in the organization of the farms went on between 1803 and 1847. It is, however, of interest to study farms in Harwood, Middle Forest, Ettersgill and Newbiggin, since they show very clearly that although they all concentrated upon the raising of stock, their organization could be completely different.

In Harwood a typical farm was Marches Gill, held by Elizabeth Dixon (Figure 9), which consisted of the following land:³⁵

Land Use	Acreage	Val. per acre(1865)
P $\frac{1}{2}$ Pasture	9 2 2	6/-
P $\frac{1}{2}$ Pasture	6 1 0	5/-
P Calf Garth	0 2 2	12/-
M Carr Browside	4 3 0	10/-
House and garth	<u>0 1 0</u>	12/-
	21 1 14	

This is the first farm to be studied which initially had more pasture than meadow. However, in 1852 the largest pasture field (which was shared with two other tenants) was turned over to meadow, perhaps because the other field under meadow could not provide enough fodder for the head of stock which the farm carried. This farm had no stints, probably because the beasts were kept on one of the unstinted commons in Harwood (Chapter 7).³⁶ This suggests that the enclosed pasture might only have been used during the winter when the cattle were brought down onto it from the fells, but it is equally possible that they were kept on the farm for the whole year round. It is of interest to note that Elizabeth Dixon was the widow of a lead miner, and that her two sons were both lead miners. She had one daughter who was a 'scholar'.³⁷ In view of this it seems most likely that the farm was merely an adjunct to lead mining, which probably provided the main source of income for the family, especially as there were no more male members of the family to help look after the farm. One must assume that there were only a few stock to look after, and that the two male members of the family were able to stay on the farm whenever the need arose, for instance at haymaking or lambing time.

In complete contrast to this farm was one in Middle Forest, Under Hurth Farm, held by John Steeley, a lead miner,³⁸ which had the following amounts of land:³⁹

Land Use	Acreage	Val. per acre (1865)
M High Grounds	7 0 37	12/-
M Little Field	1 0 21	12/-
P Little Field	6 1 20	12/-
M Carr	4 2 28	15/-
P Carr	0 1 1	-
M Sill Riggs	7 2 35	10/-
Hou House, etc	0 0 14	
	21 1 36	

This farm had only half an acre of pasture, and nineteen and three-quarters of an acre of meadow (see above), which indicates that no beasts could have been kept on the enclosed lands during the summer while the grass was growing in the hay meadows. To compensate for this John Steeley had four cattle stints on Hurth Pasture (Figure 8) and his cattle must have been kept there for most of the year, being brought down to the farm during the worst days of winter.⁴⁰ Similarly, he had four sheep stints on Langdon Beck Pasture, where they must have been kept for most of the year.⁴¹ This farm obviously concentrated very much more on the production of hay for winter fodder than did the previously mentioned farm (Marches Gill), and possibly survived the winter better in consequence, although of course the number of stock which had to be fed by each farm was the most significant factor, which cannot be taken into account here since the numbers are not known. It was noted above that John Steeley was a lead miner, and he had no family, save for his wife.⁴² This suggests that this must have been a farm on which the production of livestock for market was only a secondary consideration to lead mining, although if he worked only for himself, and not for a particular lead company, he would of course be able to spend as much time as was necessary on the farm.

Lastly, in contrast to these two farms in the Forest of Teesdale, is one in Newbiggin: Gate Side Farm, held by John Gargett:⁴³

Land Use		Acreage	Val. per acre (1865)
P	Owl Gill	2 3 11	12/-
P	High Limekiln Field	2 2 3	10/-
P	Lime Kiln Field	3 2 10	12/-
P	Back Field	Now Wm. Beadle's	
M	Home Field	2 2 16	40/-
M	Bell Pasture	1 2 30	40/-

(continued)

M	Butts & Owl Gill	2	3	17	-
M	High Boveyway	2	1	12	-
-	Low Boveyway	1	0	28	-
A	Ryeclose Tillage	1	0	4	40/-
-	House etc	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>30</u>	
		21	0	1	

This farm contrasts strongly with the other two examples in having almost equal amounts of meadow and pasture. The amount of pasture, and the fact that no cattle stints are mentioned must indicate that the cattle were kept on the farm all the year round, while the sheep were on the allotments held by John and George Coatsworth, where John Gargett had three stints.⁴⁴ He had a small amount of land permanently under arable crops, again in contrast to the other two examples; the main crops were oats, turnips, potatoes and barley, in varying combinations and rotations each year, which were probably mainly used for household consumption.⁴⁵ This must indicate the slight improvement in conditions for the growth of arable crops with the fall in altitude and perhaps better soils as compared with the Forest of Teesdale.

It is unfortunate that none of the farm books give any details of the exact numbers of stock on these farms, for it makes interpretation of the land use data rather difficult, and assumptions about the methods on the farms might well be completely wrong. However, it is probably correct to assume that the Upper Dale farms in the mid-19th century, although of secondary importance to lead mining were still of some importance in raising stock for sale to lowland farms. However difficult the information from the mid-19th century farm books is to interpret, it shows very clearly that there was no

one set pattern of land use adopted all over the area, but that farms had completely differing proportions of meadow and pasture, depending upon the nature of the area where the farm was situated, and they used their stints to offset any deficiency in pasture, or shared large pasture fields where this was necessary, as the three examples have shown. The basic use of the land for permanent grass for livestock remained very much the same, but the methods by which this was achieved seem to have differed quite widely from farm to farm, depending on the quality of land at the farm, the number of stock it carried, the number of stints it had, and so on. The fact that many of the tenants of farms were lead miners (see above) must indicate that in very many cases farming was merely a secondary occupation, merely serving to supplement the income raised from lead mining.

The study of certain selected farms in Upper Teesdale from 1612 to 1847 serves to confirm, very clearly, that since 1612 the area has been under very much the same system of management, and that the farms have concentrated on the raising of stock for sale into lowland farms. This is clear from the earliest sources in the 17th century, although at this time there were still traces of subsistence arable production in Middleton and Newbiggin.⁴⁶ Higher up the Dale it seems likely that the land has always been under permanent grass since its reclamation from the waste. One of the main trends throughout the Dale was the gradual increase in enclosed pasture (see above) in response to the increasing pressure upon the commons, and the introduction of stinting. It is also of importance to note that in the 19th century, farming, especially higher up the Dale, became subservient to lead mining, a trend which has been completely reversed in the present century, with the decline and eventual disappearance of lead mining from the area.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. P.R.O., Survey of the Manors of Raby, Brancepeth and Barnard Castle 1612, (On microfilm).
2. Pal & Dip., Various Probate Inventories of Middleton and the Forest of Teesdale, 1600-1700.
3. S.E.O., (Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate), A Particular and Valuation of the Manor of Middleton in the County Palatine of Durham belonging to the Rt. Hon. William Henry, Earl of Darlington. September, 1803.
4. M.E.O., (Bookshelves of small map store), Field Book of the Township of Harwood, 1847-1857, Field Book of the Township of Forest and Frith, 1847-1857, Field Book of the Township of Ettersgill 1847-1864, and Field Book of the Township of Newbiggin, 1847-1857.
5. Finberg, F.P.R., (Gen. Ed.), The Agrarian History of England and Wales, (Cambridge: the University Press, 1967), Vol IV, Joan Thirsk et al., pp. 21-22.
6. Pal & Dip., Probate Inventory, Roger Newbye/Powtree, Middleton in Teesdale/ 1619.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.
9. P.R.O., Survey, op. cit., John Allinson.
10. Tate, W.E., The English Village Community and the Enclosure Movements, (London: Gollancz, 1967), p. 61.
11. Chambers J.D. and G.E. Mingay., The Agricultural Revolution, (London; Batsford, 1966), p. 9.
12. P.R.O., Survey, op. cit.
13. Ibid., Guy Bainbrigge.
14. Pal & Dip., Probate Inventory, Guy Bainbrigge/Middleton in Teesdale/ 1620.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid.
17. P.R.O., Survey, op. cit., Guy Bainbrigge
18. Pal & Dip., Guy Bainbrigge Probate Inventory, op. cit.
19. S.E.O., Valuation of 1803, op. cit.
20. Ibid, Harwood Farm Book.
21. Ibid.
22. Bailey, J., A General View of the Agriculture of the County of Durham (London: Phillips, 1810), pp. 175-176.
23. S.E.O., Valuation of 1803, op. cit., Ettersgill Farm Book.

24. Ibid.
25. P.R.O., Survey, op. cit.
26. Gonner, E.C.K., Common Land and Enclosure, (London: Frank Cass & Co, 1966) pp. 29, 30, 36.
27. S.E.O., Valuation of 1803, op. cit., Newbiggin Farm Book.
28. Ibid., Harwood, Middle Forest and Ettersgill Farm Books.
29. P.R.O., Survey, op. cit.
30. Tate, op. cit., p. 61.
31. Gonner, op. cit., p. 36.
32. Chambers & Mingay, op. cit., p. 20.
33. S.E.O. Valuation of 1803, op. cit., Newbiggin Farm Book.
34. Ibid., Middle Forest Farm Book.
35. M.E.O., Harwood Field Book, op. cit.
36. Ibid.
37. C.R.O.; 1851 Census Returns, (on microfilm).
38. Ibid.
39. M.E.O. Forest and Frith Farm Book, op. cit.
40. Ibid.
41. Ibid.
42. C.R.O. Census Returns, op. cit.
43. M.E.O. Newbiggin Field Book, op. cit.
44. Ibid.
45. Ibid.
46. P.R.O. Survey, op. cit.

CHAPTER 7

THE COMMONS

"The history of Common rights in England may be viewed as that of an increasing limitation of rights to a more sharply defined class of user, and the gradual limitation of the fixed supply of land, according to local circumstances." (Hoskins) ¹ The commons of Upper Teesdale exemplify this state of affairs very well, although they are perhaps something of an exceptional case, in that the first record of stint rights on the fells does not appear until 1803.² Exactly when stinting (the limitation of the number of beasts which could be put onto a certain common by one person) began in this area is not known, but it must have been after the early 17th century when it is known that the fells were unstinted;³ this is in contrast to the fells in Weardale which were stinted very much earlier. The history of the Upper Dale commons must also be viewed in the light of the fact that the utility of the moorland is largely to be measured by its accessibility from the more sheltered and better drained lands of the Dale;⁴ as enclosed land extended up the Dale and onto the lower slopes of the fells, so moorland which might formerly have been useless became useful as grazing land, and thus was brought within the sphere of influence of the enclosed lands in the Dale.

Unfortunately evidence about the Upper Dale commons is not abundant. There are three major pieces of information: the 1612 Jacobean Survey, the 1803 Valuation, and the 1847-64 Farm Books and maps. Most of the information provided by these three sources related to stinting and to the ~~extent~~ extent of the commons. Other varied sources help to fill in the picture somewhat, but it remains rather sketchy at the present.

The first records of common lands in the Upper Dale are to be found in the 1612 Jacobean Survey of the area.⁵ This records that of the thirty-seven landholders in Middleton and Newbiggin, twenty-two had the right of 'Common sans stinte' (common without stint) ie. the right to put out as many beasts as they pleased onto the common lands of the Townships which lay beyond the enclosed lands. Eight had 'common super mora' : the right of common on the moors (mora), but with no mention of stinting; one had 'common sans stinte super le fells': the right of unstinted common on the fells, and one had 'common' with no further details. Whether or not these four types of entry reflected any significant variation in grazing rights is difficult to say: it may well be that the right of 'unstinted common' differed from the right of 'common on the moors', in that the latter may have been stinted, although if this had been the case it would surely have been noted as such in the Survey. It is quite possible that a change in terminology was made at the whim of the clerk who wrote out the Survey, and that the terms are synonymous. It is impossible at the present to say with any certainty. The remaining five landholders had no right of common recorded against their entry. The main conclusion to be drawn from this is that the majority of farmers in the lower part of the Dale had the right of common, which was for the most part unstinted. The situation was much the same in the Forest of Teesdale: Thomas Bainbrigge of Brigge House had the right of 'common sans stinte infra metas et bound de Newbigginge': unstinted common within the bounds of Newbiggin, ie. the lands on the eastern side of Ettersgill Beck which marks the boundary between Ettersgill and Newbiggin (Figure 2). Guy Bainbrigge of Hendfelloe House had 'common sans stinte super Foresta': unstinted common in the Forest (whether this meant the administrative area known as the Forest of Teesdale, or the wooded

part of Upper Teesdale, is not made clear), and Thomas Bainbrigge of Vallance Lodge had 'common' without any other details.⁶ Again, whether these terms reflected any variation in rights is impossible to say. What is clear is that the commons were already well integrated into the farming practices of the Dale. Probate Inventories reveal the considerable (and increasing) numbers of sheep and cattle kept on farms throughout Upper Teesdale,⁷ and the commons must have been well used at this time. Sheep were probably kept on the fells for most of the year, while cattle were summered there, while the enclosed lands produced meadow for the winter fodder. Indeed, without the fells the farmer could not hope to survive (Chapters 5 and 6).

It is a mistake, however, to view the commons only in terms of their use as common grazing land. They were also capable of improvement, especially on the lower slopes of the fells, and *two* 17th century Probate Inventories bear witness to this by including 'intaken land' in the valuations of the respective farms.⁸ In addition to this the commons could also provide food in the shape of birds and animals (grouse, partridge, black game, rabbits and perhaps deer), fuel (many inventories mention peat spades), stone for building, fruits such as bilberries, and so on.⁹ The commons must not be viewed merely as an abundant supply of grazing land, although this was undoubtedly of major importance, but as a resource of very much wider significance, which must at many times have been vital to the farmers of the area.

The commons in 1612 must have been very much more extensive than when they appear on the first map of the Dale in 1769¹⁰ because of the increase in enclosed land at the expense of the commons

between these two dates. It is impossible to pinpoint accurately their complete extent at this time, since there is no map accompanying the Survey, and as noted in Chapter 4 the enclosures cannot be located with any certainty either. However, it is possible to gain some sort of approximation. As Figure 20 shows, it seems very likely that common grazings completely surrounded the islands of enclosure in the Forest of Teesdale. The years between 1612 and 1769 must be viewed as a period during which the commons decreased in extent as the result of piecemeal intaking around the edges of the islands of enclosed land, until, in the case of Middle Forest and Etersgill, the common land between the two Townships had completely vanished, having been converted to improved meadow and pasture (Figure 20).

The Rent Book of the Earl of Darlington's Highland Estate, between 1757 and 1758 records that six tenants held land in the 'Great Common'.¹¹ This must imply that encroachment onto the commons was going on at this time, or that it had gone on fairly recently. Comparing these tenants with those named in the 1769 Survey only eleven years later,¹² it is possible to identify where some of these encroachments were made. The land held by Thomas and William Toward in 1757 is clearly represented in 1769 by the two farms called Bowes Close, still each owned by these same two men, and which in 1769 still abutted directly onto the common (Figure 10). Similarly the land held in 1757 by John Dowson and John Cusing can be tentatively identified as the Great Pasture which also abutted onto the common in 1769, and was owned by 'Cousin and Dowson' (John Cusing of 1757 is clearly Cousin of 1769). The land held by Nathan Horn in 1757 can perhaps be identified as that part of his farm in 1769 which lay on the south-western side of the Beck (Figure 10).

Greenwell's map of the Upper Dale in 1769¹³ gives a clear indication of the extent of the commons at this time (Figure 31), but gives no indication at all as to whether they were stinted. Perhaps the most interesting and important features revealed by this particular map are the newly made enclosures on Newbiggin Common, dating from 1764.¹⁴ The significance of this enclosure is that it highlights the the potential of much of common land for improvement, and indicates the considerable amount of land which must have been improved, and therefore not available for common pasture; this was a trend which, partially at least, must have led to the imposition of stinting. However, although the extent of the enclosed lands was at this time increasing at the expense of the commons, common pastures still completely surrounded the island of enclosure that was Harwood. Grass Hill and Sievy Hill Farms were also surrounded by common grazings (Figures 8 and 10). On the other hand the common land between Middle Forest and Ettersgill had been eaten away by gradual intaking, until the enclosed lands of the two townships met (Figure 20). The total acreage of the commons in the Forest of Teesdale (Back Common, West Common, Harwood Common, Langdon Beck Common, Great Common, Langdon Common and Ettersgill Common) was given by Greenwell as 13,103 acres.¹⁵

The utility of these common lands was summed up by Grainger in 1794 as follows: "The waste lands are situated mostly in the western part of the country, and being of different qualities are capable of various improvements; much may be converted into arable, much into pasture, much into woodland; and even of the mosses, it would be found that many might be drained, and the rest not left unuseful for the production of peat."¹⁶ In the same year Hutchinson pointed out some other qualities of the same lands, implying perhaps that they were also of use for hunting: "On each side of the river

the moors abound in game, and the streams are everywhere filled with trout: such are the compensations bountiful nature has yielded for her less seemly countenance."¹⁷

A Valuation of the Upper Dale made in 1803 by Alexander Calvert is the first record of stint rights on the fells.¹⁸ The number of sheep and cattle 'gates' (one gate probably representing one animal, although this is not confirmed by the Valuation) is noted, together with the common lands on which these privileges were enjoyed, except for the case of Middleton where "the annual value of common (is) included in the valuation without having regard to the number of stints on the common."¹⁹ The actual number of gates allotted to each person are listed in detail in Appendix 5 Part 1, but the total figures for each common are as follows:

Table 15
Common Rights in the Upper Dale, 1803²⁰

	Sheep gates	Cattle gates
Newbiggin Common:	-	1077
Ettersgill Common	466	77 5/6
Ettersgill New Pasture	398	56 2/6
Middle Forest & Langdon Commons	3137	-
Hurth Pasture	-	24
Harwood Common	1533	

The total extent of the commons, including Middleton Common, was given as 22,176 acres²¹, a reduction of some 3,000 acres on their area in 1769²², but it seems likely that some of the Harwood Commons were not yet stinted, and were therefore not noted in the Valuation or included in this total. This would account for the apparently sharp decrease in the area of the commons. However some of the decrease must certainly have been in newly intaken land.

The valuer in 1803 also had certain comments to make

upon some of the stinted pastures (smaller areas of pasture, of somewhat better quality than the commons, but nevertheless still let off in stints, often for cattle as well as sheep): "The intended new Pasture (in Ettersgill) when inclosed with a good fence will be one of the best pastures in the High Dale, and will be worth according to the number of gates as above 12/- per gate...the intended pasture to be taken out of the south part of the common, about 200 acres." Of Middle Forest and Harwood he said that "a regular stinted pasture would be of material use to the tenantry in general...not less than 400 acres of the lowest and best part of the common ...is now inclosing intended to be kept for a stinted pasture, to be let out in gates and will be worth from 10/- to 12/- per gate per annum."²³

After the enclosure of Newbiggin Common in 1764, the next main set of enclosures to be made upon one of the Upper Dale commons was the enclosure by Act of Parliament of Middleton Common, in 1804.²⁴ The common was divided into an Inner and Outer Pasture, the former being enclosed and the latter unenclosed (Figure 13). Stints on each were allotted to the tenants "in proportion to the values at which they were rated in the Poor Rate for the Township".²⁵ Much of the Inner Pasture must however have been turned over to improved land, thus causing a further diminution of the reserves of common land. The Earl of Darlington, as Lord of the Manor, claimed the right of free warren, royalties of the common, mines, minerals and quarries. In addition to this a large number of carriage roads were set out, for instance roads running from Middleton to Eggleston, Stanhope and Wolsingham in Weardale. Within Teesdale roads ran to Newbiggin, Middleside, Coldberry mine and various quarries. In addition to these, other foot roads were to be laid out, leading to

the various allotments on the Common. Some private 'carriage and drift roads' were also allotted, two of them leading to the Duke of Cleveland's allotments on the common, and another to Hope House on the eastern side of the moor. A 'public watering place' was set out on the Stanhope and Wolsingham road, and five public stone quarries were allotted: these were to be used to provide stone to make the highways and other roads mentioned in the Award, and also for the general use of all the tenants on the common.²⁶

Referring amongst others to Middleton Common, Bailey in 1810, said the following: "...a considerable portion is not capable of improvement by the plough...the greater part of which [ie. land which is capable of improvement] has undergone that operation and continues in a regular system of cultivation. The whole is well inclosed, and sub-divided into proper sized fields...I knew a great part of these commons in their native state, and think, that upon an average the lands are at least ten times more valuable by enclosure than they were in a state of common."²⁷

However, despite the fact that Bailey considered that most of the improveable land had already been improved, comparison of the 1803 and 1847 Farm Books²⁸ reveals quite clearly that between these two dates the taking in of land at the expense of the commons still continued apace, notably in Harwood and Middle Forest (Figure 31). The mid-19th century Farm Books give the numbers of stints allotted to each tenant but not the actual numbers of sheep or cattle they owned. In some cases the actual numbers of sheep on the commons were noted, but this was not always the case, as revealed by the following table:

Table 16
Common Rights in the Upper Dale, 1847 29

	Stints	Value	Total beasts
Newbiggin Common	-	14/- ea.	753 sheep
Bowlees Pasture	19	£1 ea.	- cattle
Ettersgill Common	55	4/- ea.	554 sheep
New Pasture	54	15/- ea.	- sheep
Hurth Pasture	21	14/- ea.	21 cattle
Langdon Beck Pasture	99	14/- ea.	- sheep
Bowes Close Pasture	20	12/- ea.	-
Pasture	10	14/- ea.	-

In some of the Townships there was an interesting tendency to give land in lieu of stints, as for instance in Ettersgill Pasture (Chapter 4), and also in Hurth Pasture in Middle Forest.³⁰ Thus the tenants who were allotted land in this way could turn it over to improved pasture if they wished, or leave it as rough grazing land depending on their needs. This process reduced the area of Ettersgill Pasture from 236 acres in 1847 to 184 acres in 1858 (Table 12).³¹ The 1848 Teesdale Account books indicate that some of the tenants were not using their stints: "Item Mary Parker, for stints on Hudeshope Common for which she had paid and not had the benefit of...15/-." ³² It appears that the Back Common, Harwood Common and West Common, at the head of the Dale (Figure 31) were unstinted at this time.³³ Certainly there is no mention of any stinting on these commons in the mid-19th century farm books. It is interesting in this respect to note Bell's comment that in 1856 "...the moors are not half stocked."³⁴ This perhaps implies that stinting had not been imposed out of necessity as might otherwise have been assumed, because of increasing pressure of stock upon the moorland, but perhaps merely because it was a fashionable trend in farming at this time. This is a subject which would merit much further research.

The nature of the commons at this time is revealed by Cockshott, although it must be noted that he was talking mainly about the moors at the very head of the Dale: "...a trackless waste of heather, without any single mark of human habitation, not an inch of grass...there is not even a mountain sheep to be seen." "...not a field, not a wall - nothing but heather and bogs." "Not a house, a tree nor enclosure of any kind interrupts the boundless waste."³⁵ In a different vein he noted that "...hunting and shooting are the favourite diversions of the miners, accompanied by their well trained dogs for three or four days altogether."³⁶ The 1851 Census Returns indicate that there were two gamekeepers in each of Harwood and Middle Forest, testifying to the importance of game in this area at this particular time.³⁷

Many of the moors were leased out by the landlord (the Duke of Cleveland) to various people for shooting. For instance in 1898 he granted the lease for five years of Middle End, Hudeshope, Pike Law and Ettersgill Moors to one Thomas Clutterbuck of Stanmore in Middlesex, at a rent of £1,200 per annum. This granted him the "...sole and exclusive right of shooting and killing grouse, black game and partridges by himself and his friends." This was as long as he would "...provide and employ at his own expense the requisite number of Gamekeepers and watchers for preserving the game upon the said lands, and keeping the said moors undisturbed and free from vermin. And will not kill or destroy for the time being on the said moors more than a fair and proper proportion of the game...and at all times during the said term keep up the head of game on the said moors and will to the best of his powers preserve the eggs and young of game birds from being destroyed or injured and at the end of the term hereby granted will leave a fair and due proportion.

of game therein." In addition to this he was to "...judiciously and in a workmanlike manner burn such quantities of heather and ling as may be considered necessary."³⁸ The burning was, of course, to encourage a new young growth of heather for the grouse to eat, since this is preferred to the old tough heather. In a similar manner to that mentioned above, the rights of shooting over Widdybank, Harwood and Langdon Commons, together with certain farms and plantations, were leased to Charles Hunter in 1898³⁹ although in this particular lease nothing was said about the burning of the heather, and there are no other references to the burning of heather in the moors of the high part of the Dale.

The monthly accounts of keepers and shepherds in the Upper Dale for August 1897 (Appendix 5 Part 4)⁴⁰ reveals that many of the shepherds spent a considerable amount of time during the night 'watching' the moors. This throws an interesting sidelight on the farming techniques of the time, and probably represents a practice still carried on today. The 'watching' is almost certainly linked with the establishment of 'hefts' or 'heughs', or the 'territory' of a certain flock of sheep. The sheep belonging to each farm had their heugh on the common, where the lambs had grown up with their mothers.⁴¹ The watching at this time was perhaps concerned with the establishment of new heughs, the shepherd making sure that the sheep stayed within the right area, until they knew their own heugh. This is a practice which is still carried on in the Dale today, so that each farmer who has sheep on the common knows exactly where they should be.⁴²

The history of the commons of Upper Teesdale can therefore be viewed broadly in terms of the gradual diminution of their area,

the reduced availability of grazing land for a stable or increasing number of beasts, leading in turn to the imposition of stinting. There are perhaps some slight grounds for suspecting that stinting was not imposed wholly out of necessity, but that it was a fashionable trend at the time, and was imposed for that reason.

The commons should not, however, be regarded as only a vast reserve of land capable of improvement into meadow or pasture, since, as noted above, they were also a reserve of fuel, stone for houses walls and millstones, and game, which brought extra revenue into the area when the shooting rights were leased out. However, the main significance of the commons in terms of the Upper Dale as a whole lay in their part in the farming practices of the area. The farmers of the Dale were from the beginning of the 17th century, and perhaps earlier, dependant upon the commons as grazing land for their sheep, from which much of their revenue was derived. The fell was as essential to the farmer as were the improved fields which lay around his farmhouse. It thus formed a completely integrated part of the Upper Dale farms. Without the common lands the farmers could not have maintained the number of beasts that they did. Early on in the period covered by this thesis the fells were also used for summer grazing for the cattle, until the increase in enclosed pasture meant that most of them could be kept on the farm throughout the year. The state of the commons was thus of great importance to the farmer, since he relied upon them to provide good grass for his cattle, and the quality of the grazing reflected in the quality of the cattle. To this day the quality of the commons is important as the quality of the enclosed lands, since they directly affect the quality of the sheep and cattle grazing on them. The common lands of the Upper Dale and their history are not to be

viewed only in terms of a vast expanse of waste land which had some advantages and provided a few resources, but as a vital part of the agricultural economy of the area.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Royal Commission on Common Land, 1955-1958, (London: H.M.S.O., 1958). Hoskins: The History of Common Land and Common Rights, Appendix 2, p. 150, pt. 7.
2. S.E.O., (Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate), A Particular and Valuation of the Manor of Middleton in Teesdale in the County Palatine of Durham belonging to the Rt. Hon. William Henry, Earl of Darlington. September 1803.
3. P.R.O., Survey of the Manors of Raby, Brancepeth and Barnard Castle, 1612, (On microfilm).
4. Stamp, L.D., (Gen. Ed.) The Land of Britain, The Report of the Land Utilisation Survey of Great Britain, (London: Geographical Publications, 1941), Part 47, County Durham, pp.226-227.
5. P.R.O., Survey, op. cit.
6. Ibid.
7. Pal & Dip., Various Probate Inventories of Middleton and the Forest of Teesdale, 1600-1700.
8. Pal & Dip., Probate Inventories: Roger Bainbrigge/Middleton in Teesdale/1602 and John Castell/Newbiggin/1612.
9. Finberg, H.P.R., (Gen. Ed.) The Agrarian History of England and Wales, (Cambridge: The University Press, 1967), Vol IV, Joan Thirsk et al., pp. 18-19.
10. M.E.O., (Small Map Store), Greenwell, John, A Plan of the Manor of Middleton in the County of Durham...belonging to the Rt. Hon. Henry, Earl of Darlington, 1769.
11. S.E.O., (Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate), Rent Book of the Rt. Hon the Earl of Darlington Highland Estate from Lady Day 1757 to Lady Day 1758.
12. M.E.O., Greenwell, op. cit.
13. Ibid.
14. Bailey, J., A General View of the Agriculture of the County of Durham, (London: Phillips, 1810), p. 88.
15. M.E.O., Greenwell, op. cit.
16. Grainger, J., A General View of the Agriculture of the County of Durham, (London 1794) pp. 43-44

17. Hutchinson, W., History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham, (Carlisle, 1794, III Vols), p. 281.
18. S.E.O., Valuation of 1803, op. cit.
19. Ibid, Middleton Farm Book.
20. Ibid.
21. Ibid.
22. M.E.O., Greenwell, op. cit.
23. S.E.O., Valuation of 1803, op. cit.
24. C.R.O., Middleton in Teesdale Enclosure Award, with plan made in 1842.
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid.
27. Bailey, op. cit., pp.97-99.
28. S.E.O., Valuation of 1803, op. cit.
M.E.O., (Bookshelves of small map store), Field Book of the Township of Harwood, 1847-1857, Field Book of the Township of Forest and Frith, 1847-1857, Field Book of the Township of Ettersgill, 1847-1864, and Field Book of the Township of Newbiggin, 1847-1857.
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid. Ettersgill and Forest and Frith.
31. Ibid. Ettersgill.
32. S.E.O., (Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate), Cash Account for the Teesdale Estate, Lady Day 1847-Lady Day 1848.
33. M.E.O. Harwood Field Book, op. cit.
34. Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society, Vol XVII, 1856, Report Upon the Agriculture of County Durham, Thomas Bell, p. 92.
35. C.R.O., Cockshott, Francis, A Journey on Foot through Teesdale, 1848.
36. Ibid.
37. C.R.O., 1851 Census Returns, (on microfilm).
38. S.E.O., (Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate), Lease of shooting rights to Thomas Clutterbuck, 1898, (draft).
39. S.E.O., (Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate), Lease of shooting rights to Charles Edward Hunter, 1898.
40. S.E.O., (Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate), Keepers and Shepherds (sic) monthly account, July 31st to August 28th 1897.
41. Hartley, M., and J. Ingilby, Life and Tradition in the Yorkshire Dales, (London: Dent & Sons; 1968) p.37.
42. Mr J. Pickering, Personal Communication.

CHAPTER 8

LEAD

Teesdale forms a part of the Northern Pennine Orefield, which comprises the mining districts of Alston Moor, Weardale, Teesdale and Allendales. The major rocks of the area are the Yoredale beds which consist of alternating limestones, sandstones and shales. This group of rocks, which forms a major part of the Lower Carboniferous series, dips eastwards and is overlain by younger Millstone Grit facies, mainly on the eastern edge of the Orefield (Figure 2). In the geological past igneous intrusions pervaded these rocks, and associated with them was the development of mineral veins. The latter, developed mainly in the Yoredales, are abundant on the northern side of the Dale, where they frequently occur in clusters, which trend mainly from east to west, or from north-east to south-west. However, in the lower part of the Dale around Hudeshope and Egglehope (Figure 32) most of the veins are developed in the Upper Limestone Group, which lies above the Yoredales. Finally in the Cow Green area the oldest sequence of rocks, the Lower Limestone, lying below the Yoredales, has also yielded mineral veins which have been exploited by mining activity. The lithologies of the parent rocks have given rise to varying productivity in mineral exploitation. The best horizons are the sandstones and limestones which are higher than the Great Limestone, which in this part of the Orefield contains very few minerals. This is an exception to the general rule in the Orefield as a whole, where the Great Limestone tends to be the major mineral bearing limestone. The Whin Sill yields few minerals of economic value. Even in the mineral veins themselves there is a rapid impoverishment with depth, eg. as in Hudeshope, where some veins gave rise to large workings on higher ground, but at lower altitudes were non-productive. The main methods of mining which exploited these veins were by means of adits or cross cuts, necessitating

only a few shafts.¹

In the context of this survey the major significance of lead mining lies in its contribution to the historical geography of the Dale, rather than its own development and history. Because of this the main emphasis of this Chapter will be laid upon the influence of lead mining upon land use and enclosure history in the Upper Dale, although, of course, the general development of the industry will also be noted.

Our knowledge of lead mining in Teesdale before the 18th century is somewhat sketchy because of inadequate documentation. It is possible that the Romans worked lead here, but unlike such ore-fields as those in Somerset or Derbyshire, there is no very positive evidence that mining was carried out. Evidence of medieval lead working is mostly associated with 'bale hill' sites. These were ancient "basins of stone where lead ore was smelted or run by the force of the fuel heaped upon it, assisted by the wind, before a mill or bellows were used."² The bale hill was situated usually on the brow of a hill, facing south-west or towards the prevailing wind. An area a few feet in diameter was walled off, openings made towards the wind, and channels from the interior to a collecting pool outside. A fire of wood or peat was made, and ore thrown onto it. Molten lead trickled out, into the gathering pool, to form a rough pig of lead.³ In a survey made after the northern rising in the reign of Elizabeth I of the forfeited estates of the Earl of Westmorland, who had supported the rising, under the account of Eggleston it is found that "Sir George Bowes holds the easement of a hill 'ad plumbum suum triandum' " (for smelting his lead). This hill was probably a bale hill site as described above.⁴

There is little evidence of extensive lead mining in Upper Teesdale in the 17th century, apart from two major exceptions. Firstly, the Flakebrig (Fleakbridge) mine in Eggleshope (Figure 32) which was leased out in 1663, and was evidently of some importance at this time. In 1670 the 'lead mynes of Eggleshope' were valued at £6 per annum.⁵ Secondly, Grass Hill mine, which in a Survey in 1670 was valued at £20 per annum.⁶ In a Glebe Terrier of 1663 there was a tithe to be paid to the Rector of Middleton of "a tenth part of all lead at Grass Hill and Hawkside well washed."⁷ (Hawkside was a mine lower down the Dale, to the north west of Middleton). These two references must indicate that Grass Hill mine was of importance by the mid-17th century. However, apart from references such as these there is little more evidence about Teesdale lead mines during the 17th century, and certainly not enough to draw any inferences about the state of the industry. All that can be said of this time is that there were some lead mines established in the Dale, but hardly anything is known of their state of organization or production. The presence of mines so far up the Dale in the 17th century, however, might well be a partial or even major cause of the extension of farming into Harwood and Middle Forest at this time (Chapter 4).

The first available map of the Teesdale lead mines was made in 1732 by William Jones for Lord Barnard, to whom the mines belonged.⁸ This map shows very clearly that at this time there were very large numbers of lead mines in the area, extending from Eggleshope right up the Dale to the very head of the Tees. The mines were mainly high up on the sides of the valley where most of the richest mineral veins are to be found (Figure 32). The main groups of mines were in Harwood, Langdon Beck Head, Pikelaw, Hudshop and Eggleshop, as the map clearly indicates. The three smelting

mills were in Newbiggin, Middleton and Hudeshope Beck. This map indicates that by this time the lead industry was clearly of importance in Upper Teesdale. There were a large number of mines throughout the entire length of the Dale, which must have employed a certain proportion of the inhabitants, although how many is not known. The close proximity of many of the mines and farms, notably Grass Hill strongly suggests that mining and farming were already combined, but to what extent is impossible to say without detailed information.

Further evidence of the growing importance of the lead mining and processing industry at this time is provided by the Duke of Cleveland's leadmill account for the year running from Lady Day 1739 to Lady Day 1740.⁹ This account reveals that the main producing mines were Pikelaw (c.818 tons), Redgroves (c. 179 tons), Mannergill(95 tons), Langdon (c. 76 tons), and Grass Hill (c. 358 tons) (all these amounts have been converted from 'bings', the conventional unit of weight at this time. One bing is thought to have contained about eight hundredweights). Other mines, producing less than 40 tons each were Bayles, Eastrake, Hudeshope, Skeers, Stablegreen and Wiregill. The total production from the mines listed in the account was about 1,594 tons. Duty ore paid to the Duke of Cleveland, as owner of the mines was $\frac{1}{5}$ of the total output, and thus amounted to some 318 tons. This amount of duty was worth £1991 10s 6d. The accounts are also very useful in indicating the state of organization of the lead industry at this time. For instance, the leadmills used coal, cinders, coal ashes and peat for fuel, all of which had to be acquired and carried to the mills. In addition to this, carriers were employed to bring 'mill iron' from Newcastle, Kendall and Stockton. Smiths, carpenters, masons and a millwright were employed to do

repairs at the mill. Other people were employed to do such diverse jobs as 'stacking peats etc.', 'labouring', 'watching peat mosses', 'piling lead' and 'carriage of bullion to London'. The account reveals that after the lead had been smelted and refined at the mill, most of it was transported to Stockton on Tees and sold there, while a very small proportion was sold at the lead mill. As well as this, 1013 $\frac{1}{4}$ ounces of silver were produced from the lead, and sold to two buyers for £295.¹⁰ (Appendix 6 Part 1). The account would indicate that the lead industry was well established in Upper Teesdale by this time, and that a considerable number of the population were employed in it, either working in the mines, taking supplies to and from the mines and mills, or working in the mills themselves. How many of the employees were full time and how many part time, combining this employment with farming, is not known, but it does seem quite possible that as early as this many of the workers may have been part time, and that the miner-farmer tradition of the Upper Dale may already have begun.

A significant date in the history of lead mining in Upper Teesdale was 1745, when the London Lead Company first began taking over mines in the area. In 1753 they took the leases of certain Newbiggin mines for sixteen years, and began work on three major centres of operation: Egglesthorpe, Hudeshope and Pike Law (Figure 32). These areas remained their major centres of operation, and were at the same time the main producing area in the whole of the Upper Dale.¹¹ As noted later in this Chapter, most of the other mines were worked independantly by small groups of men, most of whom had smallholdings in the Dale. The significance of the lead industry in Teesdale in the mid-18th century is indicated by the fact that in 1758 thirteen lead miners from Derbyshire moved to

Langdon Beck in Middle Forest to work the lead mines thereabouts. ¹²

Greenwell's map of the Upper Dale in 1769¹³ shows the lead mines of the area in some detail, and indicates once more the obvious importance and extent of the industry at this time (Figure 32). By 1794 Hutchinson could report of the Forest of Teesdale that:

"The barrenest heights pour forth hidden treasures, being rich in mines. In 1781 from the various mines in the district, there was brought to be smelted 5617 bings of ore; four bings and a half, upon an average, will produce a fother of lead weighing 22 cwts. Each fother yields ten ounces of silver; and about three pounds per fother will win and manufacture the ore and carry the lead to market. It sold that year for 17L a fother...The vale is well peopled on account of the great number of men employed in the mines."¹⁴

This again suggests that the tradition of the miner keeping a farm near to the mine where he worked must have been established by this time. Enclosed land already stretched as far as 2,000 feet in Harwood (Figures 17 & 20), and it seems very likely that many of the farms were created by lead miners to supplement their incomes. The proximity of Grass Hill Farm (Figure 10) to Grass Hill lead mines suggests that it may well have been created at this height, as near as possible to the mine, so that its owner could profit both from lead mining and farming. However, it seems that although the area had great riches in the form of lead, prosperity fell somewhat during the Napoleonic Wars: "The mines in Teesdale are at the present rather unsuccessful, and the unsettled state of the times is much against mine adventurers, as the sale of lead is generally very dull during war, which prevents the mining business being pursued with the usual vigour." (Grainger). He also noted that: "...the miners take these farms at extravagant rents..." ¹⁵

By 1800 important smelting experiments were being carried out by the London Lead Company at Eggleston, comparing the efficiency of various methods of smelting lead. The result of these experiments was that the single lead mill at Eggleston was triplicated, giving rise to the High, Middle and Low Mills,¹⁶ in which "...the lead ore needs no lifting, but descends from process to process until it is brought out as lead at the lower part of the Mill." (Whellan)¹⁷ Soon after this, Bailey, writing in 1810, reported that there were forty-eight lead mines in Teesdale, as compared with forty in 1732 (Figure 32); of these forty-seven belonged to the Earl of Darlington, and the remaining one (Fleakbridge in Egglehope) to William Hutchinson of Eggleston. Six of the mines were leased out to the London Lead Company, and the rest to various 'mining adventurers'. These were small groups of men, usually also tenant farmers in the Dale, who worked the mines as their main source of income (see below). Of the mines in operation, only the following are said to have been making a profit in 1810: Marlebeck Head, Old Pike Law, High Langdon, Grass Hill and Ashgill Head. The small number working to profit may well have been related to the fact that the country was still involved in the Napoleonic Wars. All the lead mines paid a Duty Ore to the proprietors of 1/5 of their total output. It was estimated that four bings of clean lead ore would yield when refined twenty cwts of lead.¹⁸

It is not until the middle years of the 19th century that a clear picture is available of the relationship between mining and farming in the Upper Dale. A Grant Book of mines held by lease from the Duke of Cleveland for the years 1833 to 1845 shows that many of the mines in operation were being worked by small groups of men¹⁹; many of whom were almost certainly tenant farmers under the Duke of

Cleveland, since their names are noted in the 1847 Farm Books as holding small farms in the Forest of Teesdale.²⁰ The 1851 Census Returns confirm that many of the lead miners in Harwood, Middle Forest and Ettersgill were also involved in farming, since they can be found also in the 1847 Farm Books for these three areas.²¹ In Ettersgill in 1851 there were 104 males, of whom 56 were lead miners and 6 former lead miners. Only two householders were classed as full time farmers. In Harwood at the same time there were 180 males, of whom 101 were lead miners and 3 lead smelters. Despite the fact that many of the householders named in the census also held small farms from the Duke of Cleveland, only one of them was classed as a farmer. A similar situation prevailed in Middle Forest: of 193 males, 79 were lead miners and 7 former miners. Many of the others were also involved in lead mining in some way.²¹ The Census Returns are listed in full in Appendix 2, and these show clearly the numbers of lead miners who also had farms. The exact relationship between mining and farming is difficult to ascertain. One must assume that the farms were looked after by the wives and children of the miners for most of the year when the main duties would be the tending and milking of the cattle. Presumably at certain periods of the year the miners would spend most of their time on the farms, for instance during haymaking, when the grass would have to be cut by hand, a process which must have involved the entire family, unless of course, outside labour was brought in. Lambing and calving must also have been a busy time for the farms. Otherwise, one must envisage the farms which were held by lead miners as being worked largely by their families, except when this was impossible. The fact that most of the lead miners in the Forest of Teesdale were their own masters implies that they could work in the mines when they wished, and that if their presence was required on their farms there was

nothing to stop them leaving their work. The possession of a small farm also ensured the miner some freedom from the periodic slumps in the lead market, since the sale of his stock must have provided him with some assured income, however small. It is interesting in this respect to note that lower down the Dale the London Lead Company often provided their miners with smallholdings, which fell into three categories: (1) a cottage with six acres of land and some rough pasture, (2) a cottage with one acre of land, cowbyres and a pig sty, and (3) a cottage with a garden plot of about one-sixth of an acre.²² This would seem to indicate that it was customary for the lead miner in the Upper Dale to have a farm, however small, on which he could keep a few beasts.

The fact that many of the miners had smallholdings must surely account for the extension in the amount of enclosed land in the Forest of Teesdale between 1769 and 1848 (Figure 20). Large tracts of land were enclosed on the edges of the fells (Chapter 4) and in view of the largely hostile environment in this area it must be assumed that much of this enclosure was carried out by "land hungry lead miners" in order to extend the size of their farms.²³

Many of the lead mines in the higher part of the Dale appear to have been worked by a few individuals who moved there only in the summer months:

"They stay up here for about five months in the year, dig out the lead ore, break it up with hammers...then wash it and then carry it a short way to where there is a track for donkeys or ponies to carry it on...They live near the High Force and during the summer months come up here every Monday returning home on the Saturday...At present the groovers (lead miners) engaged by the London Lead Company are getting forty shillings per month as subsist money, and settle it up once a year with the

lead owners, receiving so much per cent upon each bing of lead." (Cockshott)²⁴

The probable reason for this seasonal working was the harshness of the winter in the Upper Dale, especially in the higher parts, to which Cockshott was referring. At this time of year working the lead mines themselves must have been a difficult process, but even more difficult would have been the transport of the lead ore from the remote mines to the smelt mills.

The mid-19th century seems to have been the most important period of lead production in Upper Teesdale, judging not only from contemporary accounts, but also by the numbers of people employed in mining at this time, as revealed by the 1851 Census Returns and the population statistics for the whole of the 19th century. These indicate that in Middleton, Newbiggin and the Forest of Teesdale there was a steady rise in population towards the middle of the century, and then a decline towards the end of the century when lead mining is also known to have been in decline.²⁵ This is shown very clearly on Figure 4. The significance of the industry was summarized by Cockshott in 1848 who said that: "What alone renders Middleton and High Teesdale of importance to the country at large is the immense production of valuable minerals."²⁶

The Teesdale Account Books for 1848²⁷ give some indication of the amounts of Duty Ore which the Duke of Cleveland was receiving from the mines which he leased out in various parts of the Upper Dale:

Table 17

Duty Ore rendered in 1848

Township	Duty Rendered	Val. per bing	Total val.
Middleton	4,954½ bings	16/-	£396-8s
Newbiggin	63 bings	7/-	£247-7s
	142		

(continued)

Forest	108 bings	7/8d	£703 2s 6d
<u>also</u>			
High Skeers Mine	250 bings	16/-	£200

Assuming that Duty Ore still amounted to 1/5 of the total production, then the total production from the three townships must have been as follows: Middleton 24,772 $\frac{1}{2}$ bings (c.9,905 tons), Newbiggin 310 bings (c. 124 tons), and Forest 900 bings (c. 360 tons). Production from High Skeers mine must have amounted to some 1,250 bings (c. 500 tons). Assuming that all the Teesdale mines are accounted for in these totals, then the total production in 1848 must have been in the region of 27,182 bings, or some 10,872 tons. ²⁹

In 1856 the Duke of Cleveland still held most of the Teesdale lead mines, with Timothy Hutchinson holding the remainder. In the year ending October 1854 4,000 tons of lead were realised by the London Lead Company mines. It seems possible that at this time there was something of a decline in the industry, since Hutchinson was now taking a reduced render of 1/8 of the ore as Duty, in order to encourage productivity in his mines.³⁰ After about 1860 a decline set in in the mining industry both here and elsewhere, due partly to falling prices caused by the importing of cheap foreign ore, and partly to the working out of many veins, which prevented expansion of the mines to compete with the imported ore. By 1882 the London Lead Company had found it unprofitable to maintain any longer their mines in Alston Moor to the West of Teesdale, so they surrendered their leases there, and made Middleton their centre of operations, remaining there until the last Teesdale mines closed in the early 20th century. Francis Cockshott observed that: "They are here the ruling powers, and too much praise cannot be accorded to any such body of proprietors."³¹ This last reference was to the attention:

which the Company paid to the welfare of their workers, providing schools, libraries, medical attention, insurance schemes and so on.³³

By the end of the 19th century the decline in lead mining had resulted in greatly reduced production and mine closures: "The life and growth of the lead mining industry here has greatly fluctuated and at present can hardly be called flourishing, owing to the low state of the lead markets." (Whellan)³⁴ In 1891 3,423 tons of lead were produced, yielding 2,521 tons of lead when smelted and refined. 19,317 ounces of silver were also produced. This output came from eleven mines.³⁵ By 1905 only five mines were working, and the output was 335 tons.³⁶ Shortly after this all the mines were closed down.

The history of lead mining itself in the Upper Dale may thus be seen as a steady growth, perhaps initiated as early as Roman times, increasing in importance throughout the 17th and 18th centuries, and reaching a peak in the mid-19th century. There was then a very rapid decline due to falling world prices and decreasing productivity, with the result that by the early years of the 20th century all the lead mines were closed. The lead industry was obviously of great importance to the Upper Dale, and in times of rising prices must have brought great prosperity to the area. This is perhaps best seen in the population statistics for the Dale. Population rose during the 19th century, as lead mining reached its peak, and as soon as it began to decline the population declined also, reflecting the movement of people out of the Dale, and also perhaps the lessened ability of the inhabitants to maintain large families because of decreasing prosperity.

The physical effects of mining were widespread, in creating shafts, waste dumps, waggonways, reservoirs, flues and chimneys, open cast workings or 'hushes' such as Coldberry Gutter, the largest open cast lead working in the North of England. However, although fairly extensive, these relics of the lead industry do not form any really significant part of the landscape: most of the waste dumps have become completely grassed over, as have many of the hushes, reservoirs have become an almost natural-looking part of the landscape, while many of the ruined houses and 'shops' (miner's dosshouses) have almost completely disappeared. In many cases the only remaining evidence of former mining is on old maps, such as the first edition of the Ordnance Survey, which clearly reveal the degree to which industrial development took place in the Upper Dale.

The overall effect of lead mining on land use and enclosures has undoubtedly been very great, and it has already been suggested that, were it not for lead mining, especially in the 19th century, enclosed land would not extend nearly so high up the Dale. It seems probable that as early as the 17th century the miners combined their work in the mines with farming, especially in view of the fact that there was abundant land near the mines, or a little distance from them in the sheltered lands of the Dale. There would probably be a natural tendency for the miner/farmers to approximate their activities as far as possible by getting fields from the moors as near to the mines as was agriculturally feasible.³⁷ This, for instance, could explain the existence of a farm at Grass Hill as early as 1663.³⁸ It does appear very likely that if the Dale had not had such great mineral wealth, then farming would not have extended to such great heights, especially in view of the relatively harsh environment, notably in terms of climate (Chapter 1). The

possession of a smallholding would undoubtedly have helped the miner to overcome the difficulties caused by a slump in the market for lead, and was also of great use when lead finally declined, and the lead mines were forced to close. It is clear from the statistics shown in Figure 4 that the population of the Upper Dale as a whole was closely linked with the fortunes of lead mining in the 19th century, and that as soon as lead declined towards the end of the century, the population also declined. However, the decline would probably have been very much greater had many of the miners not had a smallholding to fall back upon, and on which their children could work if necessary. Quarrying has also become important, producing limestone for agriculture and for cement, and also whinstone (from the Whin Sill) for roads.³⁹ This development has also helped to maintain some of the population in the area. To conclude, therefore, it is probable that had lead mining not been so important in the Upper Dale from the 17th century to the 19th century, especially in the 19th century, then enclosed land would not extend so far up the Dale as it does today, and the entire historical geography of the area might be quite different.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, Geology of the Northern Pennine Orefield, (H.M.S.O., 1948) Volume I, Kingsley Dunham, p. 276 passim.
2. Hutchinson, W., History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham, (Carlisle, 1794), p. 277.
3. Raistrick, A. and B. Jennings, A History of Lead Mining in the Pennines (London: Longmans, 1965) p. 74.
4. Victoria County History, The County of Durham, (London, 1907), Vol III p. 351.
5. P.G. Mickleton and Spearman Mss., Volume 8, The Yearly value of lands in the County Palatine of Durham, 1670, ..Middleton in Teesdale Parish.
6. Ibid.

7. C.R.O., Strathmore Collection, Box 88, No. 130, A Complete Terrier of the Rectory of Middleton in Teesdale in the Bishopric of Durham, 1663. (Copy).
8. S.E.O., (Large Store: Drawer 7) A Map of the Forest of Teesdale and the lead mines therein belonging to the Right Honourable the Lord Barnard, 1732. William Jones.
9. S.E.O., (Large Store: Drawer 7). Accounts from Lady Day 1739 to Lady Day 1740, of Lord Barnard's lead mines etc.
10. Ibid.
11. Raistrick and Jennings, op. cit., p. 152.
12. Surtees, H.C., History of the Parish of Middleton in Teesdale, (Newcastle on Tyne: Patrick and Page, 1924) p.
13. M.E.O., (Small map store) Greenwell, John, A Plan of the Manor of Middleton in the County of Durham...belonging to the Rt. Hon. Henry, Earl of Darlington, 1769.
14. Hutchinson, op. cit., p. 281.
15. Grainger, J., A General View of the Agriculture of the County of Durham, (London, 1794), p. 20.
16. Raistrick, A.E., "Lead Smelting in the North Pennines during the 17th and 18th centuries." (Proc. Durham Phil. Soc. Vol IX) p. 164.
17. Whellan, W., History, Topography and Directory of the County of the County Palatine of Durham, (London, 1856, First Edition) p. 456.
18. Bailey, J., A General View of the Agriculture of the County of Durham, (London: Phillips, 1810), p. 38-41.
19. S.E.O., (Small box store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate), Grant Book of Mines held under the Marquess of Cleveland in the Manor of Middleton, 1833-1845.
20. M.E.O., (Bookshelves of small map store), Field Book of the Township of Harwood, 1847-1857, Field Book of the Township of Forest and Frith, Field Book of the Township of Etersgill, 1847-1864.
21. Ibid.
21. (A mistake in numbering the footnotes), C.R.O., 1851 Census Returns.
22. Smailes, A.E., The Lead Dales of the Northern Pennines, Geography, June 1936, pp.120-129.
23. Hodgson, R.l., The Progress of Enclosure in County Durham, (A discussion paper read to the symposium of the Agricultural Landscape Research Group of the I.B.G. April-May 1970).

24. C.R.O., Cockshott, Francis, A Journey on Foot through Teesdale, 1848. (Manuscript).
25. Whellan, op. cit (2nd.Edition, 1894), p. 571.
26. C.R.O., Cockshott, op. cit.
27. S.E.O., (Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate), Cash Account for the Teesdale Estate, Lady Day 1847-Lady Day 1848.
28. Ibid.
29. Ibid.
30. Whellan, op. cit (2nd.Ed.), p.571
31. C.R.O., Cockshott, op. cit.
33. Ibid.
34. Whellan, op. cit.p. 571
35. Ibid.
36. Victoria County History of Durham, op. cit., p. 352.
37. Smailes, op. cit.
38. C.R.O., Terrier, op. cit.
39. Raistrick, A., The Pennine Dales,(London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1968), p. 139

CHAPTER 9

CONCLUSIONS

The historical geography of Upper Teesdale since 1600 has clearly been extremely complex, very much more so than might appear from a first visit to the area or a brief glance at any of the relevant maps. There have been complex changes in enclosure patterns, land use, land ownership, settlement and so on, as described in the various chapters on these topics. Perhaps one of the most important facts to emerge is that, as in other parts of County Durham, there was an 'intimate and complex relationship between agriculture, industry and population growth'.¹ Lead mining and farming were closely related throughout the period covered by this thesis, especially in the 19th century, and population was closely related to the fortunes of lead mining. It is significant that since lead mining ceased in the Upper Dale, the population has declined,² the position of the head dyke has retreated down dale as former improved fields reverted to rough grazing,³ and the number of farm units has fallen, clearly seen by the number of empty farmhouses throughout the Dale.⁴ The closure of the lead mines has had a fundamental effect upon the geography of the Dale, just as the great boom in lead mining in the 19th century had an equally fundamental and opposite effect.

Summary

It is perhaps best to summarise the findings on the historical geography of Upper Teesdale by listing the main topics under study and outlining the major results of work on each, which should be of interest both to the botanists working in the area and to the historical geographer.

Firstly, the settlement and farms of the Upper Dale: the broad outlines of settlement and its development since 1612 have been established. Maps of settlement patterns exist back to 1769, although these are not always complete, while various documents from the 17th century indicate a few of the farms which existed at this time. In addition to this, some tentative conclusions are drawn about the form and origin of Middleton in Teesdale, the main village of the Dale. Information about the nature of the farm unit goes back to 1612 and the Jacobean Survey⁵ although the first map of the farms dates from 1769⁶. The increase in the number of farm units can be clearly traced from 1758 onwards, although less is known about the mechanism by which farms divided and amalgamated. The Jacobean Survey provides a great deal of important and interesting information on the types of land holding in the Dale in 1612, especially in the Forest of Teesdale. It is also possible to draw some conclusions about the actual form of houses and farms in the area between 1600 and 1900, although there is not much information specifically on this subject.

Secondly, enclosure patterns: the Jacobean Survey once more provides much useful information on enclosures in 1612, showing up the distinct contrast between enclosures around Middleton and Newbiggin, and the Forest of Teesdale. The first map of enclosures was made in 1769⁷, and a subsequent map of 1847⁸ enables us to see how much intaking went on between these two dates, as well as the considerable changes in enclosure patterns between the two dates. It thus proves possible to assess the length of time land has been improved, especially since 1769, and, to a lesser extent, since 1612 and before. Detailed work on Ettersgill reveals a complex of mediaeval enclosure banks, and clear signs of advance and retreat

of the head dyke.

Thirdly, land use: a great deal of information on land use in the 17th century is available from the Jacobean Survey and Probate Inventories⁹, revealing the fact that there was a definite change-over from subsistence arable farming to stock farming in the 17th century, and an increase in the numbers of stock kept on the various farms in the Dale. The details from these two sources clearly reveal that the complex inter-relationship between field and fell was already well developed. Detailed land use maps are available for the mid-19th century, but the usefulness of these is limited by the absence of much information about the numbers and types of beasts which were kept. The history of the commons can be traced in outline, including their gradual reduction in area and the imposition of stinting, as well as their use for other purposes such as hunting and shooting. However, the information on land use is not really substantial enough at present to talk in terms of management practice. More detailed studies of various farms at certain points in time reveal significant differences between units basically practicing the same type of land use, but a great deal more source material is needed to expand this subject, especially for the 18th and 19th centuries.

Lastly, lead mining: the outline history of lead mining in Upper Teesdale is fairly well documented, and this study has been more concerned with the relationship between lead mining and the other factors already examined: settlement, enclosure patterns and land use. It seems fairly clear that the increase in mining has affected all three substantially, contributing to the increase in the numbers of houses and farms, the subdivision of farm units, the

extension of the head dyke to considerable heights up the Dale, and the improvement of much land which otherwise might have lain waste. The decline in mining in the late 19th century has resulted in the reversal of all these trends, and clearly reveals the importance of mining in the historical geography of the area. The complex relationship between mining and farming as noted in this study is also of great interest.

Further Research

This thesis claims to be nothing but an outline study, and it poses as many questions as it answers. It should be useful in encouraging further research into more detailed aspects of the subject, and also in encouraging an active search for additional documentary evidence. It is perhaps of use to list here under the four main topics mentioned in the previous section, some of the lines of further research which might be undertaken.

Settlement and the farms: a detailed chronology of farm appearance between 1600 and 1900, and the relationship of farms to each other, in terms of inheritance, division and amalgamation of units and so on. The development of Middleton in Teesdale would also repay investigation. The different types of land holding in the 17th century are of interest, especially the three 'sub-manors' in the Forest of Teesdale.

Enclosure patterns: the chronology of enclosure of the open fields in Middleton and Newbiggin, and the relationship of this to land use changes. The chronology of intaking between 1612 and 1769. Fluctuations in the head dyke are worthy of much more detailed study, as are the complex of enclosure banks in Ettersgill.

In addition to these topics there is the important problem of the change in enclosure patterns between 1803 and 1847.

Land Use: the critical 17th century changes need examining further, since, as already noted, they must reflect the end of subsistence farming and the production of grass in a suitable environment, implying the integration of upland and lowland in a modern sense, the uplands supplying store beasts for the lowlands. Further detailed analysis and mapping of the data provided by the Probate Inventories would be invaluable. A great deal more information is needed on the 18th century land use in general, and also on management practices throughout the period, since information on this subject is very thin at present. Work could also be done on the history of the commons, especially on stinting, and the numbers of beasts on the various commons at different times.

Lastly, lead mining: it has been noted that lead mining must have affected each of the three topics already mentioned, but a great deal more work could be done on these relationships. The relationship between lead mining and population is most important as it in turn affects the increase in settlement and farm numbers. However, perhaps the most important is the relationship between lead mining and farming, which would undoubtedly repay a great deal of research, since this has undoubtedly affected management practices, land use and the extension of the head dyke to considerable heights.

These are only a few of the possible topics for further research in Upper Teesdale, but they are perhaps some of the most important, and it is quite possible that many would help to throw more light upon the botanical history of the area, in showing how

man has affected the environment and the vegetation. This study only provides a framework within^{which} questions can be answered and posed, and it is hoped that it will stimulate a more active search for additional documentary evidence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Hodgson, R., First Threat to the Environment, Geographical Magazine, Vol XLIII No4, (1971) pp. 279-288.
2. Whellan, W., History, Topography and Directory of the County Palatine of Durham, (London, 1856; 2nd Edition 1894), p.571.
3. Compare the mid 19th century maps of the Forest of Teesdale (Middleton in Teesdale Estate Office) with the current Ordnance Survey 6" maps.
4. Crudass, J.M., Personal Observations.
5. P.R.O., Survey of the Manors of Raby, Brancepeth and Barnard Castle, 1612, (On microfilm).
6. M.E.O., Greenwell, John, A Plan of the Manor of Middleton in the County of Durham...belonging to the Rt. Hon. Henry Earl of Darlington, 1769. (Small map store).
7. Ibid.
8. M.E.O., (Cupboard at rear of office) Map of the Township of Harwood, Map of the Township of Forest and Frith, Map of the Township of Ettersgill.
9. Pal & Dip., Various Probate Inventories, of Middleton and the Forest of Teesdale, 1600-1700.

APPENDICES

Number

1	THE JACOBAN SURVEY	157
2	THE 1851 CENSUS RETURNS	160
3	THE FARMS:	
	1) Rental of the Lordships of Barnard Castle and Raby ... 1641	165
	2) Yearly value of lands in Middleton in Teesdale Parish ... 1670	167
	3) Rent Book of the Earl of Darlington's Highland Estate, 1757-58	169
	4) Valuation of the Manor of Middleton...1803 . . .	172
	5) Rent Abstracts, 1860-94.	176
	6) Lease of Rumney Farm, 1875.	177
4	THE PROBATE INVENTORIES.	180
5	THE COMMONS:	
	1) Stinting arrangements in 1803.	185
	2) Stinting arrangements in 1816.	189
	3) Stinting arrangements in 1847.	192
	4) Keepers and shepherds monthly account, July- August, 1897	195
	5) Rules for stinting, 1956	196
6	LEAD:	
	1) Lord Barnard's Leadmill Account, 1739-40 . . .	197
	2) Grant Book of Mines under the Duke of Cleveland, 1833 - 45	198
	3) Regulations for the payment of Duty Ore, 1853 .	200

SOURCES

1. The Jacobean Survey: Survey of the Manors of Raby, Brancepeth and Barnard Castle, 1612, (on microfilm). P.R.O.
2. The 1851 Census Returns: 1851 Census Returns (on microfilm). C.R.O.
3. The Farms:
 - 1) Rental of the Lordships of Barnard Castle and Raby... belonging to the Rt. Hon. Henry Vane, 5th March 1641. P.G. Mickleton & Spearman Mss, Volume 6.
 - 2) The yearly value of all the lands in the County Palatine of Durham, 1670...Middleton in Teesdale Parish. P.G. Mickleton & Spearman Mss, Volume 8.
 - 3) Rent Book of the Rt. Hon the Earl of Darlington Highland Estate from LD 1757 to LD 1758. S.E.O. Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate.
 - 4) Particular and Valuation of the Manor of Middleton... 1803. S.E.O., Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate.
 - 5) Rent Abstracts for Teesdale Estate, 1860-94. S.E.O., Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate.
 - 6) Lease of Rumney Farm, 1875. S.E.O., Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate.
4. Probate Inventories: Various Wills and Inventories for Middleton, Newbiggin and Forest in Teesdale, 1600-1700. Pal & Dip.
5. The Commons:
 - 1) Particular and Valuation of the Manor of Middleton... 1803. S.E.O., Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate.
 - 2) Middleton In Teesdale Enclosure Award. C.R.O.
 - 3) Field Books of the Townships of Harwood, Forest and Frith, Ettersgill, and Newbiggin, 1847-64. M.E.O. Bookshelves of small map store.
 - 4) Keepers and shepherds monthly account, 1897. S.E.O., Box Store, Large Box, Teesdale Estate.
 - 5) Rules for stinting, 1956. Raby Estate.
6. Lead:
 - 1) Lord Barnard's Leadmill Account, LD 1739-1740. S.E.O., Large Store, Drawer 7.
 - 2) Grant Book of Mines held under the Duke of Cleveland, 1833-45. S.E.O., Small Box Store, Large Box: Teesdale Estate.
 - 3) Regulations for the payment of Duty Ore, 1853. S.E.O., Box Store, Large Box, Teesdale Estate.

* LD: Lady Day

APPENDIX 1
The Jacobean Survey, 1612

Name	H C B O ⁺	G B	Newbiggin Field		Bowleys Field		Scalbank Field		Scarlett Field		East Field		Middle Side		Parcels		Enclosed Parcels		Closes		Other details		
			A	M	A	M	A	M	A	M	A	M	M	P	M	P	M	P	M	P			
John Allinson	1 - 1 S	- 0 1	5	0 10 0																	Common on the fells. LP.		
Robert Allinson	1 - 1 -	- -	6	0 7 0																	Common. LP.		
Edmond Race	1 - 1 -	- *			1	1 3 0															Common. LP.		
Chris. Bainbrigge	1 - 1 -	- -					4	0 11 0													Common. LP. Held tenement 'Scalba		
Henry Rowthwaite	- - 1 -	- -	-	2 0																	LP.		
Cuthbert Race	1 - - -	- -																	5	1 -			
John Parkinson	1 - 1 -	0 1 -	4	0 10 0																1	2 -	Common. LP. 2a. arable in a close.	
Laurence Race	1 - 1 -	* -	2	1 6 0																	Common. LP.		
John Allinson	1 - 1 S	- -	0	1½ 8 0																	2	2 -	Common. LP.
Guy Bainbridge	1 - - -	- -	-	1 2 8 0																	1	2 -	Common. LP.
Cuthbert Allinson	1 - 1 -	- -	2	0 - -																	8	0 -	Common. LP.
Jacob Peake	1 - 1 -	- -	1	2 - -													1	0 -			2	2 -	Common. LP. Enclosed parcel in Newbiggin Field
Anthony Garstail	1 - 1 -	2 0 -	1	2 10 0											1	1 -						Common. LP.	
John Allinson	1 - 1 -	2 0 -	5	0 10 0					10	0												Common. LP.	
Leonard Gibson	1 - 1 S	0 1½ -			4	2 8 0																Common. LP.	
John Bainbrigge	1 - 1 S	- -			2	2 3 2																Common.	
John Bainbrigge	1 - 1 S	0 1 -					3	2 6 0														Common. LP.	
Cuthbert Allinson	1 - - -	- -	2	2 6 0																		Common. LP.	
Robert Allinson	1 - 1 S	- -	2	2 7 0																		Common. LP.	
George Bainbrigge	1 - 1 S	* -					2	0 6 0														Common. LP.	
John Newbie	- - 1 -	- -	-	3 0																		Common. LP.	
John Londesdale	1 - 1 -	2 0 -	5	0 8 0																		Common. LP.	
Thos. Bainbrigge	1 - 1 -	2 0 -	1	0 10 0																	2	0 -	Common on the moors. LP. Close in Newbiggin Field
Roger Bainbrigge	1 - 1 -	0 1½ -	6	0 20 0																		Common on the moors. LP.	
Jacob Allenson	- - - -	- -	-	5 0																		Common on the moors. LP.	
John Wilson	1 - 1 -	0 1½ -	1	0 3 0											4	2 -						Common on the moors. LP.	

+ For abbreviations see page 159

			Newbiggin Field	Bowleys Field	Scalbank Field	Scarlett Field	East Field	Middle Side	Parcels	Enclosed Parcels	Closes	Other Details	
Name	H C B O	G B	A M	A M	A M	A M	A M	A M	M P	M P	M P		
Thomas Hobson	1 1 - -	2 0 -											Cottage & house in Middleton called 'the Smithie'. LP.
George Bainbrigge	1 - 1 -	* -	4 0 7 0										Common on the moors. LP. Tenement in Middleton.
William Raine	1 - 1 -	* -	0 2 3 2										Common on the moors. Tenement in Middleton.
Roger Bainbrigge	1 - 1 SB	- -									8 0 -		Both of Brigge House. LP.
Thomas Bainbrigge											14 0 -		
Richard Johnson	1 - - -	8 0 -	- 1 0										Common on the moors. Tenement in Middleton.
Peter Bainbrigge	- - - -	- -											
Jane Sowerby	1 - 1 -	- -									6 0 -		Common on the moors. Tenement in Middleton. LP.
Cuthbert Nattriss	1 - 1 SB	0 2 -								25 0 -	0 2 -		Common. The parcel of land was in two closes. LP.
Thomas Bainbrigge	1 - 1 SBC	- -					- 0 2		30 0 - 16 0 - 1 0 - 9 0 - 3 0 - 1 2 - 2 0 - 1 2 -				Unstinted common on the fells. LP. Held a 'capital messuage called 'Powell' in the demaines of Newbiggin'. Also 'a parcel in Middleton called the Parke and Lickworth' and 'a parcel of waste called the Powes'. Held a 5 acre parcel of arable land.
Radulph Nattriss	1 - 1 -	1 0 -						- 5 0	1 0 -				Common. LP.
Roger Bainbrigge	2 - 3 2S B C	2 -									40 0 - 5 0 - 25 0 - 15 0 -		Common. LP. One granary called 'the kilne'. One water grain mill. One house and garth in Middleton, and belonging to this capital messuage, 3 closes of meadow, and another called the Parke, containing 26 acres. Friar House
Thomas Bainbrigge	14 - 1 S B C								400 0 35 0				Common in the bounds of Newbiggin. LP. One garden, belonging to the house, Brigge House, in the eastern part of the Forest of Teesdale.
Guy Bainbrigge	17 - 6 2S 2B C								619 0 74 0				Common in the Forest. LP. One garden, belonging to the house, Hendfelloe House, in the Middle part of the Forest of Teesdale.
Thomas Bainbrigge	18 - 3 3S 2B C								502 0 6 0		40 0 6 0		Common. LP. One granary, called the kilne. The house called Vallance Lodge, in the south part of the Forest of Teesdale.

NOTES

The preceding tables are based upon the 1612 Jacobean Survey. Limitations upon time and space have meant that not every detail noted in the survey could be included here, and only what was considered to be of direct relevance to this study has been included, the main information being, of course, on land use. The amount of land which each man held is noted, whether it was in the open fields, or in closes and so on. Other relevant information has been included in the column entitled 'Other Details', such as rights of common, certain details on the location of land etc. Amounts of land are given, as in the original, in acres and roods, i.e. an entry of 5 1 means five acres and one rood.

Abbreviations.

- H = House
- C = Cottage
- B = Barn
- O = Other - S = Stable B = Ox-stall (Bovil) C = Dovecote.
- G = Garth
- B = Backside (the difference between these two is not explained)
- * = the amount of land not specified.
- A = Arable
- M = Meadow
- LP = Land held by Letters Patent

APPENDIX 2

The 1851 Census Returns

1) Ettersgill

Name of house	Head of family	Occupation	Other males	Occupations (where applicable)	Females	Occupations (where applicable)	Acreage of farm (where applicable)
Baptist Chapel House	Geo. Tallentine	Lead miner	1	Tailor (lodger in house)	1	-	-
High Force Inn	Thomas Scott	Innkeeper	2	1 scholar	3	1 servant, 1 scholar	44 0 14
Brigg House	John Swinbank	Farmer of 200 acres	3	-	3	-	105 2 33
Durpit	John Thompson	Lead miner	1	1 scholar	2	-	19 2 19
Durpit	Henry Bainbridge	Former lead miner	3	1 lead miner, 1 scholar, 1 blacksmith	2	-	22 0 26
Durpit	William Toward	Stone mason	3	1 mason's apprentice	5	3 scholars	4 2 26
Durpit	William Lowes	Labourer on highway	1	-	1	-	-
Durpit	John Bainbridge	Lead miner	1	-	1	-	32 3 11
Ash Dub	John Bainbridge	Former lead miner	2	2 lead miners	4	-	38 2 21
Birch Tree	John Parmely	Former lead miner	2	2 wallers	1	1 servant	28 3 29
Birch Rigg	Joseph Nixon	Lead miner	2	1 lead miner	6	1 scholar	16 2 10
Birch Bush	William Bell	Lead miner	-	-	6	1 servant	28 3 17
Outberry Bat	William Anderson	Lead miner	4	4 lead miners	6	1 scholar	-
Outberry Bat	John Garget	Lead miner	3	2 lead miners	3	2 scholars	31 0 5
Bank Top	William Brumwell	Lead miner	6	3 lead miners, 2 scholars	5	1 dress maker	22 0 18
Bank Top	Elizabeth Brumwell	Widow	1	1 lead miner-grocer	2	-	-
Bank Top	Sarah Anderson	Widow	4	3 lead miners	2	1 servant	37 3 25
Bank Top	Jane Beadle	Widow	7	4 lead miners, 1 scholar	3	-	21 2 37
Bank Top	Elizabeth Tarn	Widow of lead miner	6	3 lead miners, 1 former minef, 2 scholars	1	-	34 0 19
Low Beck Head	John Hutchinson	Former lead miner	1	1 lead miner	3	1 servant	21 0 5
Low Beck Head	Hannah Bell	Widow of lead miner	1	1 lead miner	1	1 servant	15 0 30
Low Beck Head	John Hutchinson	Lead miner	1	-	3	-	-
Low Beck Head	Thomas Brumwell	Lead miner	3	3 lead miners	1	-	-
Low Beck Head	William Tarn	Lead miner	2	1 lead miner, 1 labourer	1	-	14 2 36
Low Beck Head	John Beadle	Lead miner	3	-	2	-	-
Low Beck Head	Margaret Anderson	Widow of lead miner	2	2 lead miners,	2	-	9 0 5
Low Beck Head	Matthew Anderson	Lead miner	5	3 lead miners, 2 scholars	1	-	3 7 37
High Beck Head	Mary Hutchinson	Pasture farmer	3	2 lead miners	2	-	223 2 10
Woolpitts Hill	Tim Tarn	Former lead miner	3	3 lead miners	3	-	100 0 31
Walker Hill	Jane Scott	Widow	1	-	2	2 scholars	-
Walker Hill	Frances Scott	Widow of lead miner	5	3 lead miners	4	2 scholars	65 2 16

2) Middle Forest

Name of house	Head of family	Occupation	Other males	Occupations (where applicable)	Females	Occupations (where applicable)	Acreage of farm (where applicable)
Forcegarth	Ann Robinson	Widow	5	3 lead miners, 1 former miner	2	1 scholar	324 0 33
Forcegarth West House	Robert Rutter	Gamekeeper	2	1 scholar	2	-	12 1 24
Forcegarth End	Elizabeth Walton	Widow of lead miner	1	1 slate pencil worker	-	-	18 3 37
Hill End	Henry Robinson	Worker at lead mine	2	2 washers at lead mines	3	-	25 2 23
Watgarth	Thomas Allinson	Lead miner	5	3 lead miners, 1 former miner	3	-	79 2 19
Moss	Henry Bainbrig	Lead miner	6	4 lead miners	3	-	17 1 17
English Hill	Ann Tallentine	Widow of lead miner	2	1 lead miner	3	1 scholar	42 2 26
Knot Hill	Nancy Walton	Widow of lead miner	5	3 lead miners, 1 shepherd	4	-	21 3 5
Knot Hill	Isaac Walton	Lead miner	2	1 lead miner	1	-	25 0 7
New House	John Walton	Lead miner	3	2 lead miners	4	1 dress maker	19 1 33
New House	Matthew Walton	Lead miner	1	-	2	-	-
Parsonage	John Lowe	Parson	1	-	4	2 scholars	8 3 27
Parsonage	John Bainbridge	Lead miner	1	-	2	-	-
Railton Hall	Mary Scott	Widow of lead miner	1	-	1	-	19 2 20
Hunt Hall	Thomas Bell	Lead miner	4	1 lead miner	3	1 scholar	51 0 11
Hunt Hall	John Bell	Mason	4	1 lead miner	3	-	-
Sarehill	John Teward	Lead miner	4	3 lead miners	5	-	65 1 14
Whey Syke	Jacob Scott	Lead miner	-	-	1	-	98 1 32
Whey Syke	Margaret Scott	Widow of lead miner	4	3 lead miners, 1 labourer	1	-	-
Widdy Bank	George Gibson	Farmer	4	2 lead miners, 1 labourer	4	-	1546 1 15
Sevy Hill	Jane Redfearn	Widow of lead miner	2	1 labourer	1	-	60 3 23
Intack	Isaac Tarn	Mason	5	1 lead miner, 1 mason	5	-	24 1 9
Langdon Beck Foot	William Scott	Lead miner	1	-	2	-	17 0 7
Langdon Beck	Edward Garget	Lead miner	4	3 lead miners	2	-	11 3 28
Langdon Beck	Sarah Tallentine	Widow of lead miner	1	1 lead miner	-	-	26 3 38
Langdon Beck	Jonathan Barker	Inn Keeper	5	1 cart driver, 1 labourer	7	-	12 2 12
Old Folds	Joseph Bainbridge	Lead miner	7	4 lead miners	5	-	22 3 29
Valence Lodge	Peter Garget	Lead miner	3	-	5	-	-
Valence Lodge	Emerson Currah	Hind	3	2 scholars, 1 ironstone worker	3	-	4158 2 3
Kirkhouse Folds	Thomas Tarn	Former lead miner	3	1 lead miner	5	-	59 3 24
Under Hurth	John Staley	Lead miner	-	-	1	-	21 1 36
Under Hurth	Mary Walton	Widow of lead miner	1	1 lead miner	2	-	18 3 38
Under Hurth	John Collinson	Former lead miner	7	4 lead miners, 1 apprentice shoe maker	4	-	29 1 20
Hagg Pot	Thomas Beadle	Former lead miner	2	2 lead miners	3	-	46 0 31

Name of house	Head of family	Occupation	Other males	Occupations (where applicable)	Females	Occupations (where applicable)	Acreage of farm
Moor Riggs	Mary Walton	Widow of lead miner	1	1 lead miner	-	-	8 3 30
Moor Riggs	Jane Horn	Widow of lead miner	5	1 lead miner	4	-	25 0 26
Moor Riggs	Jane Lee	Widow	1	-	1	-	-
Moor Riggs	Thomas Bell	Lead miner	1	-	4	-	7 1 2
Moor Riggs	Levi Tarn	Slate-pencil worker	1	-	1	-	-
Thompson House	William Beadle	Lead miner	1	1 lead miner	5	-	-
Moor Riggs	Hannah Redfearn	Widow	4	3 lead miners	2	-	16 2 23
Cocklake	Thomas Walton	Lead miner	1	-	2	-	19 0 1
Cocklake	Margaret Walton	Widow of lead miner	2	2 lead miners	2	-	-
Dale	Charles Dowson	Game watcher	5	2 lead miners	3	-	7 0 0
Dale	Robert Allinson	Lead miner	1	-	3	-	15 1 28
Dale	Peter Lee	Former lead miner	2	1 lead miner, 1 labourer	1	-	-
Dale	William Tallentine	Lead miner	-	-	2	-	-
Bail Hill	Mary Tallentine	Widow	5	3 lead miners	1	-	10 2 39
Hangingshaws	William Tallentine	Lead miner	3	3 lead miners	5	-	2 3 1
Hangingshaws	Jos. Ireland	Former lead miner	4	2 lead miners, 1 blacksmith	7	-	57 3 9
Hangingshaws	Jacob Tallentine	Lead miner	4	1 lead miner	2	-	20 1 35
Under Hurth	Ralph Hutchinson	Lead miner	1	-	1	-	-
Under Hurth	Frances Walton	-	1	1 labourer	-	-	-
Lane Side	Thomas Allinson	Lead miner	3	1 lead miner	1	-	10 3 17
Gillet	Thomas Allinson	Waller	1	1 labourer	1	1 scholar	11 0 31
Banks	William Dowson	Lead miner	-	-	1	-	-
Banks	William Allinson	Grocer	3	-	6	-	5 2 37

3) Harwood

Name of house	Head of family	Occupation	Other males	Occupations (where applicable)	Females	Occupations (where applicable)	Acreage of farm (where applicable)
Grass Hill	John Anderson	Lead miner	5	3 lead miners, 2 scholar	3	1 servant	54 1 5
Grass Hill	John Anderson Jnr.	Lead miner	4	2 lead miners, 1 scholar	3	-	-
Manor Gill	John Rumney	Lead miner	-	-	2	-	22 2 10
Manor Gill	John Rumney	Lead miner	2	1 lead miner	6	-	17 0 39
Manor Gill	John Rumney	Lead miner	3	1 lead miner	4	1 servant	-
Ashgill Head	George Watson	Lead miner	6	4 lead miners, 2 scholars	5	-	35 3 38
Seldom Seen	Joseph Race	Lead miner	3	2 lead miners, 1 scholar	-	-	13 2 8
Mount Pleasant	John Emerson	Lead miner	3	-	1	-	13 1 8
Mount Pleasant	John Emerson	Lead miner	2	2 lead miners	3	-	-
Dale Head	William Bayles	Sheep farmer	1	-	5	-	164 1 18
Dale Head	William Tallentine	Lead miner	-	-	1	-	-
Frog Hall	Elizabeth Rumney	Widow	4	1 lead miner	2	-	-
Frog Hall	Joseph Horn	Lead miner	2	-	4	2 scholars	-
Frog Hall	George Horn	Lead miner	1	-	4	1 servant	31 2 34
Herdship	John Walton	Lead miner	1	-	1	1 servant	-
Herdship	John Walton	Lead miner	1	-	1	-	-
Herdship	Thomas Walton	Lead miner	-	-	2	-	41 0 39
Herdship	Thomas Walton	Lead miner	-	-	2	-	15 3 5
Water Meetings	Ann Vipond	Widow of lead miner	3	1 lead miner, 2 scholars	1	-	-
Water Meetings	William Hunt	Lead miner	2	-	2	-	43 1 20
Clover Yard	John Hunt	Lead miner	1	1 lead miner	1	-	32 3 12
Clover Yard	John Watson	Lead miner	3	1 lead miner, 2 scholars	2	1 scholar	-
Willy Hall	John Tallentine	Former lead miner	1	1 lead miner	3	-	39 1 37
Stoney Hill	John Watson	Lead miner	2	-	2	1 servant	-
Stoney Coom	Thomas Heward	Former lead miner	2	2 lead miners	-	-	97 1 10
Stoney Coom	David Dowson	Lead miner	2	1 scholar	3	1 scholar	-
Stoney Coom	Frances Heward	Widow of lead miner	3	-	2	-	10 1 12
Midge Holm	John Watson	Lead miner	3	1 lead miner	5	-	92 0 2
Rowantree Foot	Joseph Cousin	Lead miner	2	1 lead miner, 1 mason	4	-	108 3 15
Rowantree Foot	George Dowson	Lead miner	1	1 lead miner	1	1 scholar	35 1 8
Marsh Gill	Elizabeth Dixon	Widow	2	2 lead miners	1	1 scholar	21 1 14
Marsh Gill	Jeremiah Dowson	Lead miner	2	1 lead miner	4	2 servants	24 2 20
Marsh Gill	William Toward	Lead miner	-	-	2	-	22 1 19
Marsh Gill	Jonothan Raisbeck	Lead miner	3	2 lead miners	2	1 scholar	31 2 9

Name of house	Head of family	Occupation	Other males	Occupations (where applicable)	Females	Occupations (where applicable)	Acreage of farm
Lane Side	Matthew Dowson	Lead miner	1	1 scholar	-	-	47 2 25
Force Foot	Thomas James	Lead smelter	3	2 lead smelters	3	-	37 3 4
The Row	Jeremiah Hutchinson	Lead smelter	5	3 lead miners	3	-	15 1 0
Pleasant Hill	William Anderson	Lead miner	1	1 lead miners	3	1 scholar, 1 servant	18 0 37
Pleasant Hill	Josiah Robinson	Lead miner	3	-	1	-	
Hill Top	Jacob Heward	Iron miner	1	Gamekeeper	3	-	
Hill Top	John Currah	Gamekeeper	2	2 lead miners	2	1 scholar	33 2 22
Rough Rigg Foot	John Dowson	Lead miner	3	2 lead miners	2	1 scholar	21 3 3
Rough Rigg Head	Matthew Cousin	Lead miner	5	2 lead miners	3	-	
Rigg Side	Benjamin Jones	Schoolmaster	-	-	-	-	-
Rigg Side	George Heward	Lead miner	3	3 lead miners	2	-	43 2 1
Rigg Side	Ann Watson	Widow of lead miner	1	1 lead miner	3	-	52 3 22
Stoney Hill	John Dowson	Lead miner	2	1 scholar	2	-	41 2 15
Binks	Thomas Dowson	Lead miner	3	2 lead miners	4	-	16 1 0
Unthank	Rachel Robinson	Widow of lead miner	3	1 lead miner	3	-	28 3 2
Unthank	Isaac Dowson	Former lead miner	-	-	1	-	28 1 35
Peghorn	Jacob Tallentine	Lead miner	6	3 lead miners	3	1 scholar	65 1 34
Green Hills	Ann Dowson	Widow	2	2 lead miners	1	1 scholar	-
Green Hills	Thomas Cousin	Lead miner	1	-	4	-	36 0 4
Redwing	William Robinson	Lead miner	-	-	1	-	-
Redwing	George Garget	Lead miner	1	1 lead miner	5	2 scholars	18 1 13
East House	Tim. Collinson	Lead miner	3	-	4	-	22 1 28
Bowes Close	Josiah Dowson	Lead miner	4	4 lead miners	3	-	-
Bowes Close	William Toward	Former lead miner	1	1 lead miner	1	-	30 2 35
Bowes Close	Elizabeth Cousin	Widow	1	-	-	-	-
Bowes Close	Ann Cousin	-	2	-	2	-	18 0 5
West House	George Toward	Former lead miner	1	1 lead miner	3	-	38 8 7

APPENDIX 3

Part 1.

A rentall of the Lordships of Barnard Castle and Raby and of all other lands and tenements within the same Lordships belonging to the Rt Hon Henry Vane the controller of his majesties household, wherein is put downe as well the auncient yearly rent payable to his majestie as also all increase rents and rents by demesne payable to the said Mr Henry Vane by the severall tenants as hereafter may particularly appear in this book. 5th March 1641

Middleton and Newbiggin. Ann rent £41 - 8 - 8d

	ann rent	increase rent
Christopher Parkin	0- 6 - 9	
Rebecca Wright	0-15- 2	3- 6- 9
John Wilson	0- 9- 6	
Peter Bainbrigg	0- 4- 0	
John Gibson	0- 1- 0	
Idem	0- 2- 0	
[?] Johnson	0- 2- 6	0- 2- 6
Raife Johnson	0- 2- 6	0- 2- 6
Will'm Raine	0- 4- 0	
Christofer Bainbrigg	0- 8- 0	
George Sobell	0- 8- 4	0- 8- 4
Thomas Allanson	0- 0- 6	
Henry Bainbrigg	0- 0- 4	
Cuthbert Bainbrigg	1- 0- 0	1- 0- 0
Gid. Bainbrigg & John Bainbrigg	0-11- 6	0-11- 6
Cuthbert Race	0- 5- 0	
John Gibson	0-10- 0	
Anthony Bainbrigg	0-13- 4	
William Bainbrigg	0- 6- 8	
William Bainbrigg	0- 5- 0	0- 5- 0
Cuthbert Race	0- 5- 0	0- 5- 0
Arthur Bainbrigg	0- 8- 0	
Roger Bainbrigg	0- 8- 0	
Edward Romthaitte	0- 2- 0	0- 6- 8
John Parkinson & John Natriss	0-13- 0	

	ann rent	increase rent
Christofer Allanson	0-13- 0	
William Raine	0-13- 0	
John Allanson of East		
End	0- 8- 0	0-12- 0
John Newby	0- 3- 0	0- 3- 0
Anthony Gastell	0-13- 0	
John Allanson	0-13- 0	
Roger Allanson	0-13- 6	0-10- 0
George Allanson senior	0- 4- 0	
George Allanson junior	0- 4- 0	
Cuthbert Allanson	0- 6- 0	
Anthony Teasdall	0- 5- 0	
Raife Peacke & Peter		
Bainbrigg	0- 4- 0	
George Bainbrigg	7-14- 0	2- 6- 0
Arthur Bainbrigg	7-14- 0	6- 0- 0
Mr Wharton	7-17- 0	4- 6- 0
Idem for Powell House	1-19- 6	1-10- 0
ffre rents there	3- 1- 7	
Tempests lands	0- 4- 4	
The guild lands in		
Barnard Castle	0- 4- 0	
Maynard's lands	1- 5- 8	
Rutter's lands	0- 4- 0	
Lands late in poss of		
Lord Scroope	0- 2- 2	
Henry Maddison	0- 0- 6	
Leonard Allanson	0- 0- 4	
Well House	0- 2- 4	
Henry Bainbrigg	0- 0- 6	
Thomas Marsh	0- 1- 6	
Chr Preston	0- 6- 8	
John Race	0- 2- 4	
Anthony Teasdall	0- 0- 6	
Bowes Lands	0- 4- 0	
Ann rent	41-15-3	
Inc rent	22-15-8	

Part 2.

The yearly value of all the lands of County Palatine of Durham as they were returned by the Assesors (upon oath) upon the subsidy Act of 12d[?] upon the neare yearly value of all lands, mines, Allam works, Parkes, Chases, Warrens, Woods, Underwoods, Coppins, fishings, Tithes, Tolls and all other yearly profits and hereditam'ts of what value soever. 1670.

Midlston in Teasdale Parish

	Yearly value
Newbiggin	
Mr Cuth. Bainbridge	6- 0- 0
Geo Race	2- 0- 0
Tho. Parkin	3- 0- 0
Jo. Allenson	2- 0- 0
Jo. Natteress	4- 0- 0
Rob. Teasdaile	3- 0- 0
Wm Hunter	3- 0- 0
Mr Arthur Bainbridge	3- 0- 0
Chrt. Parkin junr.	2- 0- 0
Lancelot Coatsworth	2- 0- 0
Jo Lynd	2- 0- 0
The rents under Lady Vane	<u>24- 0- 0</u>

Middleton

Wm. Lynd junr., Michael Dent & other rents to Sir Geo. Vane	5- 0- 0
Roger Bainbridge	4- 0- 0
Mr [?] Bowes	8- 0- 0
Tho. Myers	3- 0- 0
Jo. Robinson	2- 0- 0
Rich Johnson	2- 0- 0
Jo. Johnson	2- 0- 0
Tho. Lynd	2- 0- 0
Mr Cuth. Bainbridge	2- 0- 0
Wm. & Cuth. Lynd	3- 0- 0
Roger Gibson junr	1- 0- 0
Wm. Lynd	1- 0- 0
Henry Kiplin	1- 0- 0

	Yearly value
Cuth Allenson	1- 0- 0
Michael Dent	2- 0- 0
Lady Vane's tenants	4- 0- 0
Wm. Lynd junr	1- 0- 0
Wm. Tinkler & other freeholders	10- 0- 0
Mr Tim. Tully of rectory	<u>38- 0- 0</u>
Forest in Teasdaile	
The rents under Mr W. Bowes	3- 0- 0
The rents under ye Lady ffrancis Vane	5- 0- 0
Jo. Robinson	3- 0- 0
Jon Robson with rest of tenants	13- 0- 0
Mr Arthur Bainbridge in ye ffrith of ye high forest	5- 0- 0
The lead mines at Grass Groves	<u>20- 0- 0</u>
Egleston	
Chrs Sandeson Esq	110- 0- 0
Mr [?] Bowes	2- 0- 0
Mr Jo. Dopson	1- 0- 0
Charles Kipling	1- 0- 0
Wm. Harrison	1- 0- 0
Jo. Addison	1- 0- 0
Wm. Addison	1- 0- 0
Chrt Pinchney	1- 0- 0
The Lead mynes of Egleshope	<u>6- 0- 0</u>

Part 3.

Rent book of the Right Hon. Earl of Darlington Highland Estate from Lady Day 1757 to Lady Day 1758.

Middleton 1 year rents to LD 1758

Collinson Joseph	£10
Sherlock Mark	4-10
Lind John	8-15
Elliot Robert	8
March Thomas	17
Bainbrigg Thos.	0- 8- 0
Kellar Matt	0- 4- 0
Mark Sherlock	3- 0- 0
Richardson Charles	6- 0- 0
Sherlock John	5- 0- 0
Walton William	<u>8</u>
	70-17- 0

Newbiggin 1 do.

Eggleston George	0- 15-0
Allison Tho. Eastend	6-12- 6
" Tho. Smith	5
Elliot John	5
Allison Cuthbert	2
Ainsley George	12
" Ja. Widow	4-10-0
Bainbrigg John Madge	6
Bainbrigg " Lang	7
Coatsworth William	30
Do Scarlett Field	1- 10
Gibson Leonard	16- 2- 6
Jackson Elianor	5- 10-00
Nattrass Mary	8
Race John	2-10- 0
Robinson Robert	12
Do Jane Allison Farm	0-15- 0
Gibson John	8
Watson Elizabeth	<u>3-10- 0</u>
	136-15- 0

Ettersgill Do.	
Allison John	33- 0- 0
Bainbrigg John	3
Bayles John	2-10- 0
Gargat Robert	2-10- 0
Gargat Edward	7-15- 0
Lowes William	5
Parmerley Henry	5-10- 0
Raine Isaac	13
Do part of Tim Tarn's farm	2
Temple Thos.	4
Brumwell Geo.	6- 5- 0
Tarn Timothy	4-15- 4
Hutchinson Hall	3- 4- 8
Bedall John	<u>6-10- 0</u>
	99- 0- 0

Middle Forest

Atkinson William	4- 0- 0
Bedall John	5- 5- 0
Horn Peter	6
" Nathan	4
Hutchinson Robert	12
Ireland John	10-17- 6
Tallantine Mary	10-17- 6
Raisbeck Thos.	6
Robinson John	25
Tarn Thomas	5
Urwins Tho. Yolock Holm	7-10- 0
Watson John	8
Watson Wm.	5
" Tho. Stoney Coom	6
Ireland Jonathan	4- 5- 0
Winter John	<u>3</u>
	122-15- 0

South Forest

Allison Margt	5
" William	10- 0- 0
Bainbrigg Tim	3-10- 0

Bainbrigg James	35
Lee Arthur	8-12- 6
Colling John	6
Scott John	7
Robson Mary	3-10- 0
Teward John	6
Wilkinson Mary	7-10- 0
Walton John Widdy Bank	14- 0- 0
Walton John Moss	2-10- 0
Walton Ann	<u>9-15- 0</u>
	118- 7- 6

Great Common l Do.

Cusing John	}	8- 0- 0
Dowson "		
Race Nathan		0-10- 0
Horn Nathan		2- 0- 0
Toward Thos.		7-10- 0
" William		<u>7-10- 0</u>
		25-10- 0

Free rents 1 year	£3- 6- 4 $\frac{1}{2}$
Total	£576-10-10 $\frac{1}{4}$

Part 4.

A particular and Valuation of the Manor of Middleton in Teesdale in the County Palatine of Durham belonging to the Rt. Hon. William Henry, Earl of Darlington. Taken in September, 1803 by Alex^r. Calvert, Richmond.

Middleton. Abstract

	No. acres.*	Ann. Val.
Alderson & Brunskill	13-2-30	£28-16- 0
Ralph March	9-0-30	22-15- 9
Charles & John Richardson	26-0-19	21- 2- 0
Mr Parkin Gill House	10-0- 2	12- 7- 6
Geo Walton " "	10-3-36	15-17- 0
Mark Sherlock	11-0- 4	17-18- 0
Joseph Thompson	0-3-32	1- 0- 0
William Watson Middle Side.	22-0- 5	23-12- 0
Tho. Collinson	<u>8-0- 0</u>	<u>8- 0- 0</u>
	126-2-32	161-18- 3

The annual value of common included in valuation without having regard to the number of stints in the common.

No valuation for any buildings in any part of estate because of such bad repair.

Newbiggin Abstract

James Ainsley	36-2-36	22- 6- 6
John Allinson	18-2- 0	16- 8- 9
Widow "	6-2- 0	12-10- 0
John Barnes	7-0- 0	12-19- 0
John Bainbridge	311-2- 0	53-18- 6
John Beadle	11-0- 0	6-16- 0
Leonard Gibson	28-0-20	39- 2- 0
Jn & Robt Coatsworth	88-2- 0	132- 1- 6
Robert Forster	10-3-20	14-13- 0
Lord Darlington	236-2- 0	135- 7- 6
Robert Gibson	7-3- 0	7-18- 6
Thomas Nixon	5-2- 0	7- 7- 0
William Robinson	4-1-20	5-12- 0

* These figures represent acres, roods and poles respectively.

Newbiggin Abstract (continued)

Joseph Raine	2-2-20	£5-15- 0
Margaret Spence	23-0- 8	33- 4- 6
Thos. Spence	6-1-20	12- 2- 6
John Thompson	4-2- 0	6-18- 0
Isaac Watson	12-0-32	19-12- 0
William Bedale	88-0-20	31- 0- 0
Thos. Collinson	25-0-20	27-13- 6
Mrs Lee	<u>3-0- 0</u>	<u>3- 0- 0</u>
	937- 3-16	606- 6- 3
Allots. stinted in gates	480-0- 18	58- 2- 0
Thos. Bedale. Lord Vane	4-1- 0	3-17- 6
Margt. Spence. " "	<u>35-0- 0</u>	<u>16-16- 0</u>
	1457-0-34	685- 1- 9

Ettersgill Abstract

Grace Bainbridge	44-2-13	17- 8- 0
Thomas Allinson	18-3- 1	7-13- 0
William Anderson	35-0-26	10-11- 6
Edward Gargate	33-2-34	18-13- 6
William Lowes	146-2- 6	71-12- 0
Skew Holmn [<u>no name given</u>]	62-1-24	18-10- 6
Philis Bromley	34-3-25	13- 8- 3
Henry Palmerly	34-1-20	19-13- 0
Christopher Bell	25-2-25	10-15- 9
Mark Tarn	29-0-30	14-10- 0
Tim Tarn	43-3-16	18-17- 3
Ann Temple	28-2-31	12-14- 6
Matt ^W Anderson	28-2- 4	10- 4- 6
William Tarn	31-1-17	13- 5- 3
John Hutchinson	<u>183-0- 8</u>	<u>48- 3- 9</u>
	780-0-13	305-19- 9

The intended stinted pasture to be taken out of the south part of the Common about 200 acres. £40 value.

Total enclosed land 980-3- 0. £345-18-3d.

Remainder of Ettersgill Common 800 acres.

Middle Forest		
Joseph Bedale	42-0-29	15-10-0
Jacob Tallentine	41-3-22	26-19-6
Thos. Ireland	23-0-9	18-3-0
Thos. Walton	47-0-25	23-17-0
Jonathan Ireland	23-3-36	14-17-6
Tim Tarn	60-1-12	25-4-3
Horn & Fairless	40-3-14	18-7-3
John Hutchinson	2204-0-37	90-0-0
Jacob Gargate	17-0-3	6-6-0
Isaac Walton	1329-0-20	80-0-0
Wm. Allinson	41-0-21	19-5-0
Thos. Anderson	27-2-18	11-2-6
John Allinson	42-0-16	19-8-0
Thos. Walton	58-3-25	28-7-0
John Teward	54-0-10	18-17-3
Jacob Scott	98-3-29	31-4-0
Thos Lee	58-0-29	27-15-3
Widow Watson	17-1-1	7-8-6
Widow Tallentine	15-3-28	16-16-6
John Bainbridge	10-1-17	6-0-0
Widow Gibson	12-0-20	8-2-0
Thos. Allinson	37-0-33	16-12-0
Widow Allinson	48-1-24	17-17-0
Henry Robinson	409-3-13	79-18-9
Henry Robson	<u>32-2-11</u>	<u>14-2-3</u>
	4794-1-22	632-0-6
Part Middle Forest Common		
now inclosing for stinted		
pasture.	410-0-0	60-0-0
Remd. of Middle Forest &		
Harwood Commons	<u>8100-0-0</u>	<u>*</u>
	13304-1-22	692-0-6

* No value given.

Harwood Dale		
Thos. Horn	23-1-16	10-14- 0
Wm. Toward	99-2- 3	25- 1- 6
John Allinson	55-0-16	16-10- 0
Matt. Winter	44-3-13	15- 8- 0
James Cousin	94-1- 0	24-17- 6
John Dowson	71-2-20	23-14- 6
John Watson	43-3-35	23-10- 0
" "	53-1-18	13- 4- 0
Joseph Robinson	9-2-10	7- 1- 0
Widow Anderson	13-0-34	6- 6- 6
Chas. Dowson	12-0-31	8-11- 0
Guy Cousin	41-1- 3	10- 1- 0
John Hunt	17-1- 5	7-17- 6
John Horn	20-1-25	8- 7- 0
John Vipond	31-3-31	12- 3- 6
Thos. Watson	33-3-37	10- 0- 0
Jos. Horn's Exors	15-0- 3	6-16- 6
" " "	41-0- 5	14-10- 0
Anthony Lee	33-2- 7	11- 6- 0
Jon. Heward	54-2-27	18- 2- 6
T & J Watson	76-1-23	20- 8- 6
Widow Raisbeck	27-2- 1	10-12- 6
Toward & Dixon	32-2- 9	14-14- 0
Jacob Watson	7-2-21	4- 8- 6
Richard Oliver	51-0- 9	13-13- 6
Geo. Carpenter	8-3-21	7- 2- 0
Matt ^W . Cousin	8-2-17	7-16- 0
John Winter	72-0-15	20-18- 6
John Sanders	2-0- 0	0-10- 0
Geo. Race	20-0- 0	3- 4- 0
Ann Romney	20-0- 0	6- 0- 0
John Nixon	67-1- 0	20-15- 0
Wm. Holder	51-3- 0	15-12- 6
Thos. Tallentine	15-0- 0	6- 2- 0
Thos. Cousin	<u>29-0- 0</u>	<u>11-14- 0</u>
	1299-3-15	437-19- 0

Part 5

Rent abstracts for the Teesdale Estate. In all cases the rents given are for half a year only, as recorded in the original rent books.

Year	Middleton			Newbiggin			Ettersgill			M/Forest			Harwood							
	£	s	d	*	£	s	d	*	£	s	d	*	£	s	d	*				
1860	290	18	0	32	433	6	9	52	151	18	1	25	423	15	0	47	257	11	2	45
1861	290	18	0	32	433	6	9	52	151	18	1	25	423	15	0	47	257	11	2	45
1862	325	18	0	37	433	6	9	52	151	18	1	25	427	5	0	47	258	7	5	46
1863	326	18	0	37	435	6	9	52	153	18	1	25	431	12	6	47	258	18	5	46
1864	330	6	9	38	436	1	9	51	155	10	7	25	432	5	6	47	261	8	5	46
1865	331	11	9	39	439	1	9	52	158	0	7	26	436	4	0	48	263	6	5	46
1866	331	15	9	40	438	2	9	53	158	9	7	25	436	4	0	48	263	6	5	46
1867	368	18	2	40	539	7	11	53	188	13	8	25	585	6	3	48	315	15	6	46
1868	379	17	1	41	552	0	1	55	216	3	8	25	630	13	0	48	320	19	3	48
1869	381	9	11	44	550	15	1	54	211	5	2	23	636	19	5	51	333	4	6	48
1870	400	0	5	45	552	0	1	55	212	7	7	22	662	17	5	50	340	0	5	46
1871	400	17	5	48	552	18	10	56	215	17	7	22	666	6	6	51	352	10	6	46
1872	400	17	5	48	552	18	10	56	215	17	7	22	666	6	6	51	352	10	6	46
1873	402	2	5	49	562	6	9	62	215	18	4	22	676	3	1	51	354	5	8	46
1874	403	0	11	49	616	12	0	62	216	15	7	22	690	5	1	50	358	4	0	46
1875	406	6	2	51	633	19	9	63	216	15	7	22	704	14	7	51	363	4	6	45
1876	421	11	2	52	641	13	10	62	219	5	7	22	711	13	7	51	372	3	8	46
1877	426	15	8	58	717	8	1	67	215	18	1	22	710	7	5	51	384	2	3	46
1878	480	5	11	56	722	13	9	66	216	8	1	22	719	12	1	53	389	18	1	46
1879	499	6	2	57	724	14	5	71	217	6	10	24	735	6	10	52	391	14	4	46
1880	506	18	8	66	761	4	8	78	223	13	11	23	739	5	5	54	391	19	3	48
1895	628	13	10	63	811	2	6	73	241	11	11	21	739	8	0	55	384	11	0	46
1896	693	10	1	66	818	12	6	72	241	11	11	21	739	8	0	55	384	11	0	47
1897	687	5	1	66	828	3	0	73	241	11	11	21	739	8	0	58	384	13	6	49
1898	684	4	1	66	828	3	0	73	241	11	11	20	739	19	4	58	384	13	6	49

* These columns show the actual numbers of tenants paying rent.

Part 6

Agreement made the 7th Day of October in the Year of Our Lord 1875 between the most noble Harry George Powlett, Duke of Cleveland, by his agent, William Thomas Scarth of Staindrop House in the County of Durham, Esquire, of the one part, and Mary and John Rumney of Harwood in the said county, of the other part, as follows:-

The said duke doth hereby agree to let and the said Mary and John Rumney do hereby agree to take all that farm of land commonly known by the name of Rumney in the township of Harwood aforesaid and containing by estimation 17 acres and 20 perches be the same more and less for and during the term of 1 year from the 6th day of April 1875 and so on from year to year, so long as both parties shall think fit, but determinable at the end of any year upon either party or his agent giving to the other party or his agent 6 months previous notice in writing, of his intention to quit or make void this agreement, at and under the yearly rent of £6-10 payable by the said Mary and John Rumney their executors or administrators to the said Duke, his heirs or assigns, quarterly, on every 6th day of July, 11th day of October, 6th day of January and 6th day of April during the continuance hereof, by equal portions without any deduction whatsoever (except Landlord's Property or Income Tax).

And the said Mary and John Rumney for themselves their heirs, executors and administrators doth hereby covenant and agree with the said Duke, his heirs and assigns, that they the said Mary and John Rumney their executors and administrators will pay the said rent at the time and in the manner hereinbefore appointed for payment thereof, and will also pay all rent charges, cesses, taxes and rates, whether parliamentary or parochial in respect of the said premises (except the Landlord's Property or Income Tax). And will not pare, burn, dig, plough, or break up without the previous consent in writing of the said Duke or his Agent, any part of the said lands under the additional yearly rent of £50 for every acre he shall so pare, burn, dig, plough, or break up, and so on in proportion for a greater or less quantity than an acre, and will keep the said lands free from mole hills; And will not crop lop or top any timber or other trees growing on the said premises, without leave of the said Duke or his Agent for so doing; And will be at expense of all carriage and workmanship for all repairs,

and will keep the dwelling houses and outbuildings, gates, rails, stiles, hedges, fences, walls and drains, and every part thereof, in good and tenantable repair, being allowed all such materials in the rough for that purpose as shall be appointed or ordered by the said Duke or his agent, and shall paint all the woodwork on the outside of the dwelling house once every three years, and the inside woodwork once every six years, the paint being provided by the landlord and the workmanship by the tenant; And will manage and occupy the said land to the satisfaction of the said Duke or his Agent, so as not to impair, lessen in value, or impoverish the same; And will consume and expend thereon, on the most proper part thereof, all the hay, fodder, dung, and compost which shall be raised and gathered from the said premises, and leave all such as shall be unconsumed and unspent at the termination hereof for the benefit of the said Duke, his heirs or assigns, or his or their incoming tenant without any compensation for the same; And will not mow the meadow land oftener than once in any year during this agreement, not have the same in meadow two successive years without being sufficiently manured to the satisfaction of the said Duke or his agent for the time being; And will not depasture a greater quantity of stock thereon during the last year than he has usually done so in each preceding year of his tenancy; And will preserve all the young quickset hedges and clean and weed the same in a proper manner, and keep all the ditches and drains properly opened and cleansed; And that the said Duke, his agents and servants shall and may at any time enter the said demised premises, or any part thereof to view and examine the condition of the same, and to pursue and search for, and kill all game and rabbits thereon (which the said Duke hereby specially reserves out of this contract or demise), and authorise his gamekeepers and servants to preserve, watch, and kill the same; And that the said Mary and John Rumney will not let, assign, or otherwise part with the possession of the said premises or any part thereof without the consent in writing of the said Duke, or his agent or steward, for that purpose first had been obtained.

Provided always and it is hereby agreed and declared by and between the said parties hereto that if the said certain and contingent rents hereinbefore mentioned, or either of them or any part thereof respectively, shall be unpaid for the space of 30 days next after any of the days on which the same ought to have been paid (although no

formal or legal demand shall have been made thereof) or in case the said Mary and John Rumney their executors or administrators shall become bankrupt or insolvent, or make an assignment for the benefit of creditors, or go to jail, or in case of the breach or non-performance of any of the covenants, clauses or agreements herein contained on the part of the said Mary and John Rumney their executors or administrators to be done, kept, or performed, then and from henceforth and in either of such cases it shall lawful for the said Duke, or his agent on his behalf, into and upon the said demised premises or any part thereof in the name of the whole to re-enter and the same to have again re-possess and enjoy as in his former estate as if this agreement or demise had not been made. In witness thereof the said parties hereto have set their hands and seals the day and year first before written.

Signed and sealed and delivered by the said William Thomas Scarth for and on behalf and as the act and deed of the said Duke of Cleveland in the presence of W.I. Bell

W.T. Scarth [signature]

Signed sealed and delivered by the said Mary and John Rumney in the presence of

Mary Rumney

John Rumney [signatures]

NOTES

These tables attempt to give, in as brief a form as possible, the main contents of the Probate Inventories for Middleton in Teesdale, Newbiggin and the Forest of Teesdale between 1600 and 1700. The tables are divided into four sections: cattle, sheep, horses and others, which includes crops and poultry. Anything which cannot be fitted into any of these sections is in the final column of notes, together with any other facts which were thought to be relevant. The various terms used to denote different types of animal are listed below, although it should be noted that many of them, according to the dictionary definition appear to have the same meaning. However, since they were listed separately in many of the inventories, one must assume that different shades of meaning were applied to each at the time when the inventories were made.

Explanation of terms used in Probate Inventories.

Kyne - usually an archaic plural of cows (OED) but in many cases must have had a slightly different meaning as many farmers had cows and kyne.

Whye - heifer or young cow that has not had a calf.

Twinter - a beast (cattle or sheep) that is two winters (ie two years) old.

Stirke - a young bullock or heifer usually 1 - 2 years old.

Stot - a young castrated ox, or a heifer or a bullock under 2 years old.

Stear - a young ox, esp. one which has been castrated.

Geld - in sheep or cattle it probably means a barren female, or one which has dropped a dead lamb or calf.

Hogg - a young sheep that has not been shorn.

Gimmer - a ewe between first and second shearing.

Wedder - a male sheep after two shearings.

Ewe - adult female sheep.

Top - adult male sheep, or ram.

Shear sheep - probably a sheep after shearing

Store - a sheep kept for fattening

Work horse - one kept for work on the farm.

Mare - adult female horse.

Foal and colt - young horse.

Filley - young female horse.

Gelding - castrated horse.

Galloway- special breed of horse, peculiar to Galloway.

Stagg - an unbroken young horse.

Bigg - four rowed barley.

Other symbols and abbreviations.

x - amounts or numbers: not specified.

st - stone (weight).

r - ruck

* - the numbers given apply to all the animals or crops indicated
thus *

Middleton T - this indicates that according to the Inventory the
person concerned came from Middleton in Teesdale
itself.

Middleton - this indicates that according to the Inventory the
person concerned came from somewhere within the
Parish of Middleton in Teesdale.

APPENDIX 5.

Part 1.

Arrangements for stinting taken from the Valuation of the Manor of Middleton in Teesdale in the County Palatine of Durham belonging to the Rt. Hon. William Henry, Earl of Darlington. September 1803.

Newbiggin

Name	Cattle gates on common pasture
James Ainsley	44
John Allinson	28
Widow Allinson	21
John Barnes	22
John Bainbridge	93
John Beadle	11
Leonard Gibson	66
John & Robert Coatsworth	226
Lord Darlington	232
Robert Forster	25
Robert Gibson	13
Thomas Nixon	12
William Robinson	9
Joseph Raine	10
Margaret Spence	58
Thomas Spence	20
John Thompson	12
Isaac Watson	33
William Bedale	52
Thomas Collinson	47
Mrs Lee	5
Thomas Bedale	9
Margaret Spence	29
Thomas Bedale, Lord Vane	<u>9</u>
	1077

Ettersgill

Name	Farm	Common		New pasture *	
		SG.	BG.	SG.	BG.
Grace Bainbridge	-	35	5 5/6	30	5
Thomas Allinson	-	15	2 3/6	13	2 1/6
Wm. Anderson	Nought Berry Hill	21	3 3/6	18	3

* SG: Sheep gate. BG: Beast Gate.

(continued)

Edward Gargate	Nought Berry Hill	37	6 1/6	32	5 2/6
William Lowes	Brigg House	-	-	-	-
?	Skew Holmn	37	6 1/6	32	5 2/6
Philis Bromley	-	27	4 3/6	23	3 5/6
Henry Palmerly	East Birk Bush	39	6 3/6	33	5 3/6
Christopher Bell	West Birk Bush	22	3 4/6	18	3
Mark Tarn	-	28	4 4/6	24	6
Tim Tarn	-	37	6 1/6	31	5 1/6
Ann Temple	Eman's	25	4 1/6	21	3 3/6
Matt ^w Anderson	-	21	3 3/6	18	3
Wm. Tarn	-	26	4 2/6	23	3 5/6
John Hutchinson	-	<u>96</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>13 4/6</u>
		466	77 4/6	398	56 2/6

Middle Forest

Name	Farm	Sheep gates on common pasture	Cattle gates on Hurth Pasture
Joseph Bedale	Egg Pot	51	7
John Allinson	Hunt Hall	67	-
Jacob Tallentire	Hangingshaws	94	7
Thos. Ireland	Hangingshaws	63	6
Thos. Walton	East Under Hurth	83	4
Jonothan Ireland	East Under Hurth	52	-
Tim Tarn	Scar	88	-
Horn & Fairless	Langdon Beck	64	-
John Hutchinson	Vallance Lodge	-	-
Isaac Walton	Willow Bank	-	-
Jacob Gargate	Vallance Lodge	22	-
Wm. Allinson	Seavy Hill	67	-
Thos. Allinson	Raildon	39	-
Thos. Walton	Knot Hill	99	-
John Teward	Sawen Sike	65	-
Jacob Scott	Whay Sike	109	-
Thos. Lee	Hill Field etc.	97	-
Widow Watson	Watgarth & Moss	25	-
Widow Tallentine	Gillet	24	-
John Bainbridge	Lane Side	21	-
Widow Gibson	Gillet	28	-

(continued)

Thos. Allinson	Watgarth	57	-
Widow Allinson	Force Garth	62	-
Henry Robinson	Force Garth	275	-
Henry Robson	Force Garth	<u>49</u>	<u>-</u>
		1604	24

Harwood

Name	Farm	Sheep gates on common pasture
Thos. Horn	Force Foot	37
Wm. Toward	Bowes Close	87
John Allinson	Bowes Close	57
Matt. Winter	Bowes Close	53
James Cousin	Rowntree Ridge	87
John Dowson	Rowntree Ridge	83
John Watson	Stoney Hill	82
John Watson	Herdship	46
Jos. Robinson	Rough Ridge	25
Widow Anderson	Rough Ridge	22
Chas. Dowson	Caskey Hill	30
Guy Cousin	Ridge Side	35
John Hunt	Clover Yard	27
John Hörn	Clover Yard	29
John Vipond	Vipond Farm	42
Thos. Watson	Herdship	35
Jos. Horn's exor	Cowhill Syke	24
" " "	Cocklake	50
Anthony Lee	Herdship	39
Jon. Heward	Stoney Coom	63
T. & J. Watson	Midge Holm	71
Widow Raisbeck	-	37
Toward & Dixon	-	56
Jacob Watson	-	15
Richard Oliver	-	52
Geo Carpenter	-	25
Matt ^w Cousin	-	27
John Winter	Dale Head	73
John Sanders	-	3

(continued)

Geo. Race	-	10
Ann Romney	Grass Hill	21
John Nixon	Grass Hill	72
Wm. Holder	Intake	55
Thos. Tallentine	Intake	21
Thos. Cousin	Intake	<u>41</u>
		1533

Part 2

Middleton in Teesdale Enclosure Award, stinting arrangements, 1816

Name	Inner pasture		Outer pasture	
	Beasts	Sheep	Beasts	Sheep
Earl of Darlington, as Lord of the Manor for his 1/16th part	20	3	50	1
The same for his lands on the outer common in respect of lands having right of common	43	2	105	1
Ainsley, John	7	-	16	3
Alderson, John	-	4	2	-
Allinson, William	1	3	4	-
Ainsley, James	5	-	-	1
Bedale, William	-	2	-	4
Bustin, Anthony	-	2	-	4
Bradwell, George	-	2	-	4
Bainbridge, Jonathon	-	4	1	3
Collinson, John	3	1	8	-
Cousin, James	1	2	3	2
Coatsworth, John	2	2	5	4
Coatsworth, Robert	1	-	2	2
Coatsworth, Joseph	2	2	5	3
Dent, John	1	3	4	-
Elliot, John	13	45	45	-
Forster, John & Joseph	-	1	-	-
Gibson, Nicholas	2	1	5	2
Gibson, Nicholas	3	2	8	1
Hill, John Esquire	32	2	78	2
Hindmarsh, Thomas	2	2	6	-
Horn, Mathew	2	-	5	-
Hunt, John	1	2	3	3
Hunt's John	3	3	8	4
Hutchinson, William Esq.	4	4	11	4
Hobson, William	17	2	42	-
Hobson, John	1	2	3	3
Hanby, Ann	7	-	17	-
Hindmarsh, Ralph Robinson	1	2	3	2
Dent, Thomas- legal rep.	-	4	1	3

Dent, Hannah-legal rep.	-	4	1	4
Dent, John	1	2	3	1
Dent, William	1	-	2	-
Lee, Mistress - reps of.	2	2	5	3
Lowes, Margaret	4	-	9	1
Lee, Arthur	2	3	6	2
Middleton Free School, trustees of on Inner Pasture	1	3	4	-
Milburn, Robert, legal rep.	-	2	-	4
Marks, Rev. William, Curate	1	3	4	-
Marks, William	-	2	-	4
Middleton, Rector of	6	1	15	-
Middleton Township, poor of	3	-	7	1
March, Ralph	2	-	5	-
Nixon, Jonathon-legal reps	-	2	1	1
Oliver, William	2	2	6	-
Robinson, Thomas	-	2	1	1
Riddell, Ralph	5	4	14	-
Richardson, John	-	1	-	4
Robinson, Richard-legal rep.	2	1	5	2
Robinson, John	1	-	2	2
Redfearn, Thomas-legal rep.	2	1	5	2
Robinson, Coheiza	2	-	5	-
Richardson, Joseph	-	1	-	3
Richardson, Mary	-	4	1	3
Swinbanks, Jos., Thos., & John	2	2	5	3
Strathmore, Earl of Henry Hunter	26	-	63	-
Sherlock, Mark	12	-	29	-
Tinkler, John	1	5	4	-
Tarn, John & Timothy	-	2	1	1
Tinkler, Thomas	-	4	1	4
Thompson, Thomas	-	4	1	3
Collinson, Gibson (in respect of land etc. now or late belonging to John Winter)	-	-	11	3
Tinkler, William	-	4	1	3
Todd, Anthony-legal rep.	26	3	64	2

Todd, Thomas Esq.	3	1	8	-
Tinkler, William	10	-	24	2
Tarn, Joseph-legal rep.	1	-	2	2
Thompson, John	3	-	7	1
Thompson, William	-	4	2	-
Winter, John	3	-	7	1
Walton, Thomas	-	2	1	1
Waistell, Charles	1	2	3	2
Walron, Mark	-	4	2	-
Walton, William, legal reps of				
Watson Thos.	-	4	2	-
Watson, Jacob	2	3	6	2
Walton, John -legal rep.	-	2	1	-
Walton, Matthew	-	4	-	4
Walton, Miles	-	2	-	4

Part 3

Stinting arrangements in 1847, taken from the 1847-64 Cleveland farm books.

Newbiggin

Name	Farm	Stints		
		Coatsworth's Allotments	Bowlees Pasture	Friar Hse Pasture
Thomas Allison	Newbiggin	4	-	-
Margaret Beadle	Scar	3	3	-
Joseph Beadle	High Revelin	2	-	-
John Bainbridge	Bowlees	-	1	-
Mr Wilson	Newbiggin	4	-	-
Matt. Collinson	Newbiggin	-	1	-
Gibson Collinson	Woodside	2	-	-
Mark Coatsworth	Newbiggin	2	-	-
John Coatsworth	Low Houses	23	-	-
Thomas Collinson	Stoney Gill	3	-	-
Thomas Dickenson	Newbiggin	-	1	-
Thomas Forster	Newbiggin	2	2	-
Joseph Gibson	Newbiggin	3	-	-
Jane Gibson	Newbiggin	4	3	-
Jane Gibson	Bank	-	2	-
Ann Scott	Bowlees	-	1	-
Thomas Spence	Newbiggin	2	-	-
Ruth Watson	Bowlees	-	1	-
John Garget	Gate Side	3	-	-
Elizabeth Gibson	Friar House	-	-	8
Wm. Hutchinson	Bowlees	-	1	-
Robert Lowes	Newbiggin	2	-	-
William Lee	Friar House	-	-	6
Wm & Jere. Loan	Newbiggin	3	1	-
Thos. Robinson	Hood Gill	8	-	-
William Raine	Newbiggin	2	-	-
John Barker	Bowlees	-	1	-
Nicholas Wearmouth	Bowlees	-	1	-

Ettersgill

Name	Farm	Stints on Ettersgill Pasture
Sarah Anderson	Bank House	3
Margt. Anderson	Low Beck Head	2

Henry Bainbridge	Dirt Pit	2
Hannah Bell	Scar End	2
John Bainbridge	Ash Dub Side	4
William Bell	Birch Bush	4
Matt. Anderson	-	1
Jane Beadle	Bank House	4
William Brunwell	Bank House	4
John Gargett	Out Berry Bat	2
Mary Hutchinson	High Beck Head	2
John Hutchinson	Scar End	2
William Tuer	Dirt Pit	1
Joseph Nixon	Birch Hill	3
Henry Parmely	Birch Tree House	3
Widow Scott	Walker Hill	1
John Thompson	Dirt Pit	3
Timothy Tarn	Woolpitts Hill	4
Mark Tarn	Bank House	4
Mary Tarn	Low Beck Head	3

Middle Forest

Name	Farm	Stints	
		Langdon Beck Pasture	Hurth Pasture
Thomas Allison	Lane Side	4	-
Wm. Allison	Out Dale	2	-
Isaac Allison	Watgarth	10	-
Henry Bainbridge	Moss	2	-
Joseph Beadle	Egg Pot	4	-
Thomas Adam	Hunt Hall	6	-
Jonothan Barker	Langdon Beck	4	-
John Collinson	Under Hurth	3	2
Jos. Bainbridge	Old Folds	2	-
Edward Gargett	Langdon Beck	2	-
John Walton	Hodge Hole	2	-
Widow Walton	Force Garth End	4	-
Mary Walton	Under Hurth	2	2
Joseph Ireland	Hangingshaws	4	-
Henry Robinson	Force Garth End	2	-
Jane Redfearn	Sievy Hill	4	-
John Steeley	Under Hurth	4	4

Mary Scott	Railton	3	-
Thos. Scott	Gillet	3	-
Jacob Scott	Whey Sike	4	-
William Scott	Langdon	2	-
Arthur Tallentine	Langdon	3	-
Widow Tallentine	Bell Hill	2½	2
Geo. Tallentine	English Hill	-	5
John Tallentine	Hanging Shaws	3½	2
John Howard	Kirkhouse Folds	4	-
John Teward	Sawer Hill	4	-
Isaac Tarn	Intack	1	-
Widow Walton	Knot Hill	2	-
Nancy Walton	Mount Pleasant	2	-
Wm. Tallentine	In Dale	1	-

Harwood

Name	Farm	Stints	
		Bowes Close Pasture	Harwood Pasture
Timothy Collinson	East House	4	-
Anne Cousin	Bowes Close	6	-
Thos. Cousin	Green Hills	-	4
George Garget	Red Wing	-	3
Jacob Tallentine	Peghorn	-	3
George Teward	Anty's	4	-
John Teward	Bowes Close	6	-

Part 4

Keepers and shepherds [sic] monthly account July 31st to August 28th 1897.

	Amount
Jno. Gibson, 1 horse, 3 dogs.	£6 10 0d
Adam Bell	3 12 0
Wm. Beavis	3 12 0
Charles Dowson	3 12 0
John Nixon	3 12 0
Fenwick Dowson	3 12 0
Jos. Dowson	3 12 0
Thos. Dickinson	2 0 0
Wm. Beadle	2 0 0
Jon. Natriss	2 0 0
Henry Dixon	0 8 0
Thos. Dickinson, 4 nights watching	0 10 0
Jon. Natriss, 4 nights watching	0 10 0
Henry Dixon, 4 nights watching	0 10 0
Wm. Beadle, 2 nights watching	0 5 0
Henry Bell, 15 days watching Langdon	2 5 0
Thos. Nixon, 13 days watching Ashgill Head	1 19 0
Mrs Dickinson, cleaning lunchbuse twice	0 6 0
Mrs Beavis, cleaning lunchbuse twice	0 6 0
J. Camron, watching Pike Law 3 days	0 9 0
James Beadle, watching Langdon 1 day	<u>0 3 0</u>
	£41 13 0d

Lord Barnard's tenants allowance to shepherds [sic] on Teesdale moors. March 1st to April 6th 4/- per week each. April 6th to last day of September 8/- per week each. October 1st to November 20th 4/- per week each to Thos. Dickenson, Jonothan Natrass, Wm. Beadle.

Allowance from the tenants in Harwood to Henry Dixon, for shepherding [sic] Harwood moors March 1st to April 6th 10/- per week, April 6th to September 30th 16/- per week.

Part 5

Rules for stinting the common in the Parish of Middleton in Teesdale belonging to the Honourable H.J.N. Vane.

1 cow - 1 stint	1 yearling foal- 1 stint
2 yearling beasts- 1 stint	1 mare & foal - 2 stints
3 2 year old beasts-2 stints	5 sheep - 1 stint
1 horse	10 geese - 1 stint

1. The Common to be stinted on the 1st March (Entry may be given on 1st January by permission) and if so required by the Hon. H.J.N. Vane stock shall be taken in on the 20th day of NOVEMBER each year or on such other date as may be determined and stinthead notified.
2. No tenant to be allowed to have more stock upon the Common than the number allotted to each tenant.
3. The tenants of each Common shall appoint (by ballot) a committee of THREE who shall have the power to appoint a Herdsman subject to the approval of the Hon H.J.N. Vane or his Agent. The Committee shall collect the rent from each tenant together with the wages paid by the Hon. H.J.N. Vane and pay the same over each half-yearly rent day.
4. No tenant shall be allowed to go upon the Common with dogs.
5. Should any tenant not be able to put his allotted quantity of stock upon the Common, he or she must give notice to the Middleton Estate Office who will have the power to sublet; no subletting by tenants is allowed.
6. 3 days will be allowed for washing and clipping, viz: One day for washing and two days for clipping.
7. The Head Keeper to be informed of the days when washing or collecting is to take place.
8. Gimmer lambs to count as sheep after the 30th October each year.
9. All sheep on Commons to be kept properly marked.

November 1956.

APPENDIX 6

Part 1.

A summary of the Lord Barnard's Leadmill Account, Lady Day 1739 to Lady Day 1740.

Total ore raised	3985 bings	$2\frac{1}{2}$			
Duty Ore (1/5)	797 bings	$\frac{1}{2}$	£1991	10s	6d
Carriage of ore			126	7s	9d
Fuel	including coals, cinders, ashes, carriage of these, peats, cutting and carriage, and lime.		32	19	4
Repairs	including carriage of iron, charges for smiths, masons, carpenters, millwrights, etc.		52	16	3
Incidents	including damage done to ground by the mill, sundry small payments, carriage of bullion to London.		12	16	7
Lead	smelted	£57 15 8d			
	refined	17 5 1			
	reduced	7 13 10	total	82	14 2
	bone ashes			25	19 8
	weighing of lead			7	1 1
	carriage from mill to Stockton			121	19 2
Salaries	Thomas Hutchinson	£20			
	Robert Elliot	£20		40	0 0
				<u>2494</u>	<u>4 6</u>
Lead and silver sold	Lead		2317	7	8
	Silver		295	5	7
Mill rent			10	0	0
			<u>2662</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>3</u>
Balance, being gain from the mill			£168	8s	9d

Part 2

Grant book of Mines held under the Marquess of Cleveland in the Manor of Middleton in Teesdale. 1833 - 45. Summary.

Name of mine	To whom granted	Date	Term (yrs)
Hope Slit	Teesdale Mining Company	11. 2.1832	21
Willy Hole	" " "	11. 2.1832	21
Langdon	" " "	24. 9.1832	21
East side of Hudeshope	Governor and Company for Smelting down lead	1. 1.1833	21
West side of Hudeshope	" " " "	1. 1. 1833	21
Ashgill Head	" " " "	19. 1.1833	?
East & West Reveling	John Coatsworth & Bros., Mark Sherlock, Wm. Walton, Rbt. Hutchinson, John Watson, John Gibson, Gibson Collinson	7. 3.1835	14
Seraith Head	Governor and Company for Smelting down lead	1. 9.1835	21
Dubby Sike	Wm. Gibson, John Beadale, Matt. Hetherington	4. 3.1836	14
Casten Holes	John Barker & Co.	6. 1.1838	14
Bands Hush	Geo. Crawshall & Co.	6. 1.1838	14
Harthope & High Hurth	John Stagg, Mark Sherlock, Lancelot Walton, Jacob Allinson	13. 9.1838	14
Ettersgill Beck	Wm. Tarn, John Swinbank, Isaac Coatsworth, Robert Lowes, John Bainbridge, Jon. Coatsworth	13.11.1838	7
Foxholes at Pike Law	Matt. & John Collinson, Jon. Barker, Mark Walton, Mark Sherlock.	13.11.1838	7
Middleside	John & Jacob Allinson	13.11.1838	14
Pike Law	Matt. Collinson, Mark Sherlock	20. 4.1839	14
Flask	John Walton, Geo. Watson, Wm. & James Spencer, Joseph Curry.	23.10.1839	14
Grass Hill	Mark Sherlock, John Stagg, John Hustler, Jacob Allenson	7. 1.1840	21
Westerhead	Mark Watson, Thos. Watson James Watson, Mark Watson	23. 3.1840	14
West Cowgreen	Utrick Walton, Isaac Bell, Jos. Hind, Thos. Heward.	5. 9.1840	14

(continued)

Name of mine	To whom granted	Date	Term (yrs)
New & Tarn's Streak	John Dolphin, John Robinson Jos. Reddam.	6. 4.1841	14
Pike Law west side	John Dolphin, John Robinson, Jos. Reddam.	6. 4.1841	14
Trough Head	Mark Sherlock, John Swinbank John Barnes, Thos. Robinson, Robert Rutter, Tho. Heward.	4. 5.1841	14
Cat Scar	Mark Sherlock, Jacob Allenson, Tho. Robinson, Robert Rutter & Co.	11. 5.1841	14
East & West side of Hudeshope	Governor and Company for Smelting down lead	28. 5.1841	21
Skears	Lancelot Walton, Jn. Backhouse James Walton, Thos. Atkinson, John Hustler.	28. 5.1841	21
Redgroves & Flushiemere	Governor and Company for Smelting down lead	9. 8.1841	21
East Cowgreen	John Beadale, Thos. Holmes & Co.	15.11.1841	14
High & Low Langdon	Jacob Allenson.	16. 3.1844	21
Willy Hole, east side	Robt. Byers, Josh Byers, Mark Sherlock, Robt Rutter, Wm. Barnes, John Barnes, John Coatsworth.	16. 3.1844	14
Scarhead & Whitefolds	Mark Sherlock, Ralph Currah	16. 3.1844	14
Lord's Allot.	Robt. Byers, Thos. Robinson, Mark Sherlock, Josh. Byers, James Walton, Ed. Hutchinson, John Coatsworth, James Hindmarsh	16. 3.1844	14
Reveling ancient land	John Coatsworth	3. 9.1844	14
East Cowgreen	Thos. Holms, John Bainbridge John Richardson, Robt. Halton & Co.	16. 9.1844	14
Foxholes at Pike Law	Matt & John Collinson, Jon. Barker, Mark Walton, Mark Sherlock	7. 3.1845	21

Part 3

Regulations for the payment of Duty Ore to the Duke of Cleveland from the Mines in Teesdale. 1853.

In the lease for mines in the Township of Middleton, Teesdale, the payment in money for the Duty Ore is regulated by the London Lead Company's sales of Lead in the four counties of Durham, Cumberland, Westmorland and Northumberland during each year.

If the Fother of Lead of 21 Cwt is sold for £20 the Bing of Duty Ore is paid for by £4 5s or 14/2d per bing on the Gross Produce of the Mines.

Five shillings per Bing being added or deducted from the £4 5s or 10d per Bing from the 14/2d for every rise or fall of One pound in the price of the Fother and so in proportion for any fractional part of a pound.

The Duty Ore for Mines not in the Township of Middleton (with the exception of those in the Township of Newbiggin leased to Messrs Wilson & Co.) is paid in Kind, but let under a Yearly Agreement to the London Lead Company on payment per Bing at the Same price as the Ore sold by the respective Lessees of Mines where the ore is raised.

The Ore is also to be paid for annually in January at the same time as the other Duty Ore paid for by that Company.

The Duty Ore arising from the mines let to Messrs Wilson & Co. is paid for in money regulated by the price of the Fother of lead same as the London Lead Company; but the Duty Ore at these mines is a Seventh instead of a Sixth from the impoverished state of the Old Mines in this Take and the uncertainty of the new Ground.

When the fother of Lead is £20 the Duty on the Gross produce of the Mines is 12/- per Bing, with a Rise or Fall of 1/- per Bing as the Fother advances or recedes One pound in price, and so in proportion for a Fractional part of a pound. 1853

Five Shillings per Bing on Lead Ore raised at all mines but not washed within 6 Calendar months from the 31st October unless from the unavoidable causes therein mentioned.