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This is a comprehensive study of the origins and meanings of Shropshire field-names. The author deals with such issues as field types and size, shape, configuration, geographical position, and the condition of the soil, before launching into the largest part of the book, a treatment of the origins of field-names under twenty-one headings such as woodland names, farm crops, industry, birds, legal, sports and pastimes. The book concludes with a name index and a parish index.

Shrewsbury is fortunate to have six local subsidy rolls, a number greater than for any other town. They record the assessment of the taxpaying population’s wealth from 1297 to 1322. The rolls consist of lists of names followed by inventories of taxed goods, a summation of their values and then the tax due as a fraction which the crown demanded. The authors have looked into the historical background of the taxes at local and national levels, and have used the evidence of the inventories to discuss the social structure of the town and its economy.

The Society has already been indebted to Una Rees for the two earlier cartulary editions, those of Shrewsbury abbey and Haughmond abbey. Lilleshall abbey was an Augustinian house lying in the wooded area to the north-east of Telford. It was never a very wealthy community, and its income was diminished by the large numbers of travellers it was obliged to succour. This volume has entailed a great deal of work in searching for the originals of the charters and collating the two. In addition to the charters there are also documents relating to taxation, a rental of the abbey’s properties in Shrewsbury, and items relating to the abbey’s attempts to augment its revenues by appropriating some of its churches. This gives only a small indication of the range of the contents, which represent the archives used by the abbey officials in their dealings with their estates and legal business.

After the introductory chapter giving the historical, archaeological, and physical back ground, there follow two chapters on the surviving remains. Part 2 covering chapters 4 to 9 contains detailed accounts of the excavations undertaken between 1985 and 1988 on the Queen Anne House site, including important technical reports. Chapter 10 covers the Abbey Mill site excavations over the same period. Part 3, Synthesis, Discussion and Conclusion, contains chapters on ‘The changing precinct’, ‘The abbey and its suburb’, and ‘The abbey and the town’. This was an important undertaking aiming to use an opportunity to excavate part of a site, which till then had remained buried by industrial development, and then to relate the findings to what was still standing, and the history of the abbey and the suburb in which it stands.
THE MARCHES UPLANDS SURVEY

By JAMES DINN and RACHEL EDWARDS

SUMMARY

The Marches Uplands Survey was a management-led assessment of the archaeology of the western uplands of Herefordshire and Shropshire. A range of extensive survey techniques was used to investigate the nature and potential of archaeological sites in the survey area, comparing the results with what was already recorded on the counties' Sites and Monuments Records (SMRs). The survey was funded principally by English Heritage, with contributions from the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England (RCHME) and from both County Councils. Work started late in 1991 and continued with interruptions until 1999. The total area of the survey was 942.15 sq km, with ground fieldwork covering 118.82 sq km, within an area defined by the 250m contour.

This article summarises the project and its results, and includes chronological summaries of archaeology within the survey area, identifying the contribution of the survey.

Whilst some aspects of the archaeology of this area were well understood, it was unclear whether what was known represented all surviving archaeological remains, or just a part of a much more extensive body of material. This was of concern to those managing the archaeology of the area. The overall success of the survey was more than just an increase in numbers of sites recorded. The Marches Uplands Survey has identified the strengths and some shortcomings of the SMRs for the survey area, and has been able to establish the range of techniques required to gain a full understanding of the archaeology of this upland area. Perhaps the most significant achievement of the survey, however, was in identifying the range of archaeological sites which can be expected in the Marches Uplands.

1 Background

1.1 Introduction

The Marches Uplands Survey was an extensive survey of the western upland areas of Herefordshire and Shropshire. It was funded by English Heritage, and carried out by Hereford and Worcester County Archaeological Service, with assistance from the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England (RCHME) and from Shropshire County Council. Work began in late 1991, and continued intermittently until 1999. This article aims to bring the work of the project to a wider audience. It is based on the final project report, produced in 1999 for English Heritage and the archaeological officers of the two counties (Dinn and Edwards 1999). With very few exceptions, the conclusions have not been updated to include any work carried out since 1999.

The project was management-led, rather than research based, that is, its aim was to assess how comprehensive was the record of known sites, rather than to produce a completely new understanding of the archaeology of the area. The overall area, and the detailed survey areas within it, were therefore defined using a set of criteria which did not relate directly to historically- or archaeologically-defined regions.
1.1.1 Context

The western uplands of Herefordshire and Shropshire are generally not the open heathland which one tends to think of as ‘upland’. These uplands – the ‘Marches uplands’ – are more often rolling hills, clothed in green pasture, and patterned with hedgerows and woodlands. A sense of upland is there, however, and much of the area is remote, having more in common with Wales than with the lowlands around Hereford and Shrewsbury. Historically the area has been a borderland for much of the last two thousand years, maybe more, and this has left its mark, in the form of Roman roads, Offa’s Dyke and medieval castles. Other, older, monuments are also present; hillforts, barrows and stone circles are clearly visible in the landscape.

The area as a whole had been relatively little studied, despite the presence of these frequently impressive monuments. Prior to the survey the record of known archaeological sites was not believed to be representative of the full range of surviving archaeological evidence. Consequently, the then existing models for past settlement and land exploitation were thought to be questionable.

The Marches uplands are largely comprised of agriculturally marginal land where sheep farming has typically been the primary land-use. When the project was being set up there was a perception that archaeological survey was needed in the context of changes in the systems of agricultural subsidy and support administered by government within the framework of the Common Agricultural Policy. Threats to archaeological remains in rural areas were largely not covered by the archaeological development control system, since many of the most potentially damaging activities did not require planning permission. Agricultural subsidy schemes might also lead to damage to archaeological remains, although they also provide the potential to protect (and in some cases to enhance) the remains.

The particular importance of upland areas for the study of past human activities has long been appreciated; at the margins of settlement and intensive land-use, visible remains survive most readily, contributing to landscapes which are characterised by the surviving earthworks of earlier periods of use. These may appear to be of a single period, or they may display features which have evidently developed over millennia.

Large-scale surveys have formed a characteristic part of the approach to the archaeology of English uplands, such as Bodmin Moor (Johnson and Rose 1994), Dartmoor (Fleming 1988; Balaam et al 1982, with references to earlier reports), the Pennines (Fleming 1998), or the Cheviots (Topping 1989). Studies of archaeology in the adjacent upland parts of Wales tended to concentrate on the production of inventories of discrete sites or site classes (Browne 1986). However, this changed dramatically with the adoption of an uplands strategy by Cadw, the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Wales (RCAHMW), and the Welsh Archaeological Trusts, and with the implementation of a number of survey projects across Wales from the late 1980s on.

For most periods, the understanding of human use of the landscape remained less refined in the Welsh Marches than elsewhere. The Marches Uplands Survey was the first attempt at systematic extensive archaeological survey coverage of the uplands of western Herefordshire and Shropshire. In contrast with other more extensive upland areas in Britain, upstanding remains of ancient landscape here are more scattered and less conspicuous. There had been little tradition of organised amateur archaeological fieldwork over much of the area, and, where this had occurred, the valuable results had rarely achieved the publication or recognition they deserved.

1.1.2 Scope and definitions

‘Upland’ is commonly defined as an area where most of the land is higher than 800’ (244m) above sea level (Department of the Environment and Institute of Terrestrial Ecology; Darvill, 1986a, 4), and this was broadly followed here, with all National Grid kilometre squares containing land above 250m included in the survey area. While there are several other areas of high ground in both counties, notably Wenlock Edge, the Wrekin, the Clee Hills and the Malverns, the survey focussed only on the western upland areas in the two counties.

The Marches Uplands Survey area was divided into six different areas, extended along the English side of the modern border between England and Wales, within the historic counties of Herefordshire and Shropshire (Fig. 1). Each of these has distinct geological and topographical characteristics. The names used for the areas defined for the survey were Selattyn, Long Mountain, Long Mynd, Clun Forest, Ludlow Anticline to Hergest Ridge, and Black Mountains. Each area was sampled in greater detail by 1 km wide fieldwork transects, aligned across the geological and topographical grain of the land. Twenty transects were surveyed, with at least two placed in each survey area. The desk-based data collection took in the entire survey area (with minor exceptions), but fieldwork was confined to the transects.

The survey covered archaeological remains relating to all periods of human activity, from early prehistory to the post-medieval and modern periods. The forms of archaeological remains recorded include buildings and
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ruins, other stone structures, earthworks, individual finds and below-ground deposits. Most of these were readily visible in the field. Buried deposits, in contrast, could only rarely be recorded during ground fieldwork. If visible as cropmarks or soilmarks, these are usually only recognisable from the air; alternatively, their presence may be suggested by scatters of finds in ploughed or disturbed ground.

1.1.3 Strategy and organisational background

The Marches Uplands Survey was commissioned by English Heritage. Contributions in kind were provided by RCHME and Shropshire County Council. As the lead body for archaeological survey in England, RCHME staff provided expertise in defining levels of survey and field methods, and the organisation’s National Monuments Record (NMR) and Air Photography Unit (APU) made very significant contributions to data collection and fieldwork. Shropshire County Council’s archaeological staff provided essential local knowledge and information. The project was guided and advised by a Steering Group, with members from the contributing organisations, in addition to regional and academic specialists.

Contacts with archaeologists working in Wales were an important aspect of the survey. The Welsh Uplands Initiative had started before the Marches Uplands Survey began, and has been running over a much longer timescale, covering many of the upland areas in Wales. The extensive survey techniques used were compatible with work in Wales, and to date (2003) some of the overall conclusions from both the Marches Uplands Survey and the Welsh Uplands Initiative are very similar.

Since the project began, various reorganisations have caused amalgamation and disaggregation of some of the organisations involved in the project, so RCHME and English Heritage are now one, and Hereford and Worcester County Council was split into Herefordshire Council and Worcestershire County Council in 1998.

Further information on the project is available from a variety of sources. This article is a condensed version of the project report (Dinn and Edwards 1999, 104pp), held in the Herefordshire and the Shropshire Sites and Monuments Records (SMR) and at Worcestershire County Archaeological Service. Individual reports were compiled on each of the 20 fieldwork transects, and on other aspects of the project, and copies of these are held in each county SMR. The project databases, containing detail on specific sites, have also been deposited with the county SMRs.

1.1.4 Aims and objectives

The primary aim of the Marches Uplands Survey was to improve the management of archaeological sites and landscapes in the western uplands of Herefordshire and Shropshire, through improved understanding of existing records and their relationship with the field remains. This was achieved through a more detailed series of objectives and tasks, listed in full in the project report (Dinn and Edwards 1999, 25).

1.2 Physical and archaeological background

1.2.1 General physical summary

The maximum extent of the survey area was 112 km from north to south (from Oswestry southwards to the Black Mountains), and 39 km from east to west. Within this were several discrete areas of upland and mountain, separated by river valleys and other lowlands. Some of these upland areas form isolated ranges extending well into England, especially in the central part of the survey area, while others are marginal to much larger areas of upland in Wales.

The six areas introduced above were defined in part by geographical separation, in part by characteristics of geology and topography. Their physical characteristics are covered in more detail in the full project report (Dinn and Edwards 1999, 17–23).

Geology

The survey areas are geologically diverse; while they include some of the best-known and most studied regions in British geology, in particular the Church Stretton area and the Ludlow Anticline, much of the available mapping was only generalised in nature (Earp and Hains 1971; Barclay et al 1988; Jackson 1990). The Long
Mynd survey area in particular shows great complexity. The surface geology in the uplands is overwhelmingly solid. Drift deposits (including gravels) are present only on the lower slopes and fringes of some of the areas; however, the erosive effects of glaciation are much in evidence in the uplands.

**Soils**

Very little of the area was covered by detailed published soil maps, so again it was necessary to rely on generalised mapping for an overview. The soil survey of the West Midlands (Mackney *et al* 1983; Ragg *et al* 1984) showed a distribution of soils in the upland areas which is similar to that in the neighbouring lowlands, with a few specific exceptions. Brown earth soils are widespread, and gleyed soils rather less so. The main exception to this pattern is the Long Mynd, where there are extensive areas of podzols and stagnogleys; podzols are also present on the higher parts of the Black Mountains. Mainly the soils are acidic, with calcareous soils only present over the limestones of the Ludlow Anticline. Some colluvium is present on steeper slopes, but it had not been extensively mapped.

The impact of soils on the distribution of archaeological discovery is shown in Whimster’s (1989) study of cropmarks in the central Marches. This found a very good correlation between soil mapping units and the distribution of cropmarks, which mostly occurred on the brown earth soils.

**Topography**

The central Marches share characteristics with both mid-Wales and the English Midlands. Landforms in the region are rarely dramatic, and even the higher hills have few steep slopes. The Stiperstones, the Long Mynd and the Black Mountains stand out in this respect. Bare rock outcrops and faces are also rare. Most of the hill ranges rise, often gently, to plateau-like tops, though the terrain is broken in many areas by steep-sided dingles where minor watercourses have eroded the soft bedrock. Most of the river valleys in the uplands are small and carry only minor streams, but some areas, in particular the Clun Forest, are characterised by broad and flat-bottomed valleys.

**Land-use**

Land-use in the region at the start of the survey in the early 1990s varied from intensive arable to areas of very poor mountain grazing. The bias was very heavily towards farming; there were few built-up areas (either residential or industrial), and mineral extraction on anything but the smallest scale was very rare. At the time of the survey there were no wind farms, and land used for leisure activities was only locally significant.

Moorland and rough grazing were generally much less prevalent than in recent historic times, though evidence from areas such as Stapeley Hill and the Long Mynd indicated that areas which had reverted to open moorland were cultivated at various stages in the past. Elsewhere, for instance in the Black Mountains, it appeared that the limits of cultivation have slowly been extended up the hillsides, and it was possible to begin to discern broad stages of enclosure. Where access is easy and the conditions permit, enclosed and improved grassland extended to the very tops of the hills, to a height of over 400m in many places. Arable cultivation was relatively scarce, though some areas were cropped in rotation with ley grassland. By far the majority of the survey area was occupied by grassland; in contrast to lowland grassland, in the uplands it has generally been necessary to improve the land by ploughing and drainage, so that few earlier earthworks survive. Very large areas of open rough grazing were enclosed in the mid to late nineteenth century, with the last major phase of this process taking place in the 1940s and 1950s.

Deciduous (often relict) woodland tended to survive only on steep slopes which were otherwise unsuitable for cultivation. There are coniferous plantations in many areas, again often on steep slopes, with the greatest increases in acreage occurring after the Second World War.
1.2.2 Summary of previous archaeological knowledge

Selattyn survey area

Archaeologically this upland was one of the least known areas in Shropshire, though there are several well-preserved stretches of Offa’s Dyke. Some stray finds of prehistoric material had been made, and barrows, standing stones, and enclosures and hillforts occur in and around the survey area.

Long Mountain survey area

The archaeology of the area is characterised by a number of cropmarks, mostly of enclosures, and earthworks are rare. The preservation and diversity of sites on the Welsh side of the border (Britnell 1982) are not matched by those known on the eastern side of the hill, though this could be at least partly explained by the levels of fieldwork carried out prior to the survey.

Long Mynd survey area

The geological variability of the Long Mynd area is paralleled by a range of archaeological remains not seen elsewhere in the central Marches. All periods from early prehistory to the post-medieval are well represented.

Although Neolithic finds occurred widely, and there was evidence of Neolithic occupation at a number of sites, sites from the early Bronze Age were the earliest to survive as landscape features, including a large number of round barrows. On Stapeley Hill, at the western end of the survey area, there are two stone circles and burial cairns, forming part of a complex of sites which extends into Wales (Arnold 1990, 32); these may have been associated with the axe factory at Cwm Mawr, or perhaps with copper mining in the Stiperstones area. Later Bronze Age sites include the enclosures and cross-dykes on Stitt Hill, Ratlinghope. Other enclosures in the same area may be Iron Age (Bodbury Hill, The Lawley), Roman, or medieval (Novers Hill), though most are undated. There are several hillforts on the steep summits, including Caer Caradoc (Church Stretton) and Castle Ring (Stiperstones).

The uplands preserve little or no evidence of Roman activity (though Roman lead mining probably took place), but there were villas or substantial buildings in the lowlands around, at Linley Hall, Acton Scott, and Lea Cross. The central Shropshire basin is densely scattered with enclosure sites attributed to this period (Whimster 1989; Buteux et al 1993; Ellis et al 1994).

There are no major medieval features on the highest uplands of this area, although monastic sites (e.g. Kinnerton Grange), and castle sites (e.g. Castle Pulverbatch motte and bailey) occur on the lower slopes and upland fringes. Settlements with medieval origins are also situated on lower ground. Some or all of the field systems noted below may be of medieval or post-medieval date. The post-medieval period made a notable contribution to the landscape of the mining district around the Stiperstones, where there are extensive remains of mine workings, smelt-mills, and the associated patterns of dispersed settlement and enclosure.

Deserving special mention, though many are undated, are the earthwork field systems which are widespread in this area. The southern end of the Long Mynd provides the only example of small embanked ‘Celtic’ fields, but upland ridge and furrow cultivation was found at several locations on the Long Mynd and on Stapeley Hill, as well as elsewhere. Other examples included a co-axial field system on Wilderley Hill, at the north end of the Long Mynd.

Clun Forest survey area

Earthwork monuments in the Clun Forest area included enclosures and hillforts, castles, and several stretches of Offa’s Dyke and other linear earthworks. The very large number of flint and stone artefacts from the area reflects the activities of a small number of fieldworkers in the 1940s and 1950s, when many areas of upland were being ploughed, often for the first time. Recent aerial photographic survey had led to the discovery of many sites, including several cropmark enclosures; most of these are in the eastern part of the area.
Ludlow Anticline to Hergest Ridge survey area

The area preserved a number of well-known hillforts and earthwork castles, but archaeological sites of all types were thinly scattered and there had been no systematic work prior to this survey.

Black Mountains survey area

Archaeological work in the area had included some landscape survey (Skelton ed.) 1983), and during the middle years of the twentieth century this area was the focus of considerable activity, including excavation and the recording of large numbers of stray finds. The existing evidence, much of it in the form of flint finds, suggested that the valleys and ridges to the east of the Black Mountains were the most densely populated part of Herefordshire, at least in the Neolithic and early Bronze Age. Iron Age enclosures and hillforts also occur, and there are several medieval castles.

1.3 Archaeological survey and research

Because of the lack of systematic archaeological survey or coordinated research in the Marches Uplands, it had not usually been possible to set the major monuments into their context or to identify landscape features which might be associated.

1.3.1 General studies

When the Marches Uplands Survey commenced, there were a number of recent general studies of the archaeology of the region. The two most recent were by Stanford and Rowley. Stanford’s 1980 survey (partially updated in 1991) gave a traditional view, and was significant as the first archaeological study to treat the Welsh Marches as a meaningful unit. Rowley’s treatment of the region (1986) was able to take advantage of some of the more recent advances in archaeological knowledge, especially for the prehistoric periods. Both of these works provided important frameworks for considering the archaeology of the region. Both ranged across an extensive geographical region, extending from the Mersey and north-east Wales southwards to the Severn estuary, well into mid-Wales, and eastwards to Worcester.

1.3.2 Herefordshire

For Herefordshire, the most recent coverage was the Woolhope Club’s centenary volume of 1954; this encompassed summaries of archaeological research on the prehistoric and Roman periods, including the results of fieldwork carried out in the 1940s and early 1950s (Gavin Robinson 1954; Dudley 1954), as well as a series of historical essays on later periods. The major work of field survey was published in the 1930s (RCHME 1931, 1932, 1934), at a time when the scope of such work was much more limited than it is today. The Victoria County History made little progress in Herefordshire, completing only the introductory volume in 1908 (VCH 1908a).

Detailed landscape surveys, for instance the work around Peterchurch (Skelton 1983) or Leominster (Mills ed.) 1983), or the National Trust management survey of the Croft estate (Dalwood and Waller 1992), were ground-based, and not integrated with aerial survey at the same level. Recent publications of individual monument classes have covered barrows (Grinsell 1993) and castles (Stirling-Brown 1989).

1.3.3 Shropshire

The archaeology and landscape history of Shropshire had received more attention, including a popular summary (Rowley 1972). Bird’s History on the ground (1977) was idiosyncratic, but contained reports on a large amount of fieldwork in the south-western part of the county, including some important discoveries. The VCH (1908b, 1989a and b) continued to make an important contribution. There was no published RCHME survey of earthworks or buildings, though some field survey had been completed on Clee Hill and in Corvedale.

The North-West Wetlands Survey published an overview of prehistory in the Shropshire lowlands (Middleton and Wells 1990), as a preliminary to extensive survey. Whimster’s (1989) work on the aerial photographic
evidence provided a valuable counterbalance to interpretations based solely or largely on the evidence of earthworks and finds, and advances in aerial research were also published by Watson and Musson (1993). The Wroxeter Hinterland Survey carried out by Birmingham University Field Archaeology Unit was able to build on Whimster’s work in particular, and provided valuable new information on lowland settlement in the Iron Age and Roman periods. The timescales of the two projects were such that it has not been possible to integrate the conclusions of the Wroxeter Hinterlands Project into the Marches Uplands Survey.

1.3.4 Regional and period studies

A small number of regional period studies has been published. Sylvester (1969) covered the medieval period, against a broad chronological and geographical background. Lloyd Jones (1984) assessed settlement patterns in Herefordshire during later prehistory and the first millennium AD, based on a limited range of archaeological data. There is now an important historical study of the early medieval period (Gelling 1992), which covers both Herefordshire and Shropshire, but for this period there is very little archaeological evidence to draw on.

1.3.5 Excavated sites

A total of 81 excavations, often very small in scale, had taken place within the study area by the mid-1990s (Dinn and Edwards 1999, Appendix 3). Castles, hillforts and Offa’s Dyke figured largely, while there were several antiquarian excavations of barrows (including one of a pillow mound). The 1980s and 1990s saw a sharp increase in the number of excavations, though little of this was associated with development. The post-medieval period was particularly poorly represented. Only a small proportion of the excavations had been fully published.

2 Methodology and results

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 Project components

The understanding of the archaeology of the Marches Uplands which resulted from the project, and which is recounted below, resulted from a range of different project components. In addition to desk-based study and field survey, the project team carried out a palaeoenvironmental study and associated sample excavations on the Long Mynd. Four case studies were also carried out, to throw further light on some specific areas and issues which had been identified during the desk-based study and field survey. These were a study of the post-medieval lead mining landscape and settlement pattern in west Shropshire; a desk-based study of ‘Celtic’ field systems on the southern end of the Long Mynd; an examination of the reported condition of Offa’s Dyke within the survey area, and a management case study of a farm in the Black Mountains area of Herefordshire. Project reports were produced on each of these.

RCHME contributed a very substantial piece of work, the Marches Uplands Mapping Project, mapping all archaeological sites on existing aerial photographs across the whole survey area and also including the area in the flying programme for 1992.

Desk-based study

Enhancement of existing SMR records added 297 new sites to the original total of 1762 within the survey area. The new sites were recorded from the National Monuments Record, archaeological journals, books, Ordnance Survey 1st Edition 6’’ maps, and from aerial photographs.

A rapid assessment of the geology, topography, land-use and archaeological remains of the survey areas was then undertaken, to provide the basis for defining the field survey sample transects. The twenty transects were positioned perpendicular to the grain of the topography wherever possible, with between two and seven in each of the main survey areas. The aim was to achieve a balance between coverage and achievability, given the limited time-scale. The sum of the transect areas was 143.63 sq km (15.2% of the overall survey area) while the area actually surveyed was 118.82 sq km (12.6%).
Field survey

The level of detail of the field survey had been defined at the start of the project. As the Marches Uplands Survey was designed to assess the existing knowledge and understanding of the archaeology of the area, the purpose of the field survey was therefore to locate and characterise new and known archaeological sites over a wide area, rather than to survey a small number of known sites in great detail. This corresponds with ‘Level 1’ or Rapid Investigation survey as defined by RCHME (Bowden (ed.) 1999, 190). The field survey also aimed to assess the condition of known sites in order to identify any changes. The methodology used for rapid survey was adapted from that used by the Clwyd-Powys Archaeological Trust for extensive survey in upland areas (Silvester 1990). The recording of earthworks located by rapid survey was influenced by surveys in Cornwall (Johnson 1985; Johnson and Rose 1994).

A team of six spent eight months carrying out rapid survey in the winter/spring and autumn/winter of 1992. Sites and land-use were recorded on pro-forma record sheets and located on map overlays at a scale of 1:2500. Following the fieldwork, records were entered onto computer, and field map overlays were transcribed onto 1:2500 map sheets.

The fieldwork phase also included fieldwalking. This was limited to the small proportion of the survey area which was ploughed for arable or rotational pasture in autumn 1992. A rapid line-based method was adopted to allow location and broad definition of sites. This method was based on walking lines at 25m intervals and collecting finds from 50m long stints. Although this represents only a small proportion of the survey area as a whole, it is the most extensive programme of fieldwalking to have been carried out in the Marches Uplands.

Fieldwork summary

Fieldwork area 118.82 sq km
Rapid survey land parcels recorded 3368
Rapid survey sites recorded 2996
Number of land parcels fieldwalked 44
Fieldwalking area 2.10 sq km
Fieldwalking sites recorded 84

The Marches Uplands Mapping Project

The aerial photographic element of the Marches Uplands Survey was carried out by RCHME as part of the National Mapping Programme. The purpose of the NMP was to ‘map, document and classify, at a common scale and to a common standard, all archaeological sites and landscapes recorded in England on aerial photographs’ (Stoertz 1993, 1). The Marches Uplands Mapping Project (MUMP) covered an area larger than the Marches Uplands Survey area (as it was based on Ordnance Survey 6” quarter sheets); it used the methodology already established for the NMP, slightly adapted to suit the area (Stoertz 1993). The project started in 1993, and the initial phase of mapping archaeological sites from all oblique and some vertical aerial photographs was completed in 1994. The total MUMP area was 1650 sq km, within which a total of 4233 sites were recorded. Within the smaller Marches Uplands Survey area, 1764 sites were recorded by the MUMP. Only the results of the MUMP within the Marches Uplands Survey area are considered in this paper.

Palaeoenvironmental review

A review of palaeoenvironmental work carried out within and close to the Marches Uplands Survey area was carried out, and an assessment of palaeoenvironmental potential was made. The results of this form a project report (de Rouffignac 1992). The principal conclusion of this was that almost no palaeoenvironmental work had been carried out within the survey area, and very little in the surrounding region. The report also made recommendations for fieldwork, and small-scale sampling work took place in the Craswall area of Herefordshire, as well as on the Long Mynd.

Sample excavations on the Long Mynd

Limited sample excavation was carried out on three earthwork monuments on the Long Mynd, with the aim of assessing the preservation and potential of associated environmental material and recovering dating information
for each (Dinn et al 2006). The work was carried out in association with earthwork repairs being carried out by the National Trust. The earthworks sampled were the Shooting Box barrow (SA 00198), the Devil’s Mouth cross-dyke (SA 00251), and the High Park Cottage cross-dyke (Plate 1 SA 00199).

Case studies

Four case studies allowed specific areas, sites or themes to be covered in greater depth than was possible in the main project. A desk-based study of earthwork field systems on Black Knoll, Long Mynd (Edwards 1994) was carried out to inform discussion of this monument class, which is widespread in south Shropshire. Subsequently this led to a detailed field survey by RCHME of an Iron Age or Romano-British settlement identified within the complex (Ainsworth and Donachie 1995). Another desk-based study, of the South Shropshire mining district and its dispersed settlement and agricultural landscape (Dinn 1995), also responded to a concern about the survival of a fragile but important landscape. A ‘Whole Farm’ management plan, of an upland farm at Craswall, Herefordshire (Dinn et al 1995), aimed to provide an exemplar of an integrated study of archaeology, nature conservation, landscape and farming considerations, with contributions from the Herefordshire Wildlife Trust and the Farming and Wildlife Advisory Group. Finally, a desk-based assessment of the condition and management of scheduled parts of Offa’s Dyke within the Marches Uplands Survey area resulted in a confidential report to English Heritage (Edwards and Dinn 1994).

2.2 Results

2.2.1 Introduction

The different parts of the Marches Uplands Survey introduced above resulted in different types of information. The desk-based survey, the MUMP, the field survey, and the Mining and Farm surveys all collected data, which was then computerised, and could be quantified in terms of numbers of sites. The other component projects served to enhance or synthesise understanding of known sites, areas or themes.
The project reports on each of the twenty transects discuss the results of the survey for each of the fieldwork areas. These reports provide more detail about archaeological sites and the historic landscape. Information from fieldwork was integrated with the results of the MUMP, and compared with what was known about the areas before the survey commenced. Each report includes an assessment of the archaeological evidence, an account of the historic landscape, and data listings for SMR, MUMP and fieldwork results for the transect area. They do not include copies of the 1:2500 survey maps, which were deposited with the Herefordshire and Shropshire SMRs.

Quantifications of numbers of sites recorded by the different parts of the project are introduced and discussed in the following sections. However, because of inherent and unavoidable inconsistencies in the definition of what is a ‘site’, the aim is to present general trends and differences, rather than to make comments on precise details. Numbers of sites are given only in the first section below; the remaining sections use percentages.

2.2.2 Results of each part of the survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMRs and survey phases</th>
<th>Number of sites recorded</th>
<th>Number of new sites added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;W SMR</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrops SMR</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk-based survey</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUMP sites</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field survey sites</td>
<td>2996</td>
<td>2864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before the survey commenced, a total of 1762 sites was recorded on the two counties’ SMRs for the survey area. Desk-based survey added only a further 297 sites to that total. The majority of the new sites recorded were derived from the Ordnance Survey First Edition 6’’ County Series maps, to which neither SMR had previously had easy access. This revealed that the SMRs had already accessioned information from most existing sources of archaeological information.

The number of new sites recorded by the MUMP was an indication of the value of the ongoing NMP. Vertical and oblique aerial photographs taken since the 1930s are a significant source of information on archaeological sites, but SMRs have rarely had the opportunity to record this data.

That a large number of new sites would result from fieldwork was expected from the start of the project. In Herefordshire, a survey of Peterchurch, Vowchurch and Turnastone parishes carried out in the 1980s increased the numbers of recorded sites very considerably (Skelton 1983).

2.2.3 Results: dates of sites recorded

Percentages of sites by period for each part of the survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prehistoric</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Roman</th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Medieval</th>
<th>Post-medieval</th>
<th>Modern</th>
<th>Undated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(prehistoric)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>medieval</td>
<td>(medieval)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;W SMR</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrops SMR</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk-based survey</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUMP</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The date ranges of the two SMRs were predictably broad. The difference between the two in the post-medieval period was because the fully computerised Shropshire SMR did not include buildings when the Marches Uplands Survey began. The majority of post-medieval sites recorded on the Hereford and Worcester SMR were listed buildings.

The large proportion of post-medieval sites recorded during the desk-based part of the survey was also unremarkable, as the majority of these sites were recorded from Ordnance Survey First Edition 6’’ County Series maps.

The date range of sites recorded by the MUMP was broad, but included relatively few prehistoric and Roman sites. This was also reflected in the date range of previously unrecorded sites from aerial photographs. Only 31 new sites (3%) were prehistoric, Roman or ‘unknown prehistoric’ (i.e. prehistoric or Roman) in date. For medieval, ‘unknown medieval’ (early medieval or later), post-medieval, modern and unknown, however, the total of new sites recorded was 1162, or 97% of new sites recorded by the Marches Uplands Mapping Project.
2.2.4 Results: types of site recorded

Percentages of sites for each part of the survey by site type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Agricultural</th>
<th>Artefact</th>
<th>Boundary</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Burial</th>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>Defensive</th>
<th>Entertainment</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Natural</th>
<th>Parkland</th>
<th>Religious</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Unclassified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;W SMR</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrops SMR</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk-based</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUMP</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.5 Results: site form

Percentages of sites for each part of the survey by physical site form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Buried remains</th>
<th>Circumstantial</th>
<th>Cropmark</th>
<th>Documentary</th>
<th>Earthwork</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Natural</th>
<th>Other structure</th>
<th>Placename</th>
<th>Ruin</th>
<th>Soilmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;W SMR</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrops SMR</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk-based</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUMP</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proportion of sites which could not be dated was quite high (32% of all sites), but this was expected. Aerial photographic work relies on morphological classification, and although the morphology of some sites is very period-specific, in many cases it is not. Without dating evidence from fieldwork or other sources, such sites cannot be dated with certainty. Certain types of features have an overall currency, however, which helps the division of features into the ‘unknown prehistoric’ or ‘unknown medieval’ categories. Association with other features of known historic context can also contribute to assigning features to these broad date ranges.

A very large majority of sites recorded during fieldwork were post-medieval in date. As with aerial photography, however, dating sites proved to be difficult in many cases. Over half of all the sites recorded could not be assigned dates in the field, but dating was refined during post-fieldwork analysis, when dates or date ranges were assigned for most of these. This was principally achieved by comparison with landscape features recorded on historic maps.

2.2.4 Results: types of site recorded

The categories used to define site type were those in use by the SMRs at the start of the project. These corresponded with the Hereford and Worcester SMR ‘site type general’ category (derived originally from the specification for SMRs developed by English Heritage in the 1980s).

The types of site recorded were largely predictable, given the data collection methods used. The two SMRs again included a broad range of sites. The most obvious difference between the two was the proportion of buildings recorded, as has already been noted. The high proportion of artefacts recorded in the Shropshire SMR could be attributed almost entirely to the activities of fieldworkers in the 1950s, largely in the Clun Forest area, who collected flints and other finds, often from fields which were being ploughed up for the first time. No other area of upland Shropshire or Herefordshire had had this degree of attention.

Desk-based survey also covered a broad range of site types. The high percentage of industrial sites recorded (37%) was accounted for by the numbers of quarries previously unrecorded in the survey area. These are shown on the Ordnance Survey First Edition County Series maps, either as ‘Quarry’ or as ‘Old quarry’. Agricultural (15%) and settlement (16%) were the other types of site which are best represented.

Percentages for the MUMP were slightly different, and fewer types of site were represented, largely because the method of investigation ruled out the discovery of certain site types, such as artefacts. Agricultural sites (55%) formed the majority, followed by settlement (15%) and industry (10%).

Agricultural sites were again well-represented in the percentages for fieldwork (50%). Communications (23%) and industrial (16%) were the next highest categories. Although some of the general site types appeared not to be represented, this was because there were only very small numbers of records for these, and they amounted to less than 0.5%.

The small numbers of finds from fieldwalking have been covered in more detail in the finds assessment report (Hurst 1993).

2.2.5 Results: site form

The physical form of sites recorded was principally a reflection of the methods of data collection used in each case. The large proportion of sites recorded by the MUMP which were cropmarks (19%) was interesting, however. The majority of the survey area was under pasture, and only a minority of the area would be expected to show cropmarks. This proportion suggested that there may be more buried sites across the area as a whole than those already identified.

2.2.6 Results: land-use

During fieldwork, the land-use of every land parcel surveyed was recorded. Although this is expressed as numbers of land parcels, not as proportions by area, the table gives a useful overview.
Land-use in land parcels recorded during fieldwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land-use</th>
<th>number of land parcels</th>
<th>percentage of land parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved pasture</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasture</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rough pasture</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arable</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm/house</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road/track</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not recorded/other</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathland</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3368</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table shows, the majority of fields (52.1%) were recorded as ‘improved pasture’. This term is used for grassland improved by ploughing and reseeding, generally carried out on a three to five year cycle. If the arable fields are added to the percentage of improved pasture, the percentage of land parcels recorded during the survey which are being regularly ploughed rises to 60.3%.

Heathland formed a very small proportion of the recorded land parcels, given that the area was classed as upland. In terms of area, the proportion was probably larger, given that a single ‘parcel’ of heath or moorland frequently covers a considerable area. The proportion in the different survey area subdivisions varied, with the Long Mynd and Black Mountains survey areas (Fig. 1) including higher proportions of heathland than the other areas.

The land parcels recorded as woodland included 2.7% which were recorded as coniferous woodland, 2.3% recorded as deciduous, and 5.4% which were not differentiated. The same caution must be applied as with heathland, since individual parcels of woodland too tend to be extensive. Nevertheless, this indicated a relatively low proportion of coniferous plantations in 1992 in comparison with some other upland areas in Britain.

### 2.2.7 Results: condition of sites

An assessment was made of the condition of all the sites recorded during fieldwork, using a five-point scale similar to that used by English Heritage for monitoring the condition of scheduled monuments. Although such judgements can be difficult to make, the resulting information demonstrates that the condition of earthworks in the Marches Uplands Survey area was not particularly good.

#### Condition of earthworks recorded during fieldwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Percentage of earthworks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2.8 Discussion

Several conclusions were drawn from the raw survey data. These related to methodology, interpretation and resource management. They have particular bearing on the quality of existing information, and on methods for the survey and interpretation of new sites.

**SMRs**

It was clear from the results of the desk-based survey that the two counties’ SMRs constituted a good index of previously recorded archaeological sites. However, the number of new sites recorded by the MUMP indicated...
that existing aerial photographs can contain significant new data. The numbers of new sites from fieldwork confirmed the impression at the beginning of the survey that the SMRs were not representative of all the surviving evidence. However, it must be emphasised that the SMRs were found to be fully representative of the best-known and best-preserved monument types. Figures 2 and 3 show the distribution of sites recorded before and after the survey.

Survey techniques

No single method can produce a comprehensive record of archaeological sites, and (as can be seen from the tables above), a combination of different survey techniques is required to obtain the best results. Desk-based data collection produced the fewest new sites, although cartographic study was useful. Aerial photographic analysis produced the broadest date range of sites, and a significant number of new prehistoric sites. Fieldwork is, however, essential, to complete an assessment of archaeological sites in an area, and some form of intrusive investigation is normally required to allow an accurate assessment of date. Given that 2996 sites were recorded from 12.6% of the total survey area, fieldwork at the same level across the whole area would produce in the region of 23,000 sites.

Post-medieval sites

By far the largest class of sites recorded during the rapid ground survey were earthworks which were interpreted as resulting from post-medieval agricultural activities. Because of the scale and extent of their survival, and the lack (until recently) of an appreciation of their significance, these monuments are vulnerable to current (and probably future) agricultural practices. Recording more recent features over large areas has substantial resource implications, but is necessary if the management of these monuments and landscapes is to be given proper consideration.

Dating of sites

Dating earthworks and cropmarks is inevitably an inexact science. In the absence of documentary or other supporting evidence, dates can be assigned only on the basis of morphological similarity to known monument types, or through physical relationships to monuments of known date. This aspect of the work was more obvious in the results of the MUMP shown above, which used three categories to indicate features of uncertain date range: ‘undated’ (32% of MUMP records), ‘unknown prehistoric’ (3%) and ‘unknown medieval’ (30%). The proportion of rapid survey records which were described as ‘undated’ in the field was 57%, slightly less than the total of MUMP records of uncertain date (65%). The majority of undated rapid survey records were assigned to a date range during the analysis stage of the survey, mostly through comparison with the First Edition Ordnance Survey County Series maps. Even after this, however, 4% of records could not be assigned to a date range. Figure 4 shows undated sites recorded by the MUMP and by field survey.

Current land-use

Contrary to some expectations, open heathland and rough grassland formed only a small proportion of the areas surveyed. Over 60% of the land parcels recorded was subject to regular ploughing, for arable or grassland improvement. While the Marches Uplands Survey made a ‘point in time’ assessment of land-use, this could be given some time-depth by comparison with the Shropshire Wildlife Trust’s surveys (Kohler et al 1989; Tucker 1991), which showed that the process of agricultural improvement had affected wide areas of western Shropshire in the 1980s. This process is equally damaging to earthwork monuments and to the chances of field survey actually detecting those earthworks which survive.

Vulnerability

The vulnerability of earthwork sites in the Marches Uplands is borne out by the table showing condition of the earthworks recorded during fieldwork. Of these, 62.5% are recorded as in ‘fair’ condition, with only 14%
recorded as in 'good', and 0.5% 'very good', condition. One reason for this is almost certainly that regular ploughing is gradually eroding upstanding earthwork sites in areas of rotational arable.

The Walton Basin Project (Gibson 1999) recorded relevant data from an adjacent lowland area in Wales. A number of barrows had been surveyed in the early 1970s, and were resurveyed in 1993. The reduction in height recorded varied from 0.4–1.0m. Although some of these barrows were scheduled, they had been subjected to regular ploughing.

3 Survey contribution, by period

3.1 Introduction

This section gives an account of the archaeology of the Marches Uplands Survey area, organised chronologically.

The extent and diversity of the survey area must be borne in mind in making any general statements. The southern end of the Marches Uplands Survey area is closer to central Wiltshire or to Exmoor, for instance, than it is to Oswestry at the northern end. Uniformity should not therefore be assumed.

The marginal location of many of the Marches uplands in relation to Wales means that associations with the more extensive uplands in Wales are often more important than those within the survey area. Furthermore, very few parts of the survey area are further than 5 km from an area of lowland or a major river valley, and therefore understanding of the neighbouring lowlands is often critical to fuller knowledge of the uplands, regardless of any closer or more structured connections through, for instance, transhumance or land tenure.

Conventional period divisions have been used: the prehistoric period has been subdivided into Palaeolithic and Mesolithic; Neolithic and earlier Bronze Age; and later Bronze Age and Iron Age. There is a short discussion of modern earthworks and other monuments.

A pair of distribution maps is given for each of the main periods discussed; these cover the northern and southern parts of the survey area separately (roughly equivalent to Shropshire and Herefordshire). A set of standard symbols, based on a simplified classification of site form, is used, and the maps include all records from all the main sources used in the survey.

3.2 Palaeolithic and Mesolithic

Palaeolithic material is rare in almost all upland areas in Britain, and where it does occur it is only on the upland fringes. There were no recorded sites of this period within the survey area, and none were added by the Marches Uplands Survey.

In upland areas of Britain, Mesolithic material is most frequent on the upland fringes; in the south Pennines, finds are commonest between c. 360 and 490m (Mellars 1986, fig. 16). Stratified Mesolithic finds and occupation sites are rare. Recent study of palaeoenvironmental evidence suggests that human activity in the early Mesolithic could be described as transient, with hints of local impact on woodlands and soils. In the later Mesolithic, however, there is evidence for widespread management of woodlands and their edges (Simmons 1996, 224). Mellars (1986) summarised evidence for the Mesolithic in the uplands of England and Wales. The corpus of worked flints for the period (Wymer 1977) provides the most consistent assessment of the quality of the records for the survey area. Nearly all Mesolithic records from the area (a total of 29 finds, 21 from Shropshire and 8 from Herefordshire) were chance finds, and few of the records represent more than a single item. Stanford (1980, 43) noted the tendency for small quantities of Mesolithic material to occur among much larger collections of later flints, which suggests that more sustained and intensive fieldwork may be necessary to allow sites of this period to be identified. Half of the previously recorded finds were from the Clun Forest area. A perforated macehead from The Roveries (SA 01221) was the only reliably stratified find from the whole survey area, from a buried soil layer below the hillfort rampart.

Many of the finds from the Black Mountains were stratified below peat. Gavin Robinson reported some probable Mesolithic flints from Cefn Hill (HSMR 164), apparently from the edge of a former lake or pool; this was in a very similar level hilltop situation to the recently published Waun Fignen Felen (Barton et al 1995), and at almost the same elevation (475m). The eastern summit ridge of the Black Mountains (at between 600 and 700m) has recently been a prolific source of flints, which have been collected from the eroding peat at several locations. Many of these sites have included Mesolithic material (A. Foxall, C. S. Briggs, pers comm).

Study of palaeoenvironmental evidence from the survey area and nearby suggests that Mesolithic woodland clearance or management was occurring, both at Church Stretton and the Breiddin (Musson et al 1991). This theory is strengthened by the evidence of lowland alluviation outside the survey area. The earliest alluvial
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sequences at Wellington, Herefordshire (HSMR 5522), were of Mesolithic date, and were associated with the formation of peat deposits over the glacial gravels, now buried by as much as 3m of alluvium. This is interpreted as evidence for woodland clearance on the surrounding hills and uplands, leading to soil erosion and deposition of alluvium in the valleys (E. Pearson pers comm; see also Roseff 1992; Dinn 1996b).

From the Marches Uplands Survey, Mesolithic finds were identified from two of the 20 fields which produced flints (MUS 13704, 41659: Hurst 1993). Figures 5 and 6 show the distributions of Mesolithic sites and findspots within the survey area, including all Marches Uplands Survey records.

In summary, while there is little direct archaeological evidence for human activity in the uplands area, palaeoenvironmental evidence indicates that woodland clearance was taking place on quite a large scale.

3.3 Neolithic to earlier Bronze Age

3.3.1 Upland areas in Britain

While there is generally only slight evidence for upland settlement during the Neolithic (Darvill 1986b, 24), the early Bronze Age marks the high water mark in upland land exploitation before the medieval period (Lynch 1986), and woodland clearance may have been rapid. Survey in many of the upland areas of England and Wales, from Dartmoor to the Cheviots, has indicated the intensive nature of occupation and agriculture. The recorded evidence includes field systems, barrows, and both enclosed and unenclosed settlement. Palaeoenvironmental reconstruction, in association with archaeological survey, for instance at Shaugh Moor, Dartmoor (Balaam et al 1982) and Cefn Gwnffiwrwrd, mid-Wales (Chambers 1983) has been critical in understanding developments in this period of climatic optimum.

Continuity over long periods of time is evident in both site types and locations, especially in ritual sites. Identified settlement sites are rare. Although findspots are the largest category of identified sites of this period, many are poorly recorded and imprecisely dated.

3.3.2 Marches Uplands Survey area and environs

The ‘fossil landscapes’ which have been identified elsewhere in upland Britain do not seem to occur in the Marches uplands, largely because much of the area is under cultivation. While some elements can be recognised, only a restricted range of monument types datable to the Neolithic and early Bronze Age have been recorded in this area: principally barrows and ring-ditches, cist burials, and pits associated with apparent settlement activity. Sites of other types, such as enclosed or unenclosed settlements, field systems, and ritual sites, largely remain to be identified. Datable cropmarks in this area have tended to reflect the same range of sites (identified on the basis of morphological comparison with sites already recognised). There are very large numbers of lithic finds, though few have been made recently or in the context of systematic fieldwalking.

Arnold (1990, 24) noted an ‘explosion of data’ between the Neolithic and Bronze Age in Montgomeryshire, and this can certainly be seen here in numbers of field monuments, though not in findspots. A difference in site and finds distributions is evident between Neolithic and Bronze Age, with Neolithic sites concentrated in the Black Mountains foothills and the south-eastern part of the Clun Forest, and Bronze Age more widely distributed on the Long Mynd, Stiperstones and Stapeley Hill, the Clun Forest, and higher in the Black Mountains foothills.

Evidence for continuing woodland clearance was inferred from the presence of charcoal in deposits from the Breiddin from around 3000 BC onwards, with a decline in pine noted in the pollen record from around 2750 BC (Musson et al 1991). At Dorstone Hill unidentified charcoal was collected, with radiocarbon dating giving dates from the Neolithic period (Pye 1967, 1969).

Prior to the Marches Uplands Survey, plant macrofossil remains of this period had not been recovered from any sites within the survey area. The limited sampling exercise on the Long Mynd (Dinn et al 2006) produced evidence of an episode of burning, which accompanied the construction of the Shooting Box barrow (SA 00198), and the carbonised material recovered included wood charcoal, seeds and cereal grains, bramble thorns, nuts and tubers. There was also reasonable pollen preservation. Nearby, Neolithic charred plant remains were recovered from Bromfield (Colledge 1982) and from Trelystan, Powys (Britnell 1982); however, these remains did not include any charred cereal grains. This has been interpreted not as evidence for absence of cultivation in the region, but as a possible indication of exchange between arable and pastoral communities (Hillman 1982).

Nearly all bone recovered from excavations consisted of human bone from excavated barrows and cist burials, and many of these sites were not excavated under modern conditions. Bone in general does not survive
well in the survey area due to the acidity of the soils, unless it has been cremated, as at Bromfield (Stanford 1982), Trelstan (Britnell 1982) and Four Crosses (Warrilow et al 1986).

Unlike other parts of Britain with metalliferous deposits, there are as yet no suggestions of early mining in south-west Shropshire.

Field systems

In contrast with many other uplands (e.g. Dartmoor; Fleming 1988), no early prehistoric field boundaries or systems have been recognised. There is evidence for grassland cover on the Long Mynd in the early Bronze Age (Dinn et al 2006); this could well have been unenclosed. Clearance cairns have frequently been recorded as part of Bronze Age field systems elsewhere, but while they were commonly encountered in the field survey, only one, on the Long Mynd (MUS 40494/03), was thought likely to be early. The sample excavation at the Shooting Box barrow on the Long Mynd (SA 00198) revealed evidence of a turf construction, with very little stone present. It is possible that little clearance took place, or indeed was required, on the Long Mynd.

Settlement

Settlement sites of the Neolithic to early Bronze Age are rare everywhere in Britain, and it is probable that there were few substantial stone structures. Few settlement sites have been identified in the Marches; most of these are chance finds from excavations which produced no surface indications. Occupation deposits have been recognised at Pontesford Hill (SA 01055; Barker 1972) and The Roveries (SA 01221; Shropshire SMR), buried under hillfort earthworks. This does not necessarily indicate any sort of continuity of activity, but may result from a common interest in hilltop or hillside siting. Many, if not most, of the excavated hillforts in the region have produced some form of evidence of earlier use.

Several sites in the Black Mountains area have produced evidence of Neolithic or Bronze Age settlement. At Dorstone Hill (HSMR 1551), the excavated evidence comprised occupation surfaces, hearths, a pit (see below), and stake- and post-holes. Flints and pottery from the site were dated to the Neolithic (Pye 1967; 1969). Two areas on Cefn Hill (sites A and B; both referenced as HSMR 164) produced large numbers of flints and stone tools, which were dated to the Neolithic (Site A) and Bronze Age (Site B). These were apparently stratified within occupation deposits, but no structural remains were recorded (Gavin Robinson 1947). There was also no structural evidence from two claimed settlement sites at Craswall (Abbey Farm, HSMR 162, and Birches Farm, HSMR 161), which were represented only by concentrations of flint and stone finds (Gavin Robinson 1951). None of these sites has been fully published.

The analysis of aerial photographic and fieldwalking evidence suggested the presence of a late Neolithic to early Bronze Age settlement at Bryn Dadlu, Mainstone (SA 04404; MUS 41659); this was the only settlement site in the region where something of the form could be reconstructed. On this high (360m) south-facing slope, cropmarks (MU.45.2.1–5) indicated an unenclosed settlement consisting of five hut-circles. The flint scatter collected (18 flints; MUS 41659/01) was far greater than any other recorded during the survey, though it was not confined to the area of the cropmarks.

Beaker pits have been excavated at irregular intervals across the surrounding lowlands (e.g. Rock Green, Ludlow: Carver and Hummler 1991; Bromfield: Stanford 1982), and there was an upland example from Collfryn (Britnell 1989, 104); these very characteristic oval pits have usually been found only during the excavation of more extensive sites (Gibson 1982, 39–41). A Neolithic pit reported from the Dorstone Hill settlement (Pye 1967) appears to have been similar to these. A small number of other possible settlement sites (Haye Park, Richard’s Castle, Herefordshire: HSMR 12656, and Ratlinghope: SA 07071) have not been securely identified. No burnt mounds have been recognised.

Ritual and burial sites

A series of large and important ritual sites has been identified in the surrounding lowlands, including Sarn-y-bryn-caled (Gibson 1994), the Walton basin sites (Musson 1995; Gibson 1999), and Stretford, Wistanstow (Whimster 1989, 36–7). These comprise enclosures, cursus and henges, and at Hindwell in the Walton basin a massive palisaded enclosure (Gibson 1999). Possible henges have also been located in the Wye valley, around Winforton. The only major exception to the lowland distribution is the group of stone circles on Corndon and Stapeley hills, which includes Mitchell’s Fold and Black Marsh. A more widely distributed class of ritual
monument in the Marches uplands is the ring-cairn; these are known to occur at locations in the Black Mountains (HSMR 13082) and Clun Forest (SA 01162, 02533). Single standing stones are widely distributed but scarce.

The Black Mountains mark the north-western extent of the Cotswold-Severn long barrow distribution. Several survive as earthworks in the eastern foothills, while the best known of the group is Arthur’s Stone (HSMR 1528), where only the chamber stands above ground. Identified Neolithic burial sites are almost totally absent from the rest of the area. However, round barrows are much more frequent and widely distributed, occurring both in the higher uplands as earthworks (some of these are stone-built cairns) and in cultivated areas as cropmark ring-ditches. Few have been excavated, and virtually none recently. Consequently it is impossible to say whether the pattern of continuity from Neolithic to Bronze Age, as seen, for instance, at Trelystan (Britnell 1982) in the uplands, or Bromfield (Hughes et al 1995) in the lowlands, is matched within the survey area. The concentration of over 35 round barrows on the Long Mynd is very striking, and the results of the Marches Uplands Survey as well as other recent fieldwork have indicated that this number could easily be augmented by further survey of this area. An earthwork barrow at Stanley Knap, Clunbury (SA 03104), is surrounded by an indistinct cropmark complex which may represent a more extensive burial or ritual site. While there are small groupings of barrows and ring-ditches at several locations (this pattern is echoed in the distribution of ring-ditches in the Severn valley (Watson 1991)), barrow cemeteries as such appear to be absent, although they are of course present in the lowlands, most notably at Bromfield (Hughes et al 1995). However, parts of the Long Mynd could be argued to be an extensive cemetery. The two barrows at Trelystan proved to be part of a long-lived cemetery including smaller barrows, and the excavation of site has demonstrated the complexity which may be concealed by the apparently simple barrow earthworks. Some additional details of burial mound structure have been revealed by fieldwork. At Stanley Knap, cropmark evidence has indicated that the earthwork barrow was surrounded by a ditch, now completely infilled; the small trench excavated at the Shooting Box barrow (SA 00198; Dinn et al 2006) showed that the mound was partially constructed of turfs; and ploughing for grassland improvement at the Llan-oleu cairn, Craswall, disturbed part of a stone kerb (Plate 2, HSMR 6127).

Single inhumation burials in cists, usually associated with Beakers, are by contrast rare, and have been recorded in the southern part of the study area only: Aymestrey Pit (HSMR 7060; Woodiwiss 1989), Olchon Court (two adjacent cists: HSMR 1585; Marshall 1932), and Trelan Farm, Craswall (HSMR 5493; unpub). Further possible examples were at Upper Llanon Farm (HSMR 1010: Marshall 1938, LXXIX), and Pentwyn
Farm (HSMR 1011). At Trelan Farm and Upper Llanon Farm the cists were in barrows. Lowland sites in the surrounding areas have been recorded at Brinsop (HSMR 3208: Watkins 1931, 134–5) and Wellington, Herefordshire, (HSMR 5522: Harrison et al 1999).

The distributions of ring ditches and earthwork barrows reflect differences in survival and detection. Earthwork barrows survive on the higher, uncultivated, uplands, and the ring-ditches of ploughed-out barrows are identified as cropmarks in the lowlands (including river valleys in largely upland areas, such as Oakfield, Bicton). Much of the Marches Uplands Survey area has been ploughed repeatedly, so earthworks do not survive. However, as the dominant land-use is pasture, cropmarks are very rarely visible. So the lack of barrows over much of the area may merely be due to difficulties in detecting plough-levelled sites.

Finds

Most of the finds of this period have been from fieldwalking (nearly all lithics), and there is very little excavated and far less stratified material. Lithics findspots made up a large proportion of the SMR records for the survey area (14% overall), but dominated the record for the Clun Forest area (over 35% of records). These finds were made over a long period (mostly in the 1940s-50s) and few have been subjected to modern study (the Palaeolithic and Mesolithic material is an exception to this; see above). Most of the dated flint finds (which represent a small proportion of the total) are Neolithic or early Bronze Age, and it may be significant that the later Bronze Age cemetery at Bromfield (Stanford 1982), one of the very few sites dated to that period in the region (see below), was almost completely devoid of lithics. Ceramic finds are rare, as can be seen from a recent review of excavated finds in the region (Hughes and Woodward 1995, 15–18); the distribution map published there could now be augmented with unpublished and more recently excavated material from several sites.

3.3.3 Contribution of the Marches Uplands Survey (Figs. 7 and 8)

Data collection produced a number of records of earthworks and findspots. New sites added by the Marches Uplands Survey fieldwork reflected the two major categories recorded on the SMRs, comprising three barrows (one probable and two possible sites) and twenty flint records. The MUMP identified no Neolithic sites within the survey area, but did record 62 Bronze Age sites, three of which were previously unrecorded.

3.4 Later prehistory: later Bronze Age to Iron Age

3.4.1 Upland areas in Britain

Nationally, the later prehistoric period presents a steady retreat from the highest uplands, with evidence of a more intensive and structured use of the hillslopes and lowlands, including fortified sites, a process which may have led ultimately to the tribal pattern seen at the end of the Iron Age. Excavation for this period in the uplands has mostly been confined to hillforts. However, the changes which can be seen on the lower ground must have been accompanied by significant changes in upland land-use, which may be visible in the archaeological record. Characteristic sites in both upland and lowland include the massive earthworks of hillforts, smaller settlement enclosures (which still have a defensive aspect in many cases), and ‘ranch boundaries’ and systems of smaller fields. Finds are generally rare, with a decline and eventual cessation of the use of flint, while the other uses of stone have until recently been poorly understood. The picture for the uplands of England and Wales has been summarised by Lynch (1986) and Cunliffe (1986).

3.4.2 Marches Uplands Survey area and environs

No aspect of the later Bronze Age or Iron Age is well understood in the region, with the possible exception of the hillforts, which have dominated the study of later prehistory here even more than nationally. There is an apparent decline, both in the numbers of sites identified for the middle to later Bronze Age and Iron Age in the survey area, and in the range of site types represented, though there are hints of relationships between sites, and even organised landscapes, in some areas. The middle to later Bronze Age is particularly enigmatic, represented by not much more than a small number of linear earthworks and metalwork finds, with occasional lowland sites such as the Bromfield flat cemetery (Stanford 1982) standing out. While most of the limited excavated data
from the region is from hillforts (excavations in the survey area have been even fewer), in practice much of this work had been on a very small scale.

The clear majority of known sites, as opposed to findspots, are earthworks; most of the cropmark sites which may prove to be later prehistoric are not securely dated. Finds are rare, but given soil conditions and the fragile nature of Iron Age pottery and metalwork this may be a reflection of poor survival and the difficulty of detection rather than a real absence of material. The lack of findspots was a pattern which continued into the succeeding periods.

Environmental material reflects the range of excavations carried out on sites of this period. Within the survey area Stanford’s excavations at Croft Ambrey hillfort (Stanford 1974a) produced large quantities of charcoal, some of which was identified as oak. Preservation of charred plant remains was poor but wheat and hazel were identified. Over 7000 fragments of animal bone were also recovered, and these included both domesticated and wild species.

Waterlogged wood was recovered from two upland Iron Age sites close to the survey area: Collfryn (Britnell 1982) and from Buckbean pond on the Breiddin (Musson et al 1977; Musson et al 1991).

Agriculture and land divisions

A limited number of earthworks which are potentially related to later prehistoric agriculture or land boundaries have been recorded in the region. These consist of ‘Celtic’ fields, linear earthworks (‘ranch boundaries’), and perhaps strip fields, and most have been found on what is now unimproved or semi-improved upland. The only dated example was the linear earthwork at Devil’s Mouth (SA 00251) on the Long Mynd, where sampling carried out as part of the Marches Uplands Survey produced radiocarbon dates of 1520–1320 and 1510–1260 cal BC from the buried soil below the earthwork (Dinn et al 2006). This was only one of a number of linear and other earthworks on the Long Mynd which may be associated (Guilbert 1975), though it is uncertain how well the early dates represent the life-span of these monuments. It is similarly unclear how these extensive but apparently simple boundaries relate to the rather more complex ‘Celtic’ field system earthworks at Caer Caradoc (SA 00241), Black Knoll (SA 00421) or Bircher Common (HSMR 11362); there may be a chronological distinction, or they may be interrelated parts of a single system. Still less clear is the status of sites such as Stapeley Hill (SA 04328 and others), where linear earthworks, ‘stone rows’ and cultivation ridges form a distinctive though as yet undated pattern (Edwards 1994; Watson and Musson 1993, 23; Dinn 1996a, 18–19). Excavated cropmark field systems in the lowlands, for instance Sharpstones A (Barker et al 1991), and Duncote Farm (Ellis et al 1994) may add to our understanding of the form and dating of these earthwork sites.

Settlement and hillforts

There is very little evidence for unenclosed settlement in the region, with the exception of the newly-identified settlement at Black Knoll (Ainsworth and Donachie 1995). All the other settlement sites which have been recognised were enclosed by ditches and/or banks, and none in the survey area has yet been excavated. There is a fuller discussion of enclosure settlement sites below.

On the basis of data from excavated sites in the surrounding areas, a combination of circular and rectilinear buildings would be expected within these enclosures, though probably few finds. This applies equally to hillforts, such as the Breiddin (Musson et al 1991), and to enclosures, such as Sharpstones A and E (Barker et al 1991), Collfryn (Britnell 1989), and perhaps Bromfield (Stanford 1995). Croft Ambrey (Stanford 1974a) may be an exception, as there is only evidence for small four-poster structures here.

It is now well established that many of the region’s hillforts have origins in the late Bronze Age or even earlier. Comparison with the size of the late Bronze Age rampart at the Breiddin suggests that, on surface evidence alone, some of the region’s hillfort earthworks could date solely from this period. Of the 25 hillforts within the survey area, five (Croft Ambrey, Burrow Hill, Pontesford Hill Camp, The Roversies, Caer Caradoc) have been excavated; however, only at Croft Ambrey was the excavation large-scale, and even here this took in only a small proportion of the interior.

Ritual and funerary sites

Religious, ritual and funerary sites appear to be absent from the survey area, in common with many other parts of Britain; the Bromfield barrow burial (Hughes 1994) is unparalleled in the region. Burials may commonly
have been inserted into pre-existing barrows, but no others have been recognised. The Combe Moor metalwork find (HSMR 6230) could perhaps have been a ritual object or have formed part of a ritual deposition.

Finds

Unassociated later prehistoric finds are extremely rare in the Marches uplands (fewer than 20 from the survey area), and consist mostly of metalwork. The only pottery finds are from excavated contexts; late Bronze Age pottery in particular is rare, and apparently absent from the southern part of the region (Hughes and Woodward 1995, fig. 4). The majority of the metalwork finds are late Bronze Age, while the extremely small number of Iron Age finds consist of metal or worked stone (spindlewhorls, a quern) and do not represent adequately the diversity of materials or object types which occur on excavated sites. Finds are generally scarcer on excavated later prehistoric sites in the Marches (e.g. Collfryn; the Breiddin) than on lower-lying sites to the east (e.g. Beckford, Worcs).

3.4.3 Contribution of the Marches Uplands Survey (Figs. 9 and 10)

As the evidence for later prehistory in this region consists almost entirely of large and obvious earthworks, or cropmark enclosures, it is unsurprising that no new sites were added by Marches Uplands Survey fieldwork. Although seven enclosures were fieldwalked, no datable finds were recovered from any of them; however, this lack of surface finds has been noted for similar sites across the border in Wales (R Silvester pers comm).

The MUMP, by contrast, in addition to specific monument types, identified several areas of field systems of probable or definite Iron Age or Roman date. In some cases these could be associated with enclosures and/or hillforts, and formed fragmentary relict landscapes.

The detailed earthwork survey carried out by RCHME at Black Knoll (Ainsworth and Donachie 1995) revealed that the earthworks comprised not only a field system but also a nucleated settlement. On the basis of comparison with other similar sites, an Iron Age to Roman date was suggested for the complex, with more than one phase of activity.

3.5 Iron Age to Romano-British enclosure settlement sites

This section covers a particular site type which spans two otherwise diverse periods, and has therefore not been structured in the same way as the other period-based sections.

Enclosure sites have been identified distributed over a wide area. They consist of a bank and/or ditch (or multiple circuits) enclosing a small area, usually less than 0.5 ha. Plan forms differ very considerably; Whimster (1989, 35–57) provides the most complete discussion of enclosure morphology. Small enclosures of this type have increasingly been recognised as the typical later prehistoric and Romano-British settlement site in many areas of Britain, most notably in the north and west. The Marches have only belatedly been seen to conform to this pattern. Spurgeon (1972) first noted the existence of earthwork enclosures as a class in this region, while the cropmark sites were first classified on a large scale by Whimster (1989).

Excavations of (mainly lowland) sites in the region outside the survey area have begun to provide information on dating, as well as revealing details of internal layout and indications of their economic basis (M Watson pers comm). Over 20 have now been sampled by excavation in Shropshire alone. From just outside the Marches Uplands Survey area, the most notable recent excavations include Collfryn (Britnell 1989), Sharpstones Hill (Barker et al 1991), Bromfield (Stanford 1995), and the Shrewsbury bypass sites (Preston, Calcott and Duncote Farms: Ellis et al 1994).

The excavated enclosures generally date to the Iron Age and Roman period. Some are primarily middle to late Iron Age in date (for instance Bromfield). Others are equally clearly Roman (Duncote Farm). Many, such as Collfryn, span the two periods, with little indication of major changes at the Conquest. At the later end of the sequence, the New Pieces enclosure adjacent to the Breiddin produced glass which has been dated to the fifth to sixth centuries AD, though the nature of any use of the site at this time is unknown.

Surface morphology provides no clear way of dating unexcavated enclosure sites, whether earthwork or cropmark. Guilbert (1975) suggested that the two enclosures at Ratlinghope might be as early as the Bronze Age, on the basis of their presumed association with the linear earthworks on the Long Mynd. The Devil’s Mouth linear earthwork (SA 00251), sampled during the Marches Uplands Survey, had a tpx of around 1500–1300 BC (radiocarbon dates from soil horizon buried below the bank; Dinn et al 2006). In the same area
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the MUMP identified a field system of possible Iron Age date, which Stoertz (forthcoming) suggests is related to an enclosure and hillfort, and all of Iron Age date. A number of upland enclosures have been dated to the Iron Age, on the basis of siting or morphology (e.g. Bodbury Ring, Dorstone Hill), but these attributions have not been tested. A further suggestion is that the more angular or rectilinear examples show Roman influences and may therefore be post-Conquest in date. However, within the scope of the work during the Marches Uplands Survey no significance could be assigned to this variation (Cathy Stoertz pers comm), and this was matched in the vicinity of Wroxeter (White and Barker 1998, 68), and elsewhere (Hingley 1989, 140).

Enclosures are now generally believed to have been primarily settlement sites, and many of the excavated sites contained remains of houses and other features relating to domestic and agricultural use. Internal features rarely show as cropmarks (Whimster 1989, 36), and only excavation is likely to provide such detail. The internal details excavated even on sites with relatively poor preservation, such as Bromfield, have added very significantly to what could be interpreted from cropmarks alone, while Collfryn demonstrated the potential of better-preserved sites. Other sites have been suggested as Roman signal stations (Linley Hill, Webster 1956, and Edenhope Hill, Watson and Musson 1993, 43; see below) or prehistoric ritual sites (Stretford Bridge, Whimster 1989, fig. 22, no 19), but these are exceptional in plan form.

Aerial photography over the last 20 years has increased the numbers of recorded enclosure sites in the region very considerably. Their distribution does show biases: the average density in Whimster’s study area was 14.97 per 100 sq km (Whimster 1989); 13.08 per 100 sq km were recorded in the Herefordshire valleys (Dinn 1996b); 37.5 in the Wroxeter hinterland (Buteux et al 1993); 39.66 in the MUMP area outside the Marches Uplands Survey area, and 24.39 were recorded by the MUMP within the Marches Uplands Survey area. Whilst it might be tempting to suggest that this represents a real variation in distribution, it is quite likely to reflect the restricted opportunities to find these sites. The majority are recorded as cropmarks, and since the dominant land-use in the Marches Uplands Survey area is pasture, they would be less frequently observed. The large numbers around Wroxeter could similarly reflect the amount of flying which has taken place around the Roman city, and the small numbers in the Herefordshire valleys may be related to the depth and extent of alluviation.

3.6 Roman

3.6.1 Upland areas in Britain

Some of the best-surviving military works in the Roman Empire are found in upland areas of Britain. Conquest of these areas took the Roman army a long time, and a considerable effort, as historians including Tacitus describe. Subsequently these areas were kept under close military supervision. Large numbers of forts survive, especially in the Pennines and Wales.

Mineral resources were of great interest to the Roman Empire, and mines were under imperial control. Most of the mineral deposits the Romans were interested in were in upland areas, and some have been identified, including gold from Dolaucothi and silver and lead from the Mendips. Remains of Roman mining are difficult to identify, since the areas have in most cases been reworked since. The Roman road network extends into upland areas to serve and supply the military and mining sites.

The distribution of villas and substantial towns in the south-east of Britain has led to the assumption that wealth in the Roman period was centred in this area. However, animal products, especially wool and leather, were amongst the most prominent exports from Britain, and the majority of these were probably derived from upland pastures.

Remains of settlements and field systems survive in quite a number of upland areas, and in some areas, such as Northumberland, our understanding of the settlements and their material remains is good. In many other upland areas of Britain the range of settlement forms is not clear, nor are any changes which took place through the Roman period. It is clear, however, that settlement in the uplands is characterised by its essential continuity from the pre-Roman Iron Age.

Upland areas in Britain should not be regarded as peripheral areas in terms of importance during the Roman period. It is likely that in some upland areas the population was larger then than at any time until the early modern period. It is probable that the contribution made by upland areas to the Roman economy may have been bigger than the available evidence now suggests.

This summary was distilled from Todd’s account of the Roman period in upland areas (Todd 1986).
3.6.2 Marches Uplands Survey area and environs

The number of Roman sites recorded on the SMRs from the survey area is extremely small (a total of 42: 9 in Herefordshire, 33 in Shropshire). This is in contrast to the distribution in the adjacent lowlands where Roman sites are much better represented. Roman pottery tends to be easily visible, and the majority of the records from the survey area are of stray finds (22 in Shropshire, 7 in Herefordshire). Apart from finds there are villas at Linley (SA 01226) and Stowe (SA 01776), a cropmark fort at Bicton (SA 03047), and the earthwork on Linley Hill (SA 01234; Webster 1956). The evidence for Roman mining is largely confined to lead pigs. Some of the major Roman roads can readily be traced (e.g. Watling Street West; SA 00108 / HSMR 6089).

Settlement

The extreme paucity of finds from sites of the Roman period in mid and north Wales has frequently been noted, and is also a feature of both upland Shropshire and much of the surrounding lowlands.

Recent aerial photography, and also the systematic assimilation of earlier photographs, has shown that the concentrations of enclosure sites in the lowlands are now known to be matched in the uplands, though not currently at the same density (Whimster 1989; Watson and Musson 1993). While only a very few of these sites are as yet datable (see above), the limited indications of dating from an excavated sample of over 20 in Shropshire suggest that a large proportion, perhaps as many as half of all sites will produce Romano-British settlement evidence, while many, for instance Sharpstones Hill site E (Barker et al 1991, 43) and Collfryn (Britnell 1989, 119), show continuity of use from the late Iron Age until well into the Roman period.

A late Iron Age settlement pattern of large hillforts interspersed with smaller, enclosed settlement sites, both on low and high ground, may therefore be suggested. This has implications for the interpretation of the nature of settlement in the Roman period. There was probably a considerable degree of continuity in settlement patterns from the Iron Age to the Roman period, with the small enclosed settlements still occupied after the conquest. The lack of villas and other obviously Romanised forms of settlement certainly need not imply a lack of population.

The almost complete absence of Roman pottery from the Marches Uplands Survey fieldwalking may seem surprising in comparison with lowland and more Romanised areas of the country. However, in view of the relatively low-level use of pottery in the preceding period (Britnell 1989, 119), the small quantities of Roman pottery are likely to indicate continuation of the local aceramic tradition (Davies 1974, 34), and this pattern was also reflected in the Wroxeter Hinterland fieldwork (Roger White, pers comm) and at the Whitley villa, Bayston Hill (SA 03780). Nor does the lack of the trappings of a Romanised lifestyle have to imply poverty; rather, it may indicate the continuation of a social difference predating the Roman period, and suggest that wealth may have been measured differently, possibly in terms of livestock, or social power and influence, neither of which would necessarily be observable in the archaeological record (Hingley 1989, 145–148). White and Barker (1998, 35) suggest that this was indeed the case in the preceding period for the *Cornovii*, whose territory extended into the northern part of the Marches Uplands Survey area from the Long Mynd northwards. Taxes, however, did have to be paid, and this may have changed the economic basis of society, but the acquisition of cash would not of itself lead to Romanisation in the material sense (Hingley 1989, 145, 159).

Agriculture

The economic basis of settlement in the Marches Uplands Survey area during the Roman period is uncertain. Upland areas are generally assumed to have been pastoral (Todd 1986), and to date there is no evidence to the contrary in the survey area. There are indications of localised, but not widespread, arable cultivation at relatively high altitudes, probably continuing into the Roman period from earlier periods (Edwards 1994). Environmental evidence from the survey area provides no answers at present (de Rouffignac 1992), but pollen analysis could supply useful information, and micromorphological studies of buried soils to identify cultivated areas could be revealing.

Industry

The mineral resources of the area are assumed to have been exploited by the Romans, although the evidence is slight. The discovery of five lead pigs of Roman date from the area around Minsterley (SA 01323, SA 03503,
SA 03504, SA 03505, SA 03523) indicates that exploitation of the lead mining area of south Shropshire dates back at least to the Roman period. No Roman lead mines have been conclusively identified, perhaps due to extensive reworking of the area in the post-medieval period, although finds of Roman mining implements were reportedly recovered from a shaft at Roman Gravels Mine during the nineteenth century (SA 01318, Dinn 1995, 9). Much effort has been expended in attempts to identify Roman sites relating to lead mining activity, which has led to a tendency to interpret any Romanised material in or near the south Shropshire lead mines as associated with Roman mining. The earthworks associated with the Linley Hall villa site (SA 01226) are a case in point, since these appear to lie some distance from the ore source. Field investigation of the claimed ‘hydraulic mining’ at Norbury (SA 03797) has led to the suggestion that the earthworks represent unevenly preserved ridge and furrow rather than mining remains (Dinn 1995, 9).

Military activity

A number of the accounts of the Roman period in the area concentrate on the military history (Frere 1987; Salway 1981). The basis for the study of military activity in Wales and the Marches is Tacitus’ accounts of the campaigns waged between 48 and 78 AD. Other authors propose links between historically recorded events and the surviving archaeological sites in the area (Stanford 1991; Jarrett (ed) 1969). The Marches Uplands Survey area is almost devoid of military features, however, with the possible exception of a fort south-east of Bicton (cropmark site SA 03047), and the identification of this site is regarded as dubious (Frere 1970, 382). By contrast, in the lowlands around the survey area and along Watling Street (West), there are clusters of forts around Leintwardine and Stretford Bridge. Access to the west generally followed river valleys, and therefore the roads to Caersws and Clyro marking the military advance into Wales lie in the lowland outside the survey area. Two possible signal stations have been identified in the uplands, at Edenhope (SA 03798; Watson and Musson 1993, 43) and Linley Hill (SA 01234; Webster 1956).

3.6.3 Contribution of the Marches Uplands Survey (Figs 11 and 12)

Prior to the survey, there were just 38 Roman SMR records for the survey area in Hereford and Worcester and Shropshire (28 findspots, 4 roads, 3 villas, 1 fort and 1 lead mine). The Marches Uplands Survey bibliographic search increased this with four more references to findspots and one more to a road. Rapid survey added no new earthworks which could be positively identified as Roman. Only two sherds of Roman pottery resulted from the 210 ha of fieldwalking, a very small quantity compared with both the earlier and later material. The Marches Uplands Mapping Project was more productive, as it identified 24 enclosures of ‘Romano-British’ type (recorded as ‘unknown prehistoric’; Cathy Stoertz pers comm).

Despite the small numbers of finds, the evidence of enclosure sites can be regarded as demonstrating that the area was far from deserted during the Roman period. These sites are, however, more difficult to locate in improved grassland which rarely reveals cropmarks or parchmarks, and where ploughing is likely to have destroyed any surviving earthwork traces. More enclosures are therefore likely to be present but as yet undiscovered in the survey area and similar upland areas.

The distribution of Roman sites and findspots across the survey area appears to diminish towards the southern and northern ends of the Marches Uplands Survey area. However, as there are so few sites in the area as a whole, it is not possible to say whether this pattern is real, or a reflection of the types of fieldwork undertaken and the nature of land-use in the area.

3.7 Early medieval

3.7.1 Upland areas in Britain

The early medieval uplands of England and Wales have received little study. There is a general dearth of field monuments from the whole period 400–1050, and few are distinctive enough in form to be identified from surface evidence alone. Finds are often scarce, and only frequent in cemeteries or on late occupation sites. In addition, the historical sources are often ambiguous and provide little information on rural life or the uplands.

Despite the paucity of material remains, recent research into sepulchral inscriptions on stones from Wales reveals that a highly literate culture survived and was flourishing in the seventh-ninth centuries. These inscriptions can be read as sophisticated linguistic devices which play with words, meaning and quotations.
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following a tradition which goes back through Classical Latin and Greek to Hebrew texts. The letters inscribed in some cases are clearly derived from manuscript forms, which is a further indication of a highly literate tradition (Howlett 1998).

### 3.7.2 Marches Uplands Survey area and environs (Figs 13 and 14)

All the difficulties mentioned above appear to be multiplied in the Marches. The archaeological resource is so slender that inevitably the period has to be considered almost totally within a historically imposed framework, with the identification of historically attested sites (Offa’s Dyke, the burhs, potential pre-Conquest castles) being given a high priority. The periods preceding or in between these intermittent bursts of earthwork construction remain as difficult to approach archaeologically as ever. Although Offa’s Dyke is the largest monument of its date in Europe there is a complete absence of even remotely contemporary material of any sort to either side of it. The documentary and place-name evidence for the region in the early medieval period has therefore usually been discussed without reference to the archaeological data (Gelling 1992; Davies 1982).

The level of Welsh influence in parts of the borders during at least part of the period is evidenced by missionary activity in Herefordshire, with many churches being dedicated to Welsh missionary saints, such as Dyfrig and David. This influence in church matters continued into recent times, and it was only in the mid-nineteenth century that a number of parishes in the Herefordshire Black Mountains (formerly in the diocese of St Davids) and in 1920 the town of Oswestry and surrounding parishes (formerly in St Asaph) transferred to English dioceses.

The number of SMR records reflects the very limited nature of the archaeological material for the period. For Herefordshire there are 9 (including 5 references to Offa’s Dyke). In Shropshire, the total of 16 records includes Offa’s Dyke (SA 01000) and a single findspot (SA 03010), but the remaining 14 (while they do include some unconfirmed earthwork records) are all to some degree circumstantial. No new sites were identified by the Marches Uplands Mapping Project, and both of the two added by data collection are circumstantial. Unsurprisingly, given the nature of sites of this period, no new records were added by fieldwork, although several stretches of Offa’s Dyke were recorded. There are three possible burh sites, at Clunbury (dubious), Lydbury North and Pontesbury, as well as others just outside the survey area (Chirbury).

There has only been very limited environmental work on sites of this period (for instance in Wales: Caseldine 1990, 110), and virtually none in the study area (de Rouffignac 1992), in spite of the demonstrated potential at some locations on Offa’s Dyke.

**Offa’s Dyke**

Whatever the true purpose of Offa’s Dyke (and this has been extensively debated by Fox (1955), Noble, Hill and others), its study has dominated early medieval studies in the region. Its size and prominence, however, perhaps explain this, since it is the longest earthwork boundary in Britain, and one of few monuments of its period. Most recent work has been carried out by the Offa’s and Wat’s Dyke Project (Hill n.d.). Excavation has concentrated largely on the constructional details of the Dyke itself. A small number of cropmark features which appear to be cut by Offa’s Dyke have been noted from aerial photographs. The other upland linear earthworks in the region (on the Long Mynd and around the Kerry Ridgeway) are no longer thought to be associated with Offa’s Dyke.

**Burh sites**

More certainly defensive are the burhs dating from the Danish wars of the late ninth and early tenth centuries. Several locations in or around the northern part of the survey area have been cited as burh sites: Weardbyrig (possibly Westbury or Caus), Pontesbury, Lydbury North, Chirbury, and Clunbury. While Chirbury and Weardbyrig have been identified from written sources, the others are circumstantial, and none of the sites has been positively demonstrated by fieldwork. The identification of a series of comparable sites west of Offa’s Dyke as Dark Age (Musson and Spurgeon 1988) has recently been challenged by Huggett and Arnold (1995). The administrative arrangements made by the Normans for the Marches were anticipated to some extent in the years from c. 1050, when renewed attempts were being made to extend English control westwards over the border areas (Stenton 1971). Pre-Conquest castles are recorded at Richard’s Castle and Ewyas Harold. Settlements associated with these castles may also prove to be significant; however, no early features have as yet been defined at these sites.
Settlement

No houses or other domestic buildings are known from the period in this region (although there are lowland examples from the immediate post-Roman period at Wroxeter, and there is the slightest of evidence for ninth century occupation at Leintwardine). Evidence for the use (or re-use) of enclosure sites is limited to one or two pieces of glass from New Pieces, Powys (see below).

Religious sites

Documented pre-Conquest religious sites were mainly in the lowlands, and there is very little pre-Norman fabric in any of the Marches churches. An important exception is a small group of stone grave markers from the eastern Black Mountains. This is, however, a very disparate group, comprising a pillar from Llanveynoe (HSMR 1456), dated to the sixth century but only known from a record by Edward Lhuyd from the end of the seventeenth century; a tombstone of the ninth century from Clodock church (HSMR 7174), and two grave-crosses of the mid eleventh century at Llanveynoe church (HSMR 7178). While these are in an area of known Welsh Christian activity (both Clodock and Llanveynoe churches are dedicated to Welsh missionary saints), it is uncertain if any significance can be attached to this concentration.

Three excavated prehistoric barrow cemeteries in the surrounding area have produced early medieval inhumation burials: Trelystan (Britnell 1982, 161–3; 7 graves excavated), Four Crosses (Warrilow et al 1986, 61; 5 graves), and Bromfield (Stanford 1995, 130–41; Hadley 1995; 31 graves). These sites exemplify the re-use of earlier ritual or burial sites by the early Christians.

Finds

The region is believed to have been more or less aceramic for the whole of the early medieval period. Only very few pre-Conquest pottery finds have been recovered. Other finds from the region seem to be Saxon in character, and most are from burials. The only stray find recorded is the jet bead noted above (SA 03010). Part of a glass vessel dated to the fifth-sixth centuries AD, from the New Pieces enclosure on the Breiddin (Musson et al 1991, 194), is a solitary link to the series of sites in the south and west of Wales which have produced early post-Roman material.

3.8 Medieval

3.8.1 Upland areas in Britain

The medieval is the earliest period for which written documents survive that describe how the landscape was laid out and used, and how it changed through time. The combination of documentary sources and fieldwork is contributing to a developing picture of upland areas. Changes in patterns of settlement during the medieval period are visible, due both to population fluctuations and to climate changes. Thus, the thirteenth century saw population expansion and moorland clearance. Climatic deterioration and a decline in population followed in the fourteenth century. The population increased again in the fifteenth century, which saw the creation of new isolated farmsteads with surrounding fields. This is a general model, however, depending on an understanding of broad climatic changes, and local climatic variations may have had a significant effect.

The role played by manorial lords in managing the countryside is a significant factor in the uplands as well as in lowland areas, since many large estates would have included upland as well as lowland. Uplands were primarily pastoral areas, although subsistence level arable cultivation supported permanent inhabitants. Seasonal occupation during summer months was common, and shepherds or even whole communities would migrate to upland areas on an annual basis. The remains of shelters built for transhumance are common in all upland areas, although some became permanently occupied, and survive as farms. Quarrying for building stone was common and widespread in upland areas, and where suitable rocks occurred there were quarries for roofing slate, millstones and whetstones. Minerals were also exploited, including coal, iron, silver, tin, and most of all, lead. Water power was used for mills and for other industrial applications, including processing of mineral ores. Hunting parks and royal forests would frequently be located in upland areas, as were rabbit warrens. These all left distinctive earthwork traces which allow them to be recognised without too much difficulty. Upland areas were extensively used by monastic establishments, usually managed from granges – there were few monasteries
in the uplands. Extensive grazing rights for cattle, sheep and horses are recorded in documents, and the mineral wealth of upland areas was also exploited, especially by the Cistercians. Many medieval routeways passed through the uplands, both local and more important manorial routes. Droveways relating to transhumance and other large-scale movements of stock can still be seen, and other routes survive as deeply cut holloways or braided packhorse trails.

Upland areas in the medieval period supported specialised parts of the economy, and they were different from but interdependent with the lowlands. Medieval uplands were a properly organized and well-managed landscape, although fluctuations in their use are visible.

This summary has principally been derived from Moorhouse (1986).

3.8.2 The Marches Uplands Survey area and environs

The Welsh Marches

The Marches Uplands Survey area lies within the medieval border zone between England and Wales which was administered by the Marcher Lords, and within which a legal system different from that of the rest of England applied. The boundaries of the different lordships varied throughout the period, but a map of their extent in the fourteenth century can be found in Davies (1989, map 8).

Settlement

Settlement in the Marches Uplands Survey area lies at the eastern edge of the Welsh area described by Sylvester as an ‘almost unbroken expanse of dispersed dwellings’, and on the edge of the ‘mixed patterning’ of the English counties east of the modern border (Sylvester 1969, 200). Nevertheless, a number of deserted and shrunken medieval villages have been recorded for the survey area (SMR records for Shropshire: 16 deserted settlements, 2 shrunken; for Herefordshire: 6 deserted, 5 shrunken). This is clearly an area where recent fieldwork is having a considerable impact, since the map reproduced by Roberts and Wrathmell (2000, fig. 21) on the basis of Deserted Medieval Village Research Group information available in 1968 shows only three deserted settlements for the entire survey area. It is not an area of easily recognised nucleated villages with ‘classic’ 3-field systems, although a certain amount of ridge and furrow is recorded on the two SMRs. Roberts and Wrathmell have produced maps showing nucleated and dispersed settlement in England in the mid-nineteenth century (2000, figs. 9 and 10). Assuming that these maps indicate a situation which reflects the medieval settlement pattern, they can be used to support Sylvester’s statement quoted above. Roberts and Wrathmell’s figure 9 shows little nucleated settlement within the survey area. Their figure 10, showing dispersed settlement, distinguishes different densities of dispersed settlements. The Selattyn survey area, the Long Mynd survey area and much of the Ludlow Anticline area lie within an area where the density of dispersed settlement is medium to high. The Clun Forest survey area has a medium to low density of dispersed settlement, but the Black Mountains survey area has a high to very high density of dispersed settlement.

The medieval period saw the emergence of towns, many of which in the Marches were strategically planted boroughs established by the Marcher Lords. In the survey area these included Caus, Clun, Bishop’s Castle, Wigmore, Stapleton, Richard’s Castle, Kington and Huntington. Some planning of villages is also apparent, and may be assumed to be contemporary.

Agriculture

Of the ridge and furrow recorded in the survey area and fieldwork transects, some is likely to be of medieval date, but the majority is later since it post-dates enclosure of open land into fields, which was taking place up to the mid-nineteenth century. Of 120 records of ridge and furrow from the ground survey, very few were diagnostically medieval. Ridge and furrow of all periods was severely under-represented on existing records. As in lowland areas, the former open fields surrounding villages and townships can also be recognised by ‘reversed-S’ ridge and furrow earthworks, while the pattern is also sometimes fossilised in field boundaries, for instance at Wentnor, and Hinton, Peterchurch, or as strip lynchets, as at Lingen (Plate 3). Such earthworks and field boundaries are conventionally taken to represent the medieval pattern, although strictly speaking the features themselves should be dated to the time of enclosure, usually in post-medieval period. There is very little evidence in the survey area for the traditional medieval ‘three field’ system. Strip fields were recorded in only eight of the
3368 land parcels surveyed during rapid survey. However, ridge and furrow identified as probably of medieval type was recorded by the MUMP in 38 parishes. Preliminary analysis suggested that it was commonest in the Black Mountains, Ludlow Anticline and Clun Forest areas, and absent from the Selattyn area.

It must be presumed that the dominant land-use during the medieval period was pasture, primarily for sheep. The physical remains which would be associated with this would therefore include sheepcotes. Sheepcotes are a type of medieval agricultural site whose significance and distribution has only recently been highlighted (Dyer 1995). It is clear from extensive medieval documentary evidence that it was customary to keep sheep in sheepcotes between November and April. The character and significance of these sites had not been published when ground fieldwork was underway, so it is possible that some may have been overlooked or misinterpreted. Four probable examples were identified during post-fieldwork analysis (MUS 40127/04 at Ritton Castle, Shropshire; 40750/01 on the Long Mynd above Ratlinghope; 41505/01 near Five Turnings north of Knighton, and 13678/04 west of Lingen). On the evidence put forward by Dyer (1995), many more sheepcotes would be expected within the survey area. Some of these may of course have vanished without trace; others may have been incorporated within later farmsteads.

Two crofts and five tofts were recorded by the MUMP. Few fishponds were recorded in the survey area. Pillow mounds and warrens are discussed in the post-medieval section below; there is documentary evidence that at least one of the recorded warrens was in use in the post-medieval period.

**Defensive sites**

Archaeologically, the effect of the area’s position on the border can be seen in the number of earthwork castles within the survey area, of which 58 are recorded on the two county SMRs. There are proportionately more earthwork castles in the Herefordshire part of the survey area (a total of 30, against Shropshire’s 28). However, 10 moated sites are recorded on the Shropshire SMR, but only two in Herefordshire.

Defensive sites were recorded both by rapid survey and by the MUMP. These were motes, motes and baileys, and ringworks, but none was previously unrecorded.
Parks and forests

Very large areas were included in forests and chases. These included Mocktree, Bringewood, Wigmore and Deerfold (royal forests in north-western Herefordshire), and the Long Forest (Long Mynd) and Stiperstones in Shropshire; some of these areas will have been well wooded. Features associated with forests include enclosures and woodbanks; there is also potential for atypical settlement and agricultural patterns, as well as other types of land exploitation (including industry). There were other extensive areas of unenclosed upland common, especially in the western Clun Forest and the Black Mountains.

Industry

Medieval lead mining is documented in the Shelve area (VCH 1989b; Dinn 1995) but has not been identified in the field.

A number of mill sites were recorded during fieldwork, but although they may date back to the medieval period, only the confirmed post-medieval attribution was recorded.

A very large number of quarries was recorded during rapid survey, and some of these also may date back to the medieval period, but no clear evidence for medieval dates could be established.

Monastic sites

A number of monasteries had granges and extensive landholdings in the uplands, as well as grazing rights on the then much larger commons; these included Ewyas Harold, Llanthony, Dore (Williams 1976), Craswall, Wigmore, Limebrook, Chirbury, Alberbury, Haughmond, Buildwas, and Strata Marcella. Kinnerton is one example of a known grange (of Buildwas) where substantial and previously unrecorded earthwork remains of a massive dam were identified during field survey (Plate 4; SA 02922; MUS 40685/01). The granges themselves are often well documented. This pattern follows that for upland areas in the country as a whole, described above. Despite the extensive landholdings and granges, in the Marches Uplands Survey area there are few actual monasteries. The physical remains of only three sites (a nunnery and two priories) are known in Herefordshire, and only one in Shropshire (a preceptory), and only one of these (Craswall, Herefordshire) can truly be said to be an upland site.
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3.8.3 Contribution of the Marches Uplands Survey (Figs 15 and 16)

A total of 24 new medieval sites were recorded during the data collection phase of the survey, and 79 medieval sites were recorded during fieldwork. This includes multiple records for some linear sites in different land parcels, and 15 fields which contained medieval pottery recovered during fieldwalking. The MUMP recorded 268 medieval and 529 ‘unknown (medieval)’ sites (the latter being sites of post-Roman to nineteenth century date). The majority of previously unrecorded fieldwork sites were related to agriculture, although a few known castle sites were recorded. The MUMP sites followed the same pattern.

One of the problems for the medieval period is that continuity of settlement and land-use into the post-medieval period can mask the earlier remains. ‘Undated’ fieldwork sites were generally attributed to the post-medieval period during the analysis phase unless there was a good reason to suggest a medieval date. Consequently, medieval features may well be under-represented in the results of the survey.

3.9 Post-medieval

3.9.1 Upland areas in Britain

Archaeological surveys of British uplands have tended to focus on remains from earlier periods. Although there has been a general recognition that post-medieval remains are widespread, few of the surveys have acknowledged their complexity or significance. There are of course many notable exceptions, in particular recent surveys of a number of upland districts characterised by the widespread remains of extractive industry. Important recent surveys by RCHME focussing on industrial remains include those in the Yorkshire Dales, Bodmin Moor, Cornwall and Clee Hill, Shropshire. It is rare to find agricultural landscapes with an equivalent degree of survival or documentation, though enclosure awards can often provide a framework for explanation of a whole landscape.

With the publication for the first time of a major overview of the archaeology of the post-medieval period (Crossley 1990), and the first steps towards the articulation of theoretical approaches (e.g. Johnson 1996), different aspects of post-medieval archaeology can now more readily be discussed in a broader context which takes in contemporary society as much as the archaeological resource and its management.

3.9.2 Marches Uplands Survey area and environs

The half decade 1536–40 saw the end of the separate status of the Marches, and the incorporation (or reincorporation) of the eastern Marcher lordships into the counties of Shropshire and Herefordshire. The dissolution of the monasteries saw the largest transfer of landownership in a short timescale in the area, at least since the Norman Conquest, with the establishment of many of the large estates which still survive. These events mark the clearest possible break between the medieval and post-medieval periods.

Prior to the survey, only a very small proportion of post-medieval sites had been accessioned onto the SMRs for the survey area. While there were large numbers of records in both county SMRs, these comprised mostly buildings. The only well recorded post-medieval sites apart from buildings were the mines in western Shropshire (28 of the 75 records).

The range of activities represented by recorded sites of the post-medieval period is considerably greater than for any earlier period. ‘Innovations’ include recreational sites of various types, and planned and ‘aesthetic’ landscapes; north-west Herefordshire contains some of the most important of the latter in Britain. There is a preponderance of agricultural sites, and transport (roads and tracks) and industrial sites are both widespread and complex.

The tenurial and settlement framework, largely inherited from the medieval period, forms an essential backdrop to the field remains, and has been described and analysed on a regional basis (Sylvester 1969) as well as a more local level (the county-wide and more detailed VCH volumes for Shropshire). A number of factors may be noted here as having potentially had effects on the landscape, although these effects can rarely be identified or characterised in the current state of knowledge. Transfers of landownership following the dissolution of the monasteries, and to a lesser extent, the ending of the separate legal status of the Marches, must have had far-reaching effects on land-use, and on social and economic relationships at all levels. For example, the long drawn-out process of enclosure in general, and of enclosure and conversion of waste specifically, was shaped by the pre-existing landscape and by manorial, parish and township structures.
Land division

Many administrative and ownership boundaries can be traced through field patterns, which are discussed below. Parish boundaries were made concrete by boundary markers, and a number of these survive or are recorded from documents or maps. These include stones (Stapeley Hill) and mounds (Long Mynd); the latter may be the result of stone clearance. Linear earthworks occur on some parish boundaries, for instance between Pipe Aston and Richards Castle, Herefordshire (HSMR 5790). However, it is unclear whether such earthworks define the parish boundary or another area; the substantial bank and ditch boundary which marks the extent of the former Snodhill Park, and which is clearly a park pale, also forms the boundary between Peterchurch parish and Michaelchurch Escley and Dorstone.

Transport and communication

Transport and communications networks have rarely been studied from an archaeological perspective, although there has been an increasing emphasis on their place within studies of the wider landscape (see Hindle 1993). Fleming has stressed the importance of the layout of routeways, from footpaths upwards, within detailed landscape studies, as an indicator of activity patterns within and around settlements (Fleming 1998). A wide variety of earthwork and other remains were recorded, supplementing the very small number of features which had previously been noted. Clearly these should be considered in conjunction with cartographic evidence for routeways which are no longer evident on the ground; it should equally be noted that many of the tracks and paths recorded in the field appear on no maps.

The transport routes recorded in the field cover the range from turnpikes and major long-distance routeways to ephemeral features, many recorded as ‘packhorse trails’ which may represent anything from local footpaths to major routeways or drove roads. Some survive as paths or roads in current use, but many, at all levels of importance, are disused and are visible primarily as earthworks, usually holloways or terraceways, and often multiple or braided. A small number can be seen only as cropmarks or as scatters of metalling in ploughed fields. Associated features which have been recorded include bridges, culverts, fords and milestones. The road networks have if anything been even more fluid than field layouts.

In most cases it is difficult to assess the contribution of earlier periods to the post-medieval road system. Even in well-known cases like the Portway on the Long Mynd (SA 00157), a medieval or earlier origin is almost entirely speculative. Even when an early date can be demonstrated, the alignment is likely to have varied considerably, especially where the route crossed unenclosed land, as is so often the case with those which survive as earthworks. The braided earthwork holloways and packhorse tracks at the south end of the Portway where it ascends the Long Mynd at Black Knoll are a clear example.

The turnpike alignments often survive in use on the lower ground, but a number of upland routes have disappeared. Two examples from north-west Herefordshire are the Knighton to Mortimer’s Cross turnpike, which crossed Harley’s Mountain, and the Mocktree turnpike, between Knighton and Ludlow, now surviving variously as a green lane and a cropmark. Drove roads more often cross the uplands and were frequently established to avoid turnpike tolls. These may appear as braided packhorse trails. Routes of this type are particularly frequent crossing the Ludlow Anticline hills; a good example of this is the multiple braided track funnelled through a narrow gap between Bircher and Oaker Coppices on Bircher Common.

Wide straight roads are particularly characteristic of the late nineteenth century enclosures, and are common in the Clun Forest and parts of the Black Mountains foothills. Here they are associated with the rigidly rectilinear ‘surveyors’ landscapes’. A recent survey identified enclosure roads on Urishay Common, Michaelchurch Escley, and an associated stone quarry, which were specified in an enclosure award of 1855 (Edwards and Woodiwiss 1990).

By far the majority of the roads recorded are farm tracks. Here, the conventional post-medieval dating must disguise much variation and chronological development of trackway networks, although in only a few cases does enough of a network survive to allow reconstruction.

These extensive sites offer the opportunity to develop a stratigraphic approach to landscape study in some areas, largely where they can be related to dated events (such as enclosure), or (functionally) to other datable or mapped features (e.g. quarries or mines). The potential of this approach for widespread application has perhaps been exaggerated, and may be limited by the very long life of many roads and tracks, and lack of distinctive constructional features. However, in areas of concentrated routeways and associated features a stratigraphic approach of this type may provide a useful visualisation of the sequence of development.
Agriculture

Both Shropshire and Herefordshire were, and are still, primarily agricultural counties. Most of the recorded agricultural remains are either (mainly relict) features relating to use of the commons, or refer to later events, including enclosure clearance and field systems. A limited number of records can be related to identified later activities (e.g. warrens and associated enclosures; see below).

Documented agricultural history and the mapping of field patterns forms an essential background to an understanding of the field remains, although the level of research has been very uneven. Shropshire is well covered by the historical discussions given in the VCH (1989a), which cover parts of the upland area, though these are rarely closely linked to cartographic evidence and still less to field remains. Extensive studies such as these, or the analyses of farming patterns from the tithe and other records (Dodd 1956; 1980; Phillips 1979), have hardly begun to be applied at a local level.

Most of the Marches has for some time been recognised as an intermediate area between lowland and upland. Lowland farming systems in the region were divided between what Rackham (1986, 4–5) has characterised as ‘ancient’ and ‘planned’ landscapes. These broadly (though not exactly) correspond to the division between ‘wood pasture’ and ‘champion’ or mixed-farming landscapes. An alternative classification places the Marches uplands firmly in an ‘open pasture’ region (Thirsk 1967; Dyer 1988). The post-medieval history of these landscape types, whatever classification is followed, shows an erosion of local distinctiveness, but also of varying developments, though the enclosure process, from the different points of origin. The juxtaposition and interaction of the different lowland and upland traditions makes this an important region for the study of medieval and post-medieval agricultural changes.

At the beginning of the period, upland commons figured very largely in the economy of most communities in the survey area. Although the incidence of open-field arable was much less here than in the midland counties, the evidence suggests that most parishes and townships had some. By the end of the nineteenth century most of the commons and open fields had been enclosed, converted into private grazing or arable. The process was long and complex, and has to date been mainly documented from maps and written records.

The primary use of the enclosed fields was probably for pasture, since the area is too elevated for arable crops to flourish in most parts. Nevertheless, ground fieldwork demonstrated that the majority of fields have been ploughed sufficiently to create lynchets along their enclosure boundaries. Whilst most ploughing has probably been carried out in the second half of the twentieth century for pasture improvement, it would be reasonable to assume that some earlier arable cultivation took place, especially in times of crisis, such as the Napoleonic Wars when grain was scarce. Narrow, straight, ridge and furrow earthworks were identified in some fields, and interpreted as evidence for steam ploughing.

Commons

The commons vary from the bleak heather moorlands of the Black Mountains, through lower-lying but still markedly ‘upland’ moorlands such as the Long Mynd, to the much less exposed and smaller commons of the Ludlow Anticline, such as Bircher Common. Commons can be defined both by their physical form (including plan morphology) and by the nature of the rights held on them. While only the former is susceptible to recording in the field, the common rights are likely to affect the plan and also features within the common. The most frequent rights involve the grazing or feeding of animals, the gathering of fuel, and the collection of various other raw materials, including stone and water. Other uses include leisure (e.g. horse racing; see below).

The plan forms of wood-pasture commons, or open grazing commons in the wood-pasture zone, are typified by a ‘scalloped’ edge, with deep funnel-shaped entrances separated by extensions of encroachment extending on to the common. The limit of encroachment or enclosure is often defined by a very substantial bank or bank and ditch. In general, there is a high potential for the preservation of extensive relict features, including field systems, enclosures and barrows, although twentieth-century ploughing has levelled these in many places. Where there is settlement around the edge of a common, features close to the houses will probably include ponds and watercourses, pollarded trees, and quarries.

Enclosure

Manorial enclosure is a feature of some commons. One striking example is on Bircher Common, where two large coppices (Bircher and Oaker), in the middle of the grazing common, were enclosed with woodbanks, probably at some point in the post-medieval period. These occupy a substantial proportion of the common, and
appear to represent the imposition of a strong manorial authority over common rights; of existing uses, only the packhorse trails which pass through the narrow gap between the two woods seem to have been respected.

Parliamentary or large-scale enclosure is relatively rare in the Marches, though where it did occur it could be very extensive. The largest areas were in the Clun Forest uplands, where over 75 sq km was enclosed between 1847 and 1891. The landscape of the western Clun Forest is characteristic, with patterns of mathematically regular fields, defined by banks (incorporating stone clearance), linear quarries and shelter belts, and straight roads with wide verges.

The conversion of hunting forests and deer parks to farmland was a continuing process through the post-medieval period. Perhaps the most extreme case of this was the disafforestation of the forests of Deerfold, Mocktree, Wigmore and Bringewood in north-western Herefordshire during the seventeenth century (Robinson 1921). There is potential here for the extensive earthwork remains of field systems, lynchets and ridge and furrow in this region to be correlated with the (sometimes very detailed) documentary and cartographic evidence. A particular example is the early seventeenth century creation of a forest boundary at Mocktree, which can now be followed in places as a cropmark feature.

Snodhill in Peterchurch parish is a good example of an enclosed park. The park pale itself survives as an extensive earthwork along the parish boundary (see above), consisting of a bank (or wall) and internal ditch. The morphology of the field divisions within the park boundary indicates post-medieval enclosure, though this is not dated. Deer parks were often succeeded by landscape parks, though not in this case. A limited number of enclosures may be associated with the deer parks; these include examples at Haye Park, Richards Castle (HSMR 6368), and Park Wood, Craswall (MUS 13418/01), both with banks and internal ditches.

One minor feature which has been recorded on the edges of commons in the Long Mynd survey area is the D-shaped enclosure. Six of these are known (from both ground and aerial survey), on Stapeley Hill (MUS 40102/01, /02, MU.321.7.1), the Long Mynd (MU.34.6.1), and the intervening hills (Ritton: MUS 40464/01; The Knolls: SA 01890). Each is defined by a single bank, with no ditch, and all but the last enclose an area of 0.15 ha or less. While their morphology is distinctive, it is uncertain whether they had a specific function. However, almost all are adjacent to former ring-fence farms. Similar features have been recorded in upland areas of Wales.

Warrens

Rabbit warrens occur frequently as landscape features in the Marches. The primary characteristic of these warrens is the presence of earthwork pillow mounds, either singly or in groups of varying size; these are usually sited on unenclosed or late-enclosed uplands. Other feature types may be present, including warreners’ houses (characteristically in small enclosures) and vermin traps. The evidence for overall enclosure of warren complexes seems to be very limited, but warrens were usually sited well away from areas of arable.

A number of larger warrens had been identified before the survey, and the record was augmented in two ways: firstly by the identification of new warrens, and secondly by the recognition of further features in known warrens. Aerial and ground surveys have proved to be complementary. The four largest warrens were all known before survey; these are at Wapley Hill (HSMR 7096), Croft Ambrey (HSMR 7090; Dalwood and Waller 1992), Reeves Hill (HSMR 2372 etc; Owen 1994) and Middleton Hill (SA 01868); the first two are within hillforts. At each of these sites, the number of recorded mounds has been increased by survey. Related enclosures for warreners’ houses have been noted at the Wapley Hill and Reeves Hill warrens, as well as at other sites (e.g. Black Knoll).

Previously unrecorded warrens were noted at the following locations: Stanley Knap, Cole’s Hill, Kinsham, The Moor Farm, Stapleton, Plush Hill, Long Mynd, and Norbury Hill. Single mounds have a wide distribution (a total of 7 sites, 4 of these newly discovered). The success of aerial photography, and to a lesser extent ground survey, in adding to the numbers of mounds at the larger warrens, suggests that scrutiny of the areas around these single mounds may reveal further features. In all, 27 pillow mounds were known before survey, at 9 locations; these figures have increased to 63 and 18 respectively. The greatest concentration is in north-western Herefordshire.

Dating evidence is rather ambiguous, although most pillow mounds are regarded as post-medieval (generally earlier rather than later). The Middleton Hill warren was depicted as an antiquity on the First Edition Ordnance Survey 6” map (surveyed 1882), although there is a documentary reference to one of the mounds being redug in 1887 (Chitty, in Shropshire SMR). One of the pillow mounds was also surveyed by the young Flinders Petrie. The distribution of pillow mounds in the Marches should be set against published extensive and intensive survey from Glamorgan (Spurgeon 1982, including a distribution map of the whole Principality) and survey and excavation at Y Foel, Montgomeryshire (Silvester 1995). The concentration in east-central and south-east Wales
is matched by the distributions of larger warrens in Herefordshire and Shropshire. The published examples from Wales also allow classification of mounds by form and size. Placename and documentary evidence imply a much wider distribution for warrens generally (though these may not always have incorporated earthwork structures). Of 64 records on the Hereford and Worcester SMR, only 20 have recorded earthwork remains, the remainder being recorded as placenames or from documentary sources. Of the earthwork sites, 9 are within the Marches Uplands Survey area, and a further 5 immediately outside, while none of the others is in this area.

**Buildings and settlements**

Whilst the majority of post-medieval buildings are still in use, the marginal nature of the area means that many farms have been abandoned within the last 100 years. Many of these are now falling into ruin, and are in the process of becoming archaeological sites in their own right (Plate 5).

Farms in use, and the few larger settlements which lay within the survey transects, were deliberately excluded from the survey. As a result, the only buildings which were systematically recorded were those which were disused or ruined. Therefore, the morphology of surviving settlements and the nature of the building stock cannot be fully covered here. The earthwork remains associated with the encroachment of settlement on to common land are discussed above.

With the exception of individual farms, few new or planned settlements seem to have been established in the uplands in the post-medieval period. Two exceptions to this are Cynynion ( Oswestry) and Mocktree ( Leintwardine). Both are now largely abandoned.

**Industrial sites**

The important developments which took place in the centre and east of Shropshire in the eighteenth century, and which have led to the county being hailed as the birthplace of the Industrial Revolution, hardly seem to be reflected in the south and west. The range of industrial remains recorded in the survey area is surprisingly limited. Most features are widespread in occurrence, although the remains which are often thought of as the most characteristic (the lead mining sites around Shelve) are localised and not paralleled elsewhere. Some
classes of industrial monuments are recorded on the SMRs but were not encountered in the field (e.g. pottery kilns). Some of the remains recorded may well have earlier origins, or indeed be earlier than the post-medieval. Until the late nineteenth century, industrial siting was usually dependent on the existence of local primary resources or raw materials. This can be seen in the location of most industrial sites in the study area.

The ceramic industries are locally represented in the Marches. Brick, tile and clay pipe kilns occur, though these are poorly recorded on the SMRs. An example is a recently excavated clay pipe kiln at Pipe Aston (HSMR 6371). There was a more extensive pottery industry in the Deerfold Forest area of north-west Herefordshire (Thomas 1982). Information on the location and nature of the production sites (of which several are known to have existed in the area between Lingen and Wigmore) is very poor. Production is currently dated to about the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries, and was closely associated with the availability of large quantities of firewood from adjacent woodlands. The industry may have arisen as large numbers of squatters settled in the period (as referenced in the documentary sources) and sought to earn a livelihood.

Quarries are ubiquitous in the Marches uplands; most are small, and appear mainly to reflect local use of building stone taken from common land or from under-used corners. Some of the later nineteenth century enclosure awards specify areas to be set aside for quarrying (Baugh and Hill 1989, 176–7), and some such areas may be seen today in the western part of the Clun Forest area. These are often linear in plan and shallow in depth; many are now planted as shelter belts or survive as scrub. Other quarries can be associated with estates. Some later and generally larger quarries occur; these can usually be identified as such from the Ordnance Survey maps. The total of 359 post-medieval (or probably post-medieval) quarries recorded includes only three from the SMRs before survey.

The burning of limestone to create lime, for fertiliser, cement or other purposes, is reflected in the number of limekilns recorded. 29 kilns have been recorded in all (doubling the 14 formerly on the SMRs), while many more are likely to have left no surface traces. As would be expected, the recorded kilns are all situated on or very close to limestone deposits. They occur only in the Selattyn, Ludlow Anticline and Black Mountains survey areas; limekilns have been recorded only in the northern part of the Ludlow Anticline, while the Black Mountains examples are confined to the vicinity of the thin limestone outcrops within the Old Red Sandstone.

Some limekilns, for instance Croft (HSMR 12176), or Lawnwell Dingle (MUS 13800/01) are situated in quarries, while most are close. The majority of those recorded are small and simple; few, such as those at Craig Sychtyn (SA 07098; MUS 40959/01), are larger structures. An unusual occurrence is at Llan-oleu, Craswall (HSMR 6127; MUS 13404/02), where a limekiln seems to have been built into a prehistoric burial cairn on top of a small hill; the use of the site for burning is attested by fused sandstone, and it is indicated as a limekiln on the First Edition Ordnance Survey 6" map.

Charcoal burning is a minor industry which has left distinctive remains at several locations in the Marches. Dating of these is problematical, as charcoal burning in clamps may be as early as medieval, but continued into the twentieth century. Surface indications include earthwork platforms, mostly in surviving woodland (more than half of the 23 records from fieldwork are from woodland, although some platforms survive in grassland, mainly on steeper slopes, e.g. MUS 13630/01), and charcoal-rich soilmarks where the platforms have been ploughed (e.g. a very extensive area west of Onibury; SA 07084). This industry was poorly recorded before the survey (the 14 records on the Hereford and Worcester SMR were all from the Peterchurch Survey, and there were no records on the Shropshire SMR), and fieldwork indicates that there is still extensive survival. The distribution of recorded sites has a marked southern bias, with records from the Clun Forest (mostly the southeastern quadrant), Ludlow Anticline and Black Mountains survey areas only.

Very few mills or associated features were recorded. These are concentrated in the Clun Forest and Black Mountains survey areas, where there are extensive river systems within the upland land blocks. Many of the remains recorded are those of large mill complexes, probably of nineteenth century date. Examples are at Newcastle, Clun (outside the Clun transect, but with associated leats, MUS 41265/01, 41324/01, 41325/01), and Bicton (MUS 41711/03). Both of these mills had leats extending for over 1 km. Without detailed field and documentary survey it is not possible to say whether or not these mills had earlier origins.

Within the survey area, significant mining activity has occurred only in an area of about 80 sq km in western Shropshire. Here, lead, copper, and later barytes were extracted from a series of deep mines; silver, zinc and fluorspar were minor by-products of the industry. Over 70 mine sites have been recorded (Dinn 1995). On long-lived sites, even where there is good documentary evidence for eighteenth century and earlier mining (e.g. Snailbeach, the Bog), the surface remains characteristically reflect the larger-scale later nineteenth and twentieth century mining rather than the earlier activity. By contrast, and in common with other orefields, trial and failed works are often particularly well preserved.

In the later nineteenth century, a large number of trial shafts were sunk. While many of these were immediate failures, others, for a variety of reasons, were heavily developed and promoted, sometimes in the absence of proven ore deposits. An obvious example is Ritton Castle mine, where the almost total failure to produce ore is
belyed by the preservation of high-quality and complex earthwork and structural remains. Smaller trial works, such as Shelve Pool, and a number of mines on and around Stapeley Hill, also preserve many interesting features. Many of the larger mines continued in use well into the twentieth century, and some have suffered from extensive clearance. At the Bog mine, the surviving features (reservoirs, outlying adits etc) are mostly peripheral to the main complex. The underground features were beyond the scope of the survey.

**Military sites**

A small number of defence sites of the later nineteenth century or later are known. These include rifle butts, military practice works, and camps. Generally these have been identified from documentary sources or early maps, though one rifle butt survives as an earthwork at Llanfair Waterdine.

**Churches, chapels and meeting houses**

Many of the small settlements in the uplands were remote from their parish church, while non-conformity was also popular, especially in the newly-established or growing settlements in mining areas or on common edges. The demand for new churches, chapels and meeting houses was considerable. This was met to some extent by the use of private houses for meetings, for instance by the seventeenth century Baptist congregation at Llanveynoe (Stell 1986, 113), but a demand usually developed for a more permanent building. This could either be an adaptation of an existing building – for instance Bircher Common Primitive Methodist church (HSMR 23985) was converted from a barn in 1841 – or a new chapel could be built. Disused chapels are frequent in the uplands, and Shoesmith (1985) highlighted the loss of these buildings through abandonment and re-use in one small area of north-western Herefordshire. It is unusual for church buildings to have disappeared completely, although the Methodist chapel at Mocktree, Leintwardine (MUS 13578/01), which opened in 1865, appears to have closed by the early twentieth century and is now represented by a single fragment of stone masonry.

**Recreation**

Recreation sites are seen for the first time in the post-medieval period. Under-used upland areas were a suitable location for activities which required large amounts of land, and the late nineteenth century saw the establishment of golf courses at Black Knoll and Bradnor Hill. Upland racecourses survive as earthworks at Oswestry (pre 1776–1848; Ruckley 1989) and Hergest Ridge (c. 1820s-1880s; HSMR 13087). The earthworks of the latter (at an elevation of over 400m) are particularly well preserved, and include a cambered race track, with small rectangular bays inside the circuit, perhaps pens for horses or foundations for buildings. Several mid and late nineteenth century enclosure awards in the Clun Forest include provision for public recreation grounds (Baugh and Hill 1989, 176–7).

Landscaped gardens and parks are another post-medieval feature. Many landscape parks were the direct successors of earlier deer parks, and some preserve features such as park pales (see above). While large parks are less common in the uplands than in the surrounding lowlands, the topography of the Ludlow Anticline area in particular did lend itself to designs in the ‘Picturesque’ style of the late eighteenth century (Daniels and Watkins 1994). Characteristics of this rather self-conscious style include a stress on ‘natural’ or minimally altered layouts, the incorporation of pre-existing historic or other features into the design, and the combination of decorative and utilitarian attributes. One of the type sites of this style (Downton) is in the study area, and a group of parks in the immediate area (Croft, Shobdon, The Lodge (Richard’s Castle, Salop)) shows the influence of the style to a greater or lesser extent. Oakly is an example of the more generally fashionable landscape design of ‘Capability’ Brown, while the two traditions seem to have mingled at Moccas Park, although the contribution of each is hard to disentangle.

**Water management**

While irrigation is understandably not a characteristic feature of the uplands, an important early (seventeenth century) example, the Trench Royal, survives in the upland fringe Golden Valley. Although some limited survey of this has been carried out (Kay 1974), it is not well understood in detail, neither is its full extent known.

Features relating to water supply and drainage include the two late-nineteenth century aqueducts, supplying water from the Elan valley to Birmingham and from Lake Vyrnwy to Liverpool.
Finds

Post-medieval findspots have rarely been recorded, and those that have usually relate to exceptional finds. A total of four records from both the Herefordshire and Shropshire SMRs and data collection comprise two hoards and two pottery finds (a further three records listed are not in fact finds and should be reclassified). That post-medieval finds are not in themselves rare is clearly borne out by the results from the Marches Uplands Survey fieldwalking; all 44 fields walked produced some post-medieval material, in all but two cases including ceramics.

3.9.3 Contribution of the Marches Uplands Survey

The Marches Uplands Survey fieldwork changed the recorded number of post-medieval sites dramatically, through the accessioning of nearly 400 records from documentary and aerial photographic sources, and the field recording of nearly 2500 monuments which have been assigned post-medieval dates. These throw light on a wide variety of activities, from agriculture to industry.

A wider range of sites and monuments naturally survives from the post-medieval, and this is reflected in a wider range of monument forms. Most of the monuments recorded are earthworks; however, buildings and ruins are also prominent. The rapid SMR enhancement was important in increasing the numbers of sites known from documentary or cartographic sources; in many cases, no physical traces of these were noted in the field. The occurrence of cropmarks, or earthworks recorded from the air, appears to be relatively low; however, many of the site types recorded during ground fieldwork would have fallen outside the scope of the NMP. Recorded findspots of the post-medieval period are rare, though this obviously represents a severe under-recording of finds, with an emphasis on the earlier part of the period, and on large or unusual finds.

Figures 17 and 18 show the distributions of post-medieval sites and findspots within the survey area. (Records from fieldwork are excluded, since they merely serve to indicate the positions of survey transects, as is apparent from Fig. 3 above.)

3.10 Modern

3.10.1 Upland areas in Britain

As a rule, modern features (generally defined as twentieth century) have not been recorded as archaeological monuments. The exceptions to this depend usually on a prior identification of research interest such as twentieth century defence sites.

3.10.2 Marches Uplands Survey area and environs

The numbers of sites on the SMRs or recorded by the Marches Uplands Mapping Project were minimal, and only in the rapid ground fieldwork were many modern monuments recorded. While in certain instances these were of intrinsic interest, other recent earthworks were recorded so their presence would not be confused with earlier monuments. This latter criterion was applied mainly to agricultural earthworks (mainly field boundaries, clearance cairns, ponds, reservoirs, and dams), but also to a number of buildings and trackways associated with agriculture.

Agriculture

Agricultural monuments of some intrinsic interest include clearance and cultivation traces associated with arable intake sponsored by the War Agricultural Commission during World War II, for instance the clearance cairns, field boundaries and ridge and furrow on Hergest Ridge (MUS 14803/07–10, /13, /14, /16, /19, /20).

Modern industrial remains are concentrated in the West Shropshire mining district (Heathcote and Holding 1992; Dinn 1995). Although the lead extraction industry in Shropshire was in terminal decline by the beginning of the twentieth century, this was more than compensated by a large increase in barytes output in the early years of the century. This too declined after World War I, with a brief revival during World War II. Surface remains of barytes mines are often slight, as most of the processing was geographically separate, but shafts, adits and tips
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have been recorded at sites such as Coldyeld (MUS 40451/01), Knolls (MUS 40351/01), and Wrentnall (MUS 40566/01), as well as around Stapeley Hill (e.g. Cliffdale; SA 07204). Other, more widely distributed, industrial remains of the twentieth century include quarries and limekilns.

Twentieth century military features have received considerable attention recently, and were the most commonly recorded modern features prior to survey. They include anti-glider trenches on the Long Mynd (MU.66.3.1–2), surviving as earthworks, and a work camp at Shobdon (HSMR 11177). The latter is described together with the Second World War airfield and associated features in Pfuell’s History of Shobdon (1994, 133–142). Further investigation by the Council for British Archaeology’s Defence of Britain Project has added to the information given by Pfuell (M. Wilks pers comm). A number of minor earthwork remains on Hergest Ridge (MUS 14803/21, /22) are likely to be practice works.

A small number of unclassified remains of the twentieth century recorded during field survey are described in the transect reports and their details held in archive.

3.10.3 Contribution of the Marches Uplands Survey

The Marches Uplands Survey considerably increased the number of modern sites within the fieldwork area. Relatively few twentieth century defensive sites were located, but this area was not militarily as significant as other parts of Britain during the Second World War, the period from which the majority of such sites survive.

4 Overview of the archaeology of the survey area

4.1 Historic landscape changes through time

4.1.1 Introduction

The following table is a broad brush approach to understanding the historic landscape of the Marches Uplands Survey area. It does not attempt to distinguish the localised variation which can be observed across the survey area, since its aim is to identify trends.

The evidence upon which the table is based varies. In some cases there is concrete evidence from dated field remains, while in others it has been necessary to infer the nature of human activity from what came before or after. In other places, evidence from the lowlands is an indication of what must have been happening in upland areas. In general, the evidence for later periods is more reliable than for the earlier. Detail of the evidence for upland areas in general, and for the Marches Uplands Survey area specifically, can be found in section 3, above.

4.1.2 Period overview

Evidence for the Palaeolithic is absent from the survey area, but it has been assumed that people may have ventured into the uplands for hunting and gathering food.

Evidence for the Mesolithic is sparse, but evidence from sites in lowland Herefordshire suggests that here, as in other upland areas in Britain, Mesolithic forest clearance and management had a dramatic effect.

There is slightly more evidence for the Neolithic and early Bronze Age, but few indications of the broader landscape picture for the Marches Uplands Survey area specifically. Lowland alluviation continues, but with interruptions, and there are the first excavated signs of activity in the area.

Barrows, hillforts and enclosures provide more evidence for the later Bronze Age and Iron Age, but for this period too there has been little investigation into the historic environment of the survey area.

Fewer sites of definitely Roman date have been identified in the Marches Uplands. This is interpreted here as evidence for continuity from the preceding Iron Age, and for a population which was not highly Romanised. There is no direct evidence for the historic landscape or for the agricultural basis of the area during this period.

Evidence for the early medieval period is even slighter than for the Roman period, as the only archaeological site is Offa’s Dyke. The monumentality of the dyke is such that it tends to have a disproportionate influence on investigation and study of the period.

There is much more evidence for the medieval period, though the framework is still weak in many areas. It is only in the post-medieval period that all the columns of the table can be filled in with conviction.

Despite the paucity of evidence, the framework set out here should form a useful model for understanding the area, and for future research and investigation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Religious/ritual/funerary</th>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>Political boundaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Enclosed</td>
<td>Expansion of nucleated settlement</td>
<td>Quarrying (ubiquitous)</td>
<td>Non-conformist chapels associated with remote dispersed settlement</td>
<td>Toll roads</td>
<td>Border now stable, no effects on landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expansion of enclosure through the period</td>
<td>Increase in dispersed settlement, both agricultural and industrial</td>
<td>Lime burning</td>
<td>Rebuilding of churches in nucleated settlements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little open land</td>
<td>Pastoral basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Road improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly pasture</td>
<td>Periodic cultivation of marginal land e.g. in times of war</td>
<td>Decline of some medieval market towns, which become villages</td>
<td>Lead and barytes mining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some arable, esp on lower ground</td>
<td>Some woodland management</td>
<td>Decline of some medieval market towns, which become villages</td>
<td>Deerfold/Lingen pottery kilns</td>
<td>Railways/tramways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some managed woodland</td>
<td>Warrens</td>
<td>Racecourses and golf courses on some hilltops</td>
<td>Charcoal burning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some areas of managed, Picturesque, landscape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water mills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Much open land, esp higher ground, for pasture</td>
<td>Predominantly pastoral on high open land</td>
<td>Dispersed</td>
<td>Some quarrying</td>
<td>Churches in nucleated settlements</td>
<td>Generally poor: unmetalled holloways, packhorse trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some cultivation, some in open fields, poss some enclosed fields</td>
<td>Possibly some early enclosure</td>
<td>Some nucleated settlement (towns and villages)</td>
<td>Possible lead mining</td>
<td>Churchyards</td>
<td>Marcher Lords travelled extensively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Motte &amp; bailey castles built from 1050 (Ewyas Harold and Richard’s Castle pre-conquest) Castles disused as military sites by 1300, although continued as centres of power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Religious/ritual/funerary</td>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medieval</strong></td>
<td>Managed woodland and wood pasture</td>
<td>Some cultivation – ridge and furrow, esp on lower ground monastic holdings</td>
<td>Manors, Marcher Lords, and their parks</td>
<td>Possible early pottery kilns in the Deerfold/Lingen area</td>
<td>Monasteries</td>
<td>Transport of goods, Period of disturbance e.g. wool and livestock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Continued)</td>
<td>Deer parks</td>
<td>Fishponds</td>
<td></td>
<td>Water mills</td>
<td>Charcoal burning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managed woodland and woodland management</td>
<td>Fishponds, woodland and woodland management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early medieval</strong></td>
<td>Upland open pasture</td>
<td>Pastoral, esp on higher open ground</td>
<td>Origins of parishes and nucleated settlements</td>
<td>Some quarrying</td>
<td>Burials</td>
<td>Presumably poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultivated fields in lowlands</td>
<td>Cultivation of lower ground</td>
<td>Dispersed settlement</td>
<td>Early Churches from c. 900AD</td>
<td>Presumably use of Roman roads</td>
<td>Period of disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managed woodland</td>
<td>Woodland management</td>
<td>Dispersed settlement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roman</strong></td>
<td>Upland open pasture</td>
<td>Pastoral, esp on higher ground</td>
<td>Occupation of ditched enclosure sites</td>
<td>Lead mining</td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>Main roads built along natural routes, e.g. valleys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowland cultivation and fields</td>
<td>Cultivation of lower ground and sheltered higher ground</td>
<td>Leintwardine (Branogenium) – small town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Military communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managed woodland</td>
<td>Some woodland management</td>
<td>Military sites (forts) from 50AD Some activity in hillforts, possibly settlement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transport of materials for taxes and export</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Religious/ritual/funerary</td>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later Bronze Age</td>
<td>Cleared open land for pasture</td>
<td>Pastoral</td>
<td>Occupation of ditched enclosure sites</td>
<td>Barrows at Bromfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Iron Age</td>
<td>Cleared land for cultivation, and created fields</td>
<td>Cultivation of lower ground</td>
<td>Hillforts built from 1000BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic to Early Bronze Age</td>
<td>Limited cleared areas for pasture (indicated by low-land alluviation)</td>
<td>Cultivation and clearance</td>
<td>(?enclosed) sites, e.g. Dorstone Hill</td>
<td>Barrows</td>
<td>Flint imported to area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic to Early Bronze Age</td>
<td>Limited cleared areas under cultivation</td>
<td>Herding/ pastoralism. Sheep/cattle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stone circles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolithic</td>
<td>Clearance of upland areas (caused lowland alluviation)</td>
<td>Gathering</td>
<td></td>
<td>Long Barrows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaeolithic</td>
<td>Atlantic climax woodland forest</td>
<td>Gathering</td>
<td>Cave sites</td>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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THREE LONG MYND EARTHWORKS: EXCAVATION AND ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL POTENTIAL

By JAMES DINN, JAMES GREIG, SUSAN LIMBREY, JEREMY MILLN and CLARE DE ROUFFIGNAC

SUMMARY

A programme of small-scale excavation and environmental sampling at three earthworks on the Long Mynd took place in 1992. It was related closely to repairs to the monuments, and formed part of the Marches Uplands Survey. The results have contributed to an understanding of the land-use history of the area, and have also indicated the high potential of upland earthwork sites in the region.

The sites investigated were the Shooting Box barrow, and two cross-dykes (at the Devil’s Mouth and High Park Cottage). Radiocarbon dates were obtained from two of the sites, with dates in the early Bronze Age from the Shooting Box barrow and the middle Bronze Age from the Devil’s Mouth linear earthwork. All three earthworks sealed ground surfaces, which were investigated using soil analysis and micromorphology and pollen analysis. Charred plant remains were also present.

The environmental and soils analysis results from the Shooting Box barrow in particular were useful, relating to the contemporary environment, the construction of the earthwork, and associated activities. The report stresses the potential value of such opportunistic work and makes recommendations for future sampling.

Introduction and background

This paper reports on sample excavations, carried out during 1992 at three earthwork sites on the Long Mynd in south-west Shropshire. The aim of the project was to assess the value and potential of opportunistic sampling for palaeoenvironmental remains during small-scale archaeological intervention, in this case linked to monument repair.

The sampling exercise on the Long Mynd took place within the overall framework of the Marches Uplands Survey (Dinn and Edwards 1999; Dinn and Edwards 2006). This extensive survey commenced in 1991, and aimed to enhance the archaeological record for the western upland areas of Herefordshire and Shropshire. Further aims were to work towards defining and quantifying archaeological landscapes and individual sites in these areas, and to produce strategies for their management. The survey was commissioned from the Archaeological Service of Hereford and Worcester County Council (now Worcestershire County Council) by English Heritage, and extensive support was provided by Shropshire County Council and the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England.

Selection of the study area for the survey followed a definition of upland given by the Institute of Terrestrial Ecology (areas where a significant proportion of the land surface is above 250m, 820ft). The Marches Uplands Survey examined six blocks of upland in western Shropshire and Herefordshire, with a total area of 942 sq km, extending from the north-western Shropshire uplands, west of Oswestry, in the north, to the eastern Black Mountains in the south. The main survey objectives included:

- evaluation of the survival, character and potential of archaeological and palaeoenvironmental material for all periods
- assessment of the completeness and quality of the existing data, as represented by the SMRs (Sites and Monuments Records)
- identification of threats from land-use change and other causes
production of recommendations for further archaeological work

development of frameworks for the management and protection of archaeological landscapes and monuments in the uplands

The palaeoenvironmental material was initially approached through a desktop study, which collected all available information from the survey area as defined above, whether published or in archive (de Rouffignac 1992, revised 1995b). At that time, so few sites within the survey area had produced any palaeoenvironmental evidence (22 in all, including Pleistocene sites) that examination of sites from an area 10 km around was necessary to allow any meaningful assessment to be made. Forty-six sites were identified from this wider zone, most of them in Wales.

As a result of this study, recommendations were made for fieldwork. Establishing the potential survival of buried soils under earthwork monuments was highlighted as one of the main priorities for palaeoenvironmental research in the region, as it was felt that these could be used to establish a broad framework of land-use, especially for the prehistoric periods. Opportunities for this type of work can be very limited, in particular as many of the monuments identified are protected by scheduling. However, not only does this enforce a more rigorous approach to sampling, without which scheduled monument consent would not be granted, but the regular monitoring of the condition of scheduled ancient monuments allows for the relatively early identification of damage or erosion. Surface damage may lead to the exposure of stratigraphic sequences, suitable for archaeological recording and environmental investigations, and scheduled monuments are more likely to be the subject of repair programmes. The study suggested that an opportunistic approach to sampling is needed, and it was possible to put this into practice on the Long Mynd.

This report is a synthesis of work by several specialists. Detailed reports covering the description, analysis and discussion of the soils (Susan Limbrey), pollen (James Greig) and plant macrofossils (Clare de Rouffignac) were brought together by Clare de Rouffignac in 1995, and are given here as Appendices 1–3. The sections on management issues are by Jeremy Milln. The introductory sections, and descriptions of the monuments and stratigraphy, are by James Dinn. The discussions incorporate contributions from all five authors, and were edited by James Dinn and Clare de Rouffignac. Figures 1–3 and 5–7 are by Laura Templeton, and the site plans incorporate earthwork surveys by Jeremy Milln.

The Long Mynd

Location, geology and topography

The three sites investigated are situated towards the north-east of the Long Mynd (Fig. 1). This is the largest of the hill ranges in the Church Stretton area, which form a major upland block in south central Shropshire, to the south-west of Shrewsbury. Most of the hills, including the Long Mynd itself, are composed of steeply bedded Pre-Cambrian rocks (Institute of Geological Sciences 1967; Greig et al 1968), faults in these giving rise to their characteristically steep-sided profiles. The Long Mynd plateau has a comparatively level top (reaching 517m at its highest), with very steep slopes to the east and west. Glacial meltwater channels and later downcutting incise the eastern side of the Long Mynd, forming steep-sided valleys known as ‘batches’ (Toghill 1990, 178–9), and these are also present, though to a lesser extent, on the west. The slopes to the south and in particular to the north are much gentler.

Archaeological sites and landscapes on the Long Mynd

Prehistoric earthwork remains survive on the Long Mynd in greater quantity than anywhere else in the uplands of Shropshire and Herefordshire, and the diversity present here is also unparalleled in the region. Most of the earthwork monuments on the Long Mynd were first described in detail by Cobbold (1904). In spite of this early attention, there has subsequently been very little intensive field survey or excavation in the area, and many of the earthworks are still poorly understood.

There are over 30 Bronze Age round barrows on the Long Mynd itself. Several earthwork enclosures survive on the upper slopes on both the west and east sides; while many of these are likely to be Iron Age or Roman in date, individual enclosures have been dated on various grounds to the Bronze Age to medieval periods. A number of linear earthworks (‘cross-dykes’) are also present. These have not previously been closely dated, and their function is still poorly understood. The enclosures and cross-dykes on Stitt Hill, on the western edge of the Long Mynd, have been discussed by Guilbert (1975), who proposed a late Bronze Age date.

For more substantial comparative material, including excavated data, it is necessary to look to the adjacent Shropshire lowlands, where broad assessments of the prehistoric archaeology have been produced by Carver...
(1991) and Buteux and Hughes (1995), following a number of excavations in central and south Shropshire, primarily at Bromfield (Hughes et al 1995) and Meole Brace (Hughes and Woodward 1995). More notable still have been the results from excavations in the neighbouring areas of Wales, including Trelystan (Britnell 1982), Four Crosses (Warrilow et al 1986), Sarn-y-bryn-Caled (Gibson 1994), the Breiddin (Musson et al 1991), and most recently the Walton Basin (Gibson 1999).

Concentrated towards the northern and southern ends of the Long Mynd, and present on other parts as well, are a number of relict earthwork field systems of various types. Some of these, for instance the ‘Celtic’ fields at Black Knoll, are likely to be prehistoric or Roman in date (Crawford 1954; Edwards 1994); the Black Knoll field system has recently been shown to be associated with a settlement of Roman date whose remains survive as earthworks (Ainsworth and Donachie 1995). Other field systems, in particular those characterised by narrow ridge and furrow, are more likely to be post-medieval. These appear to be associated with brief phases of arable expansion; episodes occurring around the time of the French wars in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were described by contemporary writers (Plymley 1803, quoted in Baugh and Hill 1989). However, the contemporary descriptions are vague both as to the location and the nature of cultivation, and it is possible
that they refer to areas, particularly at the northern end of the Long Mynd, which have since been permanently enclosed; these include extensive areas of rectilinear enclosure, for instance at Darnford and around High Park Cottage, and ‘ring-fence’ farms such as Jinlye (all these examples are at the northern end of the plateau). Most of the areas of ridging noted on the open moorland have now reverted to moorland vegetation, mainly rough grass and bracken.

Modern vegetation and land-use

The Long Mynd is the most extensive remaining area of heather moorland in the central Marches. ‘Moorland’ is characterised as open heathland with a plant community dominated by evergreen dwarf shrubs, lying above the limit of enclosed or improved agricultural land. The moorland vegetation on the Long Mynd is derived from woodland which once existed in the area; the woodland flora would have included evergreen dwarf shrubs, but these did not come to dominate until tree clearance and grazing allowed them to spread. The vegetation is now dominated by Calluna (heather) and Vaccinium myrtillus (bilberry, locally known as ‘wimberry’; Sinker et al 1991, 100–1). The Long Mynd is one of Britain’s most southerly grouse moors, and until recently the heather was managed by regular burning. More recently, bracken has become established, in spite of attempts to control it through cutting and spraying.

Hedges survive on field boundaries around the edges of the hills and away from the open moorland; the main hedgerow tree species are hawthorn and hazel, with the occasional and surprising addition of laburnum, presumably deliberately planted.

The open hilltop is common land, and the grazing rights are well used for sheep and also ponies. Sheep in particular are a major cause of erosion as many are overwintered on the hill rather than being brought down to lowland pastures. This does not allow the vegetation to recover, and leads to damage to already eroded areas through trampling; the sheep are often fed from farm vehicles, and this tends to concentrate the erosion. Recreational use of the Long Mynd is extremely widespread; both walking and riding were evidently very popular at the time of the fieldwork. Where roads or paths cross earthworks, the large numbers of walkers and riders have often contributed to damage; this had occurred at two of the sites sampled.

The national importance of the Long Mynd landscape has been recognised by multiple designations. It lies within the Shropshire Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and also the recently designated Shropshire Hills Environmentally Sensitive Area. The moorland is a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and most of the recognised early earthworks are protected as scheduled ancient monuments. Most of the open moorland is owned and managed on behalf of the nation by the National Trust, who are charged with balancing the interests of all the users of the Long Mynd, whether commoners or leisure visitors.

Background to the excavation and sampling programme

Aims and objectives

The investigation of buried soils at earthwork sites was identified as the main priority for palaeoenvironmental fieldwork within the Marches Uplands Survey. The aim of this part of the project was to demonstrate the potential of quite small-scale work to provide useful data, rather than to attempt any comprehensive reconstruction of land-use and human activity on the Long Mynd. Sites were therefore selected on the basis of their potential to influence the future management of sites across the region. A variety of deposit types were to be investigated, using several different techniques. The Long Mynd area and the eastern Black Mountains were selected for fieldwork, as being complementary; in the former case the sampling concentrated on earthwork sites, and in the latter on deposits buried by colluvium (de Rouffignac 1995b).

Selection of sampling sites

During 1992 the National Trust, in conjunction with English Heritage, had planned a programme of monument repair on several earthworks on the Long Mynd. This appeared to be a suitable opportunity for palaeoenvironmental sampling. One of the four earthworks in the repair programme (the small hillfort or enclosure of Bodbury Ring: SA 01245) was rejected for sampling, as the repair works required were confined to the surface of the earthwork. However, the other three (the Shooting Box barrow: SA 00198, and two linear earthworks, at High Park Cottages: SA 00199, and the Devil’s Mouth: SA 00251) had all suffered considerable damage, both
in the past and more recently, which was to entail more extensive repairs. There was also the opportunity at these three sites to examine deeper deposits without undue destruction of previously undisturbed stratigraphy. Therefore, these three were chosen for small-scale excavation and sampling.

**Excavation and sampling methodologies**

The excavations were all in areas which were to be repaired. The work consisted either of cutting back a damaged area, to provide a vertical section, or of excavation of a small trench, and all excavation was done by hand, by students from the University of Birmingham. Contexts were recorded on proforma sheets using the standard methods of the Hereford and Worcester County Archaeological Service (1988, as amended). Where the work consisted only of cutting back an already damaged area of earthwork, the excavated volume of most of the deposits encountered was minimal. In many cases it was only possible to describe contexts from the section. Only the work at the Shooting Box barrow mound involved significantly more excavation than this.

Environmental sampling was carried out in the field by the three specialists who undertook the analysis: Susan Limbrey (soils), James Greig (pollen) and Clare de Rouffignac (plant macrofossils). The samples were mostly taken from rather limited exposures in the excavated sections. Additionally some (relatively small) bulk samples were taken during excavation, to be sieved for plant macrofossil remains, and as a result this element of the study covered the deposits which made up the earthworks themselves. Otherwise, the sampling concentrated on deposits predating the earthworks, most of which were visually identified on site as representing buried soils. Priority was given to the identification of material for radiocarbon dating, and charcoal samples for potential dating were collected from all three sites.

After examination and detailed description in the laboratory, samples for soil micromorphology were dried, impregnated and cured before thin sections were prepared. Laboratory analyses included particle size analysis, pH, total organic matter and loss on ignition.

Samples for pollen analysis were prepared for counting using the normal methods (disaggregation in alkali, treatment with hydrofluoric acid, acetolysis, staining and mounting in glycerol jelly). Pollen counting was done with a Leitz Dialux microscope. The writer’s pollen reference collection was used to check identifications where necessary.

Samples for plant macrofossil analysis were floated and sieved using a 500 micron mesh for both the flot and residue, to recover all charred plant remains.

No animal bones or other remains were recovered, either from the excavation or from the sieved samples.

**Shooting Box barrow (SA 00198)**

**Location**

The Shooting Box barrow (SO 421954) is situated at an altitude of 470m on the Wild Moor, at the very top of the Long Mynd plateau; there is a very gentle slope down to the south into a shallow col. The barrow is located on the boundary between sandstones, at the base of the Bayton-Oakwood Group of the Wentnor Series, and shaly siltstones and sandstones of the Portway Group of the Stretton Series. The present soil type is of brown podzolic soils of the Withnell series, with localised areas of podzols of the Portway series (Ragg et al 1984). Heather predominates on this part of the moor.

**Recent site history**

This barrow is the most obvious of the prehistoric burial mounds on the Long Mynd, and must have been identified as such not only by early antiquaries but also in earlier periods. It forms a clear skyline feature from many angles. Cobbold (1904, 38–9) provides the first comprehensive description of the monument. The construction in the late nineteenth century of the first shooting box, which occupied the centre of the barrow mound, makes it impossible to say whether any antiquarian excavation had taken place; Cobbold’s description suggests that both the shooting box, and a sheep shelter which has disturbed the north side of the mound, were constructed at the very end of the nineteenth century; he visited in 1895, when the scars of excavation had not healed, and was able to observe the earth make-up of the barrow. A concrete structure replaced the original shooting box in the 1950s; its roof was damaged by vandals in September 1991, and was subsequently taken down by the National Trust for safety reasons.
Although usually described as a disc barrow, the Shooting Box barrow is best classified as a ‘bell-disc’ barrow (Burgess 1980, fig 7.4), an intermediate category which has characteristics of both bell and disc barrows. It consists of a relatively small central mound (approximately 20m in diameter, and a maximum of 1.70m high), which has been so disturbed by later activity that its original shape cannot be reconstructed from surface evidence (Fig. 2). The surrounding annular bank is between 5 and 6m wide, and survives to a height of 0.45m. It has an external diameter of about 55m and there is no evidence that there was a ditch. The bank has also been heavily disturbed, mainly by a north-south trackway, heavily used by vehicles as well as walkers, which joins the Portway just to the north of the site.

Repair

The surviving concrete foundations of the shooting box provided a shelter for sheep and walkers, but the increased use was causing erosion of the barrow. The National Trust therefore decided to remove the upstanding parts of the structure, to fill the remainder with rubble and soil, and to allow grass growth by covering the barrow with brash, so that sheep would temporarily be discouraged from grazing. A second focus of erosion was on the outer bank; at one point the trackway was cutting into the bank, and consolidation was needed to limit the damage.
Fieldwork

Two trenches were excavated, one adjacent to the former entrance of the concrete shooting box (towards the centre of the barrow), the other at the point where the trackway crosses the bank. A contour survey was made of the earthworks by Jeremy Milln; this forms the basis of the hachured plan at Figure 2.

The barrow mound

Excavation and stratigraphy

The removal of the shooting box enabled hand-cutting of a one metre square trench, to a depth of 1.0m. This cut through the surviving barrow material into the layers below (Figs. 3, 4). A smaller area was excavated by a further 0.25m, to examine the lower soil profile.

Beneath the barrow was a partial soil profile (011, 010, 009), from which the turf had been removed. Overlying this was a dense layer of charcoal (008), up to 1cm thick. This was directly covered by barrow material, in a series of roughly horizontal layers (013, 007, 006, 005, 004), including one layer (006) which contained several turf lines. Layer 004 was not certain to be part of the barrow, but was cut by the shooting box foundation trench; this and the concrete foundation were the latest activity represented. No artefacts were recovered.

Sampling

Bulk samples for plant macrofossil analysis were taken from the barrow make-up during excavation. A sample for radiocarbon dating was taken from the charcoal layer. Soil and pollen samples were taken from the section by the specialists.

Soil analysis and micromorphology

Description and sampling of soils began below the charcoal layer (008). Analytical results are given in Appendix 1 and confirm the field textural description. They show an acid soil reaction, increasingly acid with depth, and the loss on ignition illustrates the high charcoal content in comparison with low non-charred organic matter. Interpretation below is based on the micromorphological descriptions given in the appendix.

The sequence under the barrow began with the development of an acid brown earth. Some burning took place, depositing charcoal which was incorporated into the soil. The greater quantity of charred material remained in the upper part of the soil. The soil was converted to a stagnopodzol, with mobilisation of iron and manganese from the upper part of the soil under the influence of high leaching and a vegetation conducive to podzolisation, their deposition as pan features obstructing further percolation of water and bringing about stagnation above the pan.

There was sufficient disturbance of the surface vegetation for rain impact to disrupt the now poorly-structured A horizon and wash silty clay into the pores. The silty clay infillings and coatings do not contain the abundance of very fine charcoal which would be expected if this process happened during or after the deposition of the layer of charcoal at the surface of the buried soil. There is no sign of the organic A horizon which would be expected to develop on a soil of this type, and if it had been in place the mineral soil would not have been exposed to rain. The organic horizon, if present, must have been thin and would have been compressed by the barrow overburden, and mixed with the charcoal. Stripping off turf to build the mound could have been the process which exposed the mineral soil.

The charcoal layer was then deposited, and the surface was buried below barrow material. Further localised mobilisation of iron then took place to produce the staining just below the surface.

Pollen

Samples were taken from layers 009, 010 and 011, components of the buried soil horizon below the barrow. Many of the samples contained relatively well preserved pollen, although thin and corroded grains were noted. All spectra contained modest amounts of *Alnus* (alder) and Coryloid (probably hazel) pollen. Some features of
the pollen spectra may have been caused or accentuated by differential pollen preservation, for example the enormous numbers of *Polypodium* (polypody) spores in some of the samples.

Ericales (heather) pollen was only present in samples from the top of the profile next to the Shooting Box barrow. This may represent development of heather moorland at a later date than that represented by samples from beneath the barrow bank, but probably not such an extensive heather cover as grows on the Long Mynd now.

*Polypodium* spores were very abundant, numbers reaching 200–300% of the total land pollen, *Pteridium* (bracken) less so at around 10%. *Polypodium* is fairly widespread in the western uplands of Shropshire (Sinker *et al* 1991), doubtless favoured by the wetter climate. *Polypodium* and *Pteridium* would have formed part of the grassland and fern vegetation of the Long Mynd.
The great majority of the pollen, comprising 80–90% of the total (except spores), was from various herbs. *Plantago lanceolata* (ribwort plantain) and Poaceae (grasses) were most abundant, followed by Dipsacaceae (probably *Succisa pratensis*, devil’s-bit scabious) and *Ranunculus* type (buttercup) and *Potentilla* (cinquefoil). These suggest that the Long Mynd was mainly covered by grassland during the periods represented by the pollen samples.

There was no sign of any cultivated plants, and no cereal pollen was found. Cereals were probably not grown on the Long Mynd, but one might have expected some cereal pollen to have been blown in from the surrounding valleys. This implies that the pollen was from a very local catchment area.

**Plant macrofossils**

The four samples from the barrow mound itself (layers 004, 005, 006, 007) all contained charred plant material, of variable quantity and quality. A fifth sample, from the soil layer beneath the barrow (009), included cereal seeds and weed seeds, which suggests that processing of cereals was being undertaken within the vicinity of the barrow before its construction. The seeds recovered from the barrow material itself probably originate from upcast from the gleyed soil during construction of the barrow. The weed seeds are typical of early Bronze Age cultivation assemblages, as found at sites such as Bromfield (de Rouffignac 1995a) and Trelystan (Britnell 1982).

The abundance of other charred material, including twigs and rootlets, may be indicative of the burning of cleared scrub before the barrow was constructed, though the presence of this material on a burial site could also represent fuel gathered for use in a cremation pyre. The presence of a scrub vegetation may also be inferred from charred *Rubus* sp (bramble) thorns and fragments of *Corylus avellana* (hazel) nuts.

The presence of charred tubers is of considerable interest, though identification to species was not possible due to their poor preservation. Edible tubers have been identified from various Bronze Age sites in the Midlands, and are thought to represent an important gathered food resource (Moffett 1991, 190); tubers were also abundant from one barrow at Bromfield and may be a food offering (de Rouffignac 1995a, 60). It is possible that the tubers from the layer beneath the barrow were just part of material gathered up for burning when clearance was taking place.

The whole of layer 008, the charcoal layer which separated the barrow from the soil horizon below, was sampled and submitted for radiocarbon dating. The bulk of the charcoal proved to be *Quercus* (oak, including heartwood), but there was a smaller quantity of *Betula* (birch). Charcoal from layer 007 was also identified as *Quercus* and *Betula*, and is likely to represent disturbed material from the burning.

**Radiocarbon dating**

Two AMS (accelerator) dates were obtained from *Betula* charcoal from layer 008. The dates, from separate pieces of charcoal, produced date ranges of 1950–1690 cal BC (OxA-5080; 3495 ± 45 BP) and 1890–1670 cal BC (OxA-5081; 3445 ± 45 BP).

**Barrow bank**

**Excavation and stratigraphy**

Excavation consisted of cutting back part of the barrow bank on the eastern side of the trackway to a straight and vertical section. This involved minimal removal of soil, and no artefacts were found. The drawn section (Fig. 5) is at an oblique angle to the bank.

Beneath the bank was a buried soil, consisting of a B horizon (107, 106) and an A horizon (105); the latter only survived towards the centre of the bank, and had evidently been removed elsewhere. Layer 104 formed the main bank material, a compact dark yellowish brown clay loam. The top of the bank, which subsequently developed as a soil horizon including a turf line (103, 102), had been buried by the modern topsoil (101). A possible posthole (108) had been cut from the level of the turf line 102, but was of uncertain date.
Sampling

Samples for soil analysis and micromorphology and for pollen were taken from the buried soil layers below the centre of the bank (105, 106, 107). No samples were taken for plant macrofossils.

Soil analysis and micromorphology

Beneath the bank, the buried ground surface was indistinct, but was taken to be the top of a distinctly paler horizon above a stone line. Analysis again confirms field texture assessment and a strongly acid reaction. Very high loss on ignition reflects content of recent, unhumified roots.

The soil has the structural characteristics of an acid brown earth or the B horizon of a brown podzolic soil, but the presence of a stone line indicates an earlier history of worm sorting, suggesting less acid conditions earlier in the soil’s history. Some disturbance prior to the burial of the soil had disrupted an already formed iron pan, showing that podzolisation to this degree had already occurred before burial, but the soil is not isolated from the pedogenic effects of present vegetation and there has been some further translocation of iron. The slight development of podzolisation in the soil under the bank is in clear contrast to the stagnopodzol below the barrow mound.

Pollen

Samples were taken from the buried soil below the bank (layers 105 – A horizon, and 106 – B horizon). These contained some *Quercus* (oak) and *Tilia* (lime) pollen, as well as traces of *Betula* (birch), and Dipsacaceae (scabious / teasel type). The Dipsacaceae pollen, especially abundant in these samples, probably reflects some degree of differential preservation, allowing this thick-walled pollen to persist where other grains have probably decayed.

Discussion of results

Survey and excavation of the Shooting Box barrow has helped to define the surviving form of the monument, which has suffered disturbance on a number of recent occasions, and has also provided some constructional detail. It is identified as a bell-disc barrow, though apparently without a ditch. The turf lines within the mound material have many parallels, including, locally, barrow B15 at Bromfield. As turf seems to have been absent from the area below the barrow, it is likely that at least some of the turf used was stripped from the area of the barrow itself. There was then an episode of burning resulting in a charcoal layer, before the barrow was built. The excavation was too small, however, for more extensive conclusions on the barrow construction to be drawn. The detailed earthwork survey indicated that the bank had been laid out in short straight stretches rather than forming a regular circle.

There are a number of differences between the sample results from the barrow mound and bank. These can be seen to derive from the different post-depositional environments below the two earthwork features, as well as from differences contemporary with or earlier than the barrow. The contrast between the soil beneath the mound...
and that beneath the bank is possibly attributable to the geological boundary close to the site. The stagnopodzol beneath the mound is only locally present on the plateau today, and this pattern appears to have already been established by the Bronze Age.

The presence of oak and lime pollen, which may represent evidence of ancient woodland, in samples from beneath the bank, may indicate that these represent an earlier period than samples from beneath the barrow itself. This region would have originally been covered by mixed wildwood, mainly of lime, oak and elm, with alder carr in the damp valleys. The woodland seems to have disappeared with the advent of occupation of the landscape in the prehistoric period.

It is interesting that no cereal pollen was recovered from the deposits beneath the barrow. In view of the abundance of some thinner-walled pollen grains in the samples analysed, this is likely to reflect a real absence of cereal cultivation in the area rather than poor preservation. While cereals may not have been grown on the Long Mynd or in the immediately surrounding lowlands, the plant macrofossil evidence shows that cereal processing did take place. This may however have been a specific activity, perhaps associated with burial rites rather than occupation.

The environmental material can be added to the corpus of material derived from sampling at barrow sites in the region. This includes Bromfield (barrows B9, B10, B15; Stanford 1982; Hughes et al 1995), Meole Brace (Hughes and Woodward 1995), Trelystan (Britnell 1982), and Four Crosses (Warrilow et al 1986). There is considerable potential for information from these sites, relating both to the local environment and to activities related to the funerary and other uses of the sites. However, work on as small a scale as that reported here, while confirming the potential, is more likely to suggest further questions than to provide definitive interpretations of landscape history.

The Devil’s Mouth cross-dyke (SA 00251)

Location

The Devil’s Mouth cross-dyke (SO 438943) crosses a narrow col between the Cardingmill and Townbrook valleys, on the east side of the Long Mynd, at an altitude of 380m. To the west the ground slopes gently upwards towards the top of the Long Mynd; to the east, there is a much steeper slope up to the Devil’s Mouth. The site lies at the base of the shaly mudstones and siltstones of the Synalds Group of the Stretton Series. The brown podzolic soil of the Withnell series is severely eroded here, and supports an acid grassland vegetation which is close-cropped by sheep.

Description and recent site history

The earthwork (Fig. 6) consists of a bank, up to 6m wide and 1.5m high, with a ditch to either side, cutting off the Devil’s Mouth spur; the ditch to the west (4–6m wide, 0.7m deep) is much more substantial than that to the east (2–3m wide, 0.3m deep), which is perhaps merely a quarry. The bank is cut by the Burway road, and by a car park, and there is now no visible evidence that it was ever continuous. It extends for 25m to the north of this 35m gap, and 70m to the south. At both ends the ditches disappear, and the bank then tails away down precipitous slopes, some 200m into the valleys on either side.

The Devil’s Mouth cross-dyke does not seem to have been recognised as an ancient earthwork until it was described by Cobbold in 1904. The Burway road was formerly a braided series of tracks at this point, and one of these ran diagonally across the site of the present car park. It has been suggested that the central part of the earthwork was levelled when the car park was constructed; while this may be partially true, the 1905 Ordnance Survey 1:2500 map shows the monument apparently with a similar extent to that surviving today. The car park was resurfaced in 1972, and it was at that time that a trench was dug around the edge of the car park to prevent vehicles driving off the surfaced area on to the moor. This trench had subsequently been partly backfilled.

Repair

As well as pressure from livestock (ubiquitous on the Long Mynd), the cross-dyke was subject to erosion caused by visitors to the adjacent car park, one of the most popular viewpoints in the area. The surface of the bank had become trampled and badly worn, and much of the turf had to be removed and replaced.
Fieldwork

Trench 1 (5 x 1m) was excavated across the end of the bank next to the car park. In this area the turf was so worn that it needed total replacement. Trench 2 (also 5 x 1m) involved the re-excavation of part of the modern trench surrounding the car park, and the excavation of a small area of deposits below this. The earthwork was surveyed in 1995.

Excavation and stratigraphy

Following the removal of the turf in Trench 1, and the recent car park material in Trench 2, further excavation was confined to Trench 2, where the rock-cut ditch and part of the bank of the cross-dyke were evident (Fig. 7). The ditch had been cut by the trench around the car park (102), and at an earlier date by a wide (3.85m) and shallow (maximum 0.45m) cut feature (111); the latter also appeared to be recent.

An area of buried soil (110) was encountered at the eastern end of the excavated area; this was discontinuous, and covered an area of less than 0.25m², where it had been sealed by the bank material (107); only the very edge of the bank was encountered. The ditch cut (116) was 0.35m from the probable edge of the bank; the ditch was shallow and U-shaped (0.95m wide and 0.35m deep). Overlying the two ditch fills (115, along the east side, and possibly the result of contemporary bank erosion, and 114, the main fill) was a soil layer (117), and adjacent to this was a second layer (118). It is possible that the latter represents a second layer of bank material; however the origin of both layers is uncertain.

A stray (and undated) flint flake was found on the surface of the bank, but there were no stratified prehistoric finds.

Sampling

Sampling was confined to the limited area of buried soil revealed below the western edge of the bank. Samples were taken for pollen and soil analysis and micromorphology. There was insufficient material available for bulk samples for plant macrofossil analysis. However the charcoal sent for radiocarbon dating was identified.
Soil analysis and micromorphology

This soil is distinctly finer in texture than at the Shooting Box barrow, reflecting the mudstone parent material, and is again acid in reaction. High loss on ignition reflects charcoal content, but unhumified organic matter is also abundant. Soil micromorphology provided a rather more complex picture than that given by archaeological excavation and straightforward visual inspection of deposits (where the A and B horizons had been recorded as a single context).

The soil below the bank was variable in depth, with a discontinuous grey horizon blackened in places by abundant charcoal, overlying a pinker horizon, dipping into crevices in jumbled shale fragments. In places a very thin iron pan occurred at the top of the grey horizon.

A very thin brown podzolic soil had formed on the red mudstone, giving a pinkish silt-rich horizon below a browner, slightly iron-depleted A horizon. Fine particles of charcoal were incorporated into the A horizon. The profile was disrupted, mixing brown soil containing dispersed fine charred material with pinker, cleaner soil from the B horizon. Small sharp stone fragments were introduced into its surface, and then charcoal was deposited on the surface before it was buried. Processes subsequent to burial have redistributed iron, giving the staining at the surface. Later, faunal activity has introduced reworked soil in the form of fine aggregates deposited loosely in channels.

The shallowness of the soil and the eroded nature of the locality today give little scope for comparison, but again a low degree of podzolisation is manifest in the buried soil. On these intensely red mudstones, however, there is some resistance to dissolution of the ancient haematite to provide the iron mobilised in podzolisation.

Pollen

A single sample was analysed, from the buried soil (110). This contained a small quantity of *Fraxinus* (ash) pollen.

Plant macrofossils

About 20 fragments of *Corylus* (hazel) charcoal were identified from a sample sent for radiocarbon dating.

Radiocarbon dating

A sample of charcoal from the buried soil was submitted for radiocarbon dating. The two AMS determinations obtained produced date ranges of 1520–1320 cal BC (OxA-5082; 3155 ± 45 BP) and 1510–1260 cal BC (OxA-5083; 3105 ± 45 BP).

Discussion

The two radiocarbon dates provide significant support for the identification of the linear earthworks on the Long Mynd as middle to late Bronze Age in date. This is in general agreement with Guilbert’s (1975)
assessment of the Stitt Hill earthwork complex. However, the results throw no further light on the function of
the earthwork, and little on its construction or on the contemporary environment. The small size of the
excavation, and the concentration on areas of previous disturbance, were limiting factors, and the areas of bank,
ditch and buried soil actually seen in the excavation were smaller than anticipated. Any conclusions drawn from
the work at this site must therefore be tentative.

High Park Cottage cross-dyke (SA 00199)

Location

The High Park Cottage cross-dyke (SO 444968) is at an altitude of 400m, on a slope which falls gently from the
plateau eastwards. It is at the northern limit both of the open moorland and of National Trust ownership. The
local geology consists of Pre-Cambrian siltstones of the Lightsout Group, Stretton Series, with some head of
loose rock rubble. Brown podzolic soils of the Batch series are present at the site, covered with acid grassland,
and close cropped by sheep and ponies. The area suffers badly from bracken invasion.

Description and recent site history

The High Park Cottage earthwork crosses a low ridge between two steep-sided stream gullies. The total length
of the earthwork is c. 350m, of which 230m is on the open moor. To the north of this the bank continues as a
substantial embanked field boundary, with regular nineteenth century enclosure fields to either side.

The bank is up to 8m wide and generally no more than 0.5m high. There is a ditch on the upslope (western)
side of the bank for most of its length, generally 4m wide and 0.4m deep; as it approaches the sample site the
ditch appears to divide into two. A slight earthwork, oval in plan, which overlies the ditches, may represent a
small embanked pond, probably of post-medieval date, similar to others seen close to nearby common-edge
houses. There are three gaps in the earthwork, one of which has been suggested to be original (Shropshire SMR;
information from the Ordnance Survey Field Investigator 1972). The sample site is on the southern side of the
most northerly gap, and on the very edge of the open moorland. The cross-dyke also forms the western
boundary of an area of undated (but probably post-medieval) narrow ridge and furrow cultivation. This runs up
to and over the eastern tail of the bank. The bank itself is undated.

Repair

The gap in the earthwork at the sample site is used by a farm track which runs along the edge of the common;
tyre tracks had cut into the end of the bank and stabilisation of this area was needed.

Fieldwork

Where the bank was being eroded by the trackway, the north-facing side was cut back to form a roughly vertical
section. Visual inspection of conditions in the sample area was sufficient to indicate that the potential for organic
preservation within the bank material or buried soils was very low, and no samples for pollen, plant macrofossils
or radiocarbon dating were taken. A contour survey was made of the area around the erosion.

Excavation and stratigraphy

Cutting back the earthwork in the eroded area revealed that the bank survived to a height of only 0.20m at the
sample site. The bank material consisted of a single layer of compact dark yellowish brown silty clay, with
moderate amounts of gravel and small angular stones. The upper part of the section was made up of a stony
layer, probably representing a post-medieval road surface, and a subsequent subsoil and topsoil. At the base of
the bank was a charcoally lens and below this a buried soil profile.

No artefact dating was obtained from the High Park Cottage earthwork.
Soil analysis and micromorphology

The very high silt content reflects the siltstone parent material, and the soil is again acid. Exceptionally high loss on ignition is not easily explained. The buried surface at the High Park Cottage cross-dyke was marked by the slightly browner colour and lower stone content of the upper part of the buried soil compared to the material of the bank and the lower part of the buried soil. The buried soil is a shallow acid brown earth, formed on head dominated by silty rock, micromorphology showing no effects of surface disturbance prior to burial. The acid brown earth would be a fragile soil type, susceptible to podzolisation under changing grazing pressure and vegetation type, the process resulting in the brown podzolic soils now found in the area.

Discussion

The earthwork had clearly been eroded and disturbed by traffic using the trackway over a long period. This and the well drained nature of the sample site contributed to the generally poorer preservation here, compared with the other two sites sampled. Little of the monument survived in section and there was no potential for sampling for organic material here, although other locations on this earthwork are likely to be more fruitful. The soil micromorphology indicated that there had been changes in land-use, and therefore in soil type, since the construction of the bank.

Discussion and conclusions

Results of the environmental sampling

The results of this small-scale project have a bearing on a wide range of aspects of the archaeology of the Long Mynd. However, the scale of the work at the individual sites means that some of the conclusions drawn are preliminary and require further testing. More significant is the demonstration of high potential for integrated study at the Shooting Box barrow and the Devil’s Mouth cross-dyke. Even the High Park Cottage cross-dyke is likely to provide useful material, though from other parts of the earthwork.

The environmental evidence – soil analysis and micromorphology, pollen and charred plant macrofossils – from the Shooting Box barrow has provided a clear sequence of events prior to and during the construction of the barrow. It has also provided evidence on the nature of the prehistoric landscape of the Long Mynd during the early Bronze Age. The radiocarbon dating of the Devil’s Mouth cross-dyke is important in confirming the suggestion that earthwork and other remains from the middle to late Bronze Age are widely distributed in this upland area. The Bronze Age dating of the Devil’s Mouth earthwork means that the Long Mynd cross-dykes should now be considered alongside similar linear earthworks in Wessex and elsewhere. Again, comparisons with nearby lowland sites are likely to be instructive. The results from the cross-dykes suggest that full excavation of sections through the earthworks in undisturbed areas would provide significant further information.

The pollen results show that the Long Mynd seems to have been used as pasture during the time covered by the samples (probably in the Bronze Age). Very little work had hitherto been undertaken in these upland areas (Greig, undated); however, contemporary results from valley bottoms show that thick woodland persisted there, the woodland being cleared in phases. The wet woodlands of the valleys seem to have persisted for a long time because the land was not very valuable for agriculture. However there was far more clearance of woodland on the drier land of the valley slopes, especially during the Bronze Age (around c. 2000 cal BC; c. 3700 BP). Some lowland sites show evidence of a very open grassy arable landscape by the Bronze Age, especially in fertile areas such as the Warwickshire Avon valley (Greig 1987; Greig and Colledge 1988). There is very good potential for investigating the vegetational history of the uplands from suitable buried land surfaces, in particular from sites like the Shooting Box barrow.

The three buried soils reflect the characteristics of their parent materials in their texture, and show a strong relationship to the soils of the present day in their localities, but there are some differences which can be attributed to changes in the soils since the surfaces were buried. Detailed soil survey in the locality of the barrow would help to investigate the pattern further.

Collectively, the earthwork monuments of the Long Mynd provide a laboratory for the study of environmental change which is unique in this part of England. The series of dated or datable earthworks, representing all periods from the early Bronze Age to the present day, has the potential for a reconstruction of environmental history through most of the period of settled human occupation in the region. While the small-scale work on the Long Mynd has demonstrated potential and suggested an outline sequence, sampling of earthwork features on a
larger scale should allow better interpretation of the contemporary and earlier vegetation and cultivation regimes, and of the use of wild and domesticated plant products.

**Monument management and palaeoenvironmental sampling**

The results of the work on the Long Mynd indicate that even small-scale and relatively inexpensive fieldwork can yield useful results when appropriate recording and analytical techniques are applied. The broad research framework produced by the Marches Uplands Survey (de Rouffignac 1995b) provided an essential backdrop for the work, and similar documents would be valuable elsewhere. The value of more detailed research designs should be considered in areas such as the Long Mynd, where there are concentrations of suitable earthwork and other remains (including, for instance, field systems and enclosures as well as the barrows and cross-dykes) with potential for further sampling. All earthwork monuments should be considered as potential sources of evidence for palaeoenvironmental reconstruction. Opportunities for the recording of palaeoenvironmental material, whether during management-related work, such as that reported here, or development-related projects, may be very short-lived and must be grasped firmly when they occur.
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### Appendix 1 Context listing

#### Shooting Box barrow (SA 00198)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Site period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Layer Topsoil</td>
<td>Concrete foundation of shooting box</td>
<td>Recent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Foundation trench for shooting box</td>
<td>Recent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>Cut Barrow material</td>
<td>Barrow material with turf lines</td>
<td>Barrow construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>Layer Barrow material</td>
<td>Barrow construction</td>
<td>Barrow construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>Layer Barrow material</td>
<td>Preparation for barrow construction</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>Layer Charcoal layer</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Bank construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>Layer A horizon below barrow</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>Layer Iron &amp; manganese pan</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>Layer Former turf line</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>Layer Subsoil</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>Layer Bank material</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>Layer Old ground surface below bank</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>Layer Grey stony layer, possibly road material</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>Layer B horizon below bank</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>Layer B horizon below bank</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>Layer B horizon below bank</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017</td>
<td>Cut Possible posthole</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Outer bank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Site period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Layer Topsoil</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Layer Former turf line</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Layer Subsoil</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Layer Bank material</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Layer Old ground surface below bank</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Layer B horizon below bank</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Layer B horizon below bank</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Cut Possible posthole</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### High Park Cottage cross-dyke (SA 00199)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Site period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Layer Turf</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>Layer Modern subsoil</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>Layer Road material</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>Layer Bank material</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>Layer Old ground surface below bank</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>Layer B horizon below bank</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>Layer Grey stony layer, possibly road material</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>Layer B horizon below bank</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Devil’s Mouth cross-dyke (SA 00251)

**Trench 1 (bank)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Site period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Layer Turf</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>Layer Car park material</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>Layer Former turf line</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>Layer Bank material</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trench 2 (ditch and bank)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Site period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Layer &amp; fill Car park material and fill of 102</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Cut Trench around car park</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Cut Shallow N-S gully</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Fill Fill of 103</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Layer Former turf line</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Layer Grey layer – former topsoil?</td>
<td>Turf and topsoil</td>
<td>Pre-barrow soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Material/Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Bank material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Ditch fill of 111 (grey)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Ditch fill of 111 (stony)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Buried topsoil below bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Wide ditch cut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Layer at W end of trench, cut by 111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>B horizon below bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Ditch fill (stony)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Ditch fill (silting or slumped bank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Ditch cut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Layer or fill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Layer (?bank material)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix 2  Buried soils  Susan Limbrey**

This appendix contains the methods, soil descriptions and micromorphological analysis for the three sites. The introductory text, discussion and conclusions can be found in the main report.

**Methods**

After examination in the laboratory, with use of stereomicroscope for greater detail in description, samples for micromorphology were dried by acetone replacement and impregnated with Crystic resin by slow replacement of acetone from dilute solution, and then cured. Thin sections, 10x4cm and 5x4cm according to needs of study, were prepared in the Soil Science Laboratories of Aberdeen and Newcastle Universities.

Laboratory analyses included particle size analysis by sieve and SediGraph X-ray equipment, after pretreatment to remove organic matter and ultrasonic dispersion, and pH, total organic matter and loss on ignition by standard methods.

**Soil Descriptions**

**Shooting Box Barrow; soil beneath barrow mound**

The buried surface was covered by a mass of charcoal. It was not possible to distinguish any organic horizon which, if present, must have been thin and would have been compressed by the overburden, and mixed with the charcoal. Description and sampling began below the charcoal layer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (cm)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Strong brown, 7.5YR 5/6, stony sandy clay loam with black mottling. Abrupt boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thin iron pan (not continuous): 2mm thick, yellowish red, 5YR 4/6. Sharp boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Brown, 7.5YR 5/2, moist, 5YR 7/1–6/1 dry, more grey in upper 1cm, and with common distinct fine diffuse mottles, yellowish red, 5YR 5/6, sandy clay loam with many softened and disintegrating stones, fine angular blocky structure. Moderately sticky, very plastic. Sharp boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>Yellowish red, 5YR 5/8 moist, variably intense staining, interleaved with thin, darker, hard, pan. Sharp boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-6.5</td>
<td>Black, hard. Sharp boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5-7</td>
<td>Dark reddish brown, 5YR3/2 and darker, fading downwards with a zone of mottling. The dark reddish brown colour is in part in the form of coatings to very fine granular peds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>Yellowish to light olive brown, 10YR-2.5Y 5/6 moist, 10YR 6/7 dry, with dark brown, 5YR 3/2, sharp fine mottles (soft concretions), stony sandy silt loam. Fine granular structure, moderately sticky and very plastic. Clear boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-20</td>
<td>Dark yellowish brown, 10YR 4/5 moist, 6/5 dry, coarse stony sandy loam, weak fine granular structure, slightly sticky, moderately plastic. Clear boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>Dark yellowish brown, 10YR 4/4 moist, 7/4 dry, stony sandy clay loam, weak fine granular structure, slightly sticky, moderately plastic. Abrupt boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td>Shale, fragmenting, with grey clay matrix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shooting Box barrow: soil beneath bank
The buried surface was indistinct, but was taken to be the top of a distinctly paler horizon above a stone line.

0–3cm Yellowish brown, 10YR 5/6 moist, 6/6 dry, with faint fine ferruginous mottles and coatings, sandy loam, fine granular structure, slightly sticky, slightly plastic. Sharp boundary. [Context 105]

3–6cm Dark reddish brown, 5YR 3/3 moist, 10YR 5/6 dry, Stony sandy clay loam, very fine angular blocky to fine granular structure, moderately sticky, very plastic. The stones formed a distinct stone line within this darker soil. Sharp boundary. [Context 106]

6–22cm Strong brown, 7.5YR 5/6 moist, 6/5 dry, sandy loam, weak very fine granular structure, moderately sticky, slightly plastic. Sharp boundary. [Context 107]

22cm + Stones in a loamy sand matrix, yellowish brown, 10YR 5/6 moist, 6/6 dry. [Context 107]

Devil’s Mouth cross-dyke
The soil was variable in depth, 5cm at most, and in characteristics, with a discontinuous grey, 5YR 2.5/2, horizon blackened in places by abundant charcoal, overlying a pinker horizon, 7.5YR 3/2 moist, 6/2 dry, dipping into crevices in jumbled shale fragments. In places a very thin iron pan occurred at the top of the grey horizon. Soil texture stony sandy loam; structure fine angular blocky. [Context 110]

High Park Cottage cross-dyke
The buried surface was marked by the slightly browner colour and lower stone content of the upper part of the buried soil compared to the material of the bank and the lower part of the buried soil.

0–5cm Reddish brown to dark brown, 5YR-7.5 YR 4/4 moist, 10YR 5/5 dry, very stony sandy loam, weak very fine granular structure, slightly sticky, slightly plastic. Clear boundary. [Context 006]

5–12cm Dark brown, 5YR 3/3 moist, 6/5 dry, extremely stony sandy clay loam, weak very fine granular structure, slightly sticky, slightly plastic. Clear boundary. [Context 006]

12cm + Very loose stones with matrix of clay loam, colour becoming a bit paler. [Context 008]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sand</th>
<th>Silt</th>
<th>Clay</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>Organic matter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shooting box barrow, mound</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–5cm</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–13cm</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–20cm</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–25cm</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shooting box barrow, bank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–3cm</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–6cm</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–11cm</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–16cm</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–21cm</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22cmm+</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Park Cottage cross-dyke</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–5cm</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–10cm</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–15cm</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Devil’s Mouth cross-dyke** |      |      |      |     |               |
| 0–5cm                   | 36.9 | 49.9 | 15.2 | 4.4 | ND            |

Table 1 Soil composition – analytical data

Micromorphological analysis

**Shooting Box Barrow: soil beneath the barrow mound**

Slides LM 1 and 1a: The slide covers the depth from immediately below the charcoal on the buried surface to below the iron pan, an additional small slide covering the lower part of the iron pan, the manganese pan and the upper part of the underlying soil.
Above the pan: Unsorted, porphyritic; structure angular blocky, accommodated planar voids and occasional channels and chambers (part of the slide shows this structure disrupted, with larger voids and unaccommodated subangular blocky peds, but presence of large stones in this area suggests disruption during sampling). Colour light brown, slightly pinkish in lower part. Crystalline fabric (medium silt, predominantly quartz) with a small amount of brown opaque isotropic fine material, increasing downwards. Occasional charcoal fragments. There is a large amount of fine black particles, but the stones present contain very abundant opaque black minerals, so it is not possible to assess the quantity of fine charred particles. Stones, predominantly fine sandstone with a high content of mafic minerals, are strongly altered and iron stained but have iron-depleted rims. The mottles are mostly centred on stones, but in the lower part there are localized areas of iron staining of the soil fabric. There are abundant layered coatings and infillings to channels and chambers, particularly in the lower part but also right up to the surface, with pale yellow dusty and impure clay.

Close to the buried surface there is a zone of iron staining and impregnation forming hypocoatings in a fine granular structure. There are infillings and coatings of yellow isotropic iron hydroxide. Fragmentation of coatings and infillings has occurred in some areas, and channels are infilled with fine granular aggregates and these ferruginous papules.

Iron/humus pan: There is a rapid transition from the light brown soil to a zone where the opaque brown fine material becomes more dense and becomes iron stained and then increasingly impregnated. The microstructure prior to impregnation appears to have been fine granular, but the structure has coalesced, and remaining voids have been infilled with yellow to red isotropic iron hydroxide. The staining and impregnation is laminar, each lamina having a sharp top and fading downwards. The pale yellow layered impure and dusty clay coatings penetrate from the soil above the zone of iron impregnation into occasional channels and chambers within it.

Manganese pan: below the zone of most intense iron enrichment, black manganese dioxide forms further laminar pan. Below the dense black impregnation, the porous fine granular structure becomes very apparent, the aggregates still being impregnated with iron oxide but not coalesced and with many voids not infilled. As the black pan fades out downwards, black infillings and coatings give way to discrete impregnated peds, and at the same time the iron staining takes the form of hypocoatings and then fades out.

Slide LM 2. This slide covers the 10cm below the pan. Unsorted, porphyritic; structure is composite, fine granular, partly coalesced, and fine angular blocky. Colour is yellowish brown. Fabric crystalline, with yellow isotropic fine material. Discrete dark red iron/manganese oxide impregnations, fade out downwards. Fragments of humified organic matter, and spore-like bodies occur. Some yellow isotropic iron hydroxide infillings in the upper part.

Shooting Box barrow: soil beneath bank

Slide LM 3. The slide covers 9.5cm down from the apparent buried surface. It is divided at a depth of 6 to 7cm by a weakly developed thin iron pan. The texture is unsorted, porphyritic, but a concentration of stones above the iron pan represents the stone line observed macroscopically. Porous fine granular structure, partly coalesced, with channels and chambers. Above the iron pan the soil is light brown, the crystalline fabric has a small amount of brown isotropic fine material; below the pan, the colour is yellowish brown, again with isotropic fine material of that colour. Above the pan, the soil is iron-depleted, and stones have depleted rims. There is patchy iron staining, and some stained peds and papules of yellow isotropic iron hydroxide which appear to have been derived from the pan and incorporated into the overlying soil. There are no coatings or infillings to pores in the soil above the pan, except in the incorporated peds. The iron pan has the form of an upper lamina, with a sharp top and a more diffuse base, and two or three weaker laminae below this, all within two to three millimetres, below which staining rapidly fades. Within the pan there are infillings of yellow isotropic iron hydroxide, and these occur patchily in the soil below. The pan has been disrupted, there being gaps, and some fragments of it being upside down. Immediately above and below the pan there are isolated peds of darker soil more strongly iron stained in which the infillings are micro-laminated and dark reddish brown. Immediately below the pan there are infillings to pores with soil like that above the pan, and channels have loose deposits of small ovoid aggregates – the excreta of microfauna.

The soil has fragments of humified organic matter, and residues of fine roots whose outer cells have been impregnated with iron oxide. Since these roots are in pores, rather than embedded in the soil fabric, they would appear to be those of recent vegetation, and their condition shows that mobilization of iron is at least in part a recent process. There is also an unusually large number of spores, of unidentified type, in the soil.

Devil’s Mouth cross-dyke

Slide LM 4. The slide covers the base of the overburden and the 5cm depth of the buried soil at a point where it is most fully expressed. The main part of the fabric is unsorted, but there is a concentration of angular mudstone
fragments at the bottom, and another concentration of smaller angular mudstone fragments in the top of the buried soil. Within the soil, stones are smaller and rounded, and include siltstone. Complex structure, prismatic and angular blocky, accommodated with planar voids, subangular blocky with channels and chambers, and fine granular, loose aggregates in channels and chambers among the blocky peds, locally in crescentic pattern. The prismatic and blocky peds appear to be formed by intense coalescence of fine granular structure which is just detectable within them. Colour variable dark greyish brown to reddish brown, increasingly reddish brown in the lower part, particularly among the mudstone fragments. Peds of different colour, and with different amounts of fine charred particles occur side by side; the loose aggregates in channels are greyish brown rather than reddish. Fabric is crystallic, with variable amounts of brown and reddish brown isotropic fine material. Some stones have iron-depleted rims, others have staining spreading from them. Iron staining is concentrated close to the buried surface and at the base of the soil. Some of the iron stained areas have reddish brown birefringent clay/iron oxide infillings and coatings. Iron staining does not affect the loose aggregates in channels. Large charcoal fragments, having cell structure preserved to exceptional degree, are concentrated on the top of the buried soil, some of them affected by iron staining; some fragments are crushed, and crushed particles dispersed into the immediately underlying soil for a short distance. There are occasional rounded charcoal fragments lower down, in poorer condition than those at the surface.

**High Park Cottage cross-dyke**

**Slide LM 5** The slide covers the upper 5cm of the buried soil. Texture is unsorted, open porphyritic. Structure is porous, vughy to spongy, with very fine granular aggregates coalescing to form the fabric; loose fine granular aggregates occur in channels. Colour is yellowish brown. Fabric is crystallic, coarse and medium silt with moderate amount of yellowish brown isotropic fine material. Fragments of humified organic matter and brown stains occur. Fungal sclerotia, complete and disintegrating occur. No iron staining in the soil fabric. No coatings or infillings. Stones, which are predominantly siltstone but include sandstone and mudstone, do not have iron-depleted rims; some have slight iron stained rims. Rare charcoal fragments; since the stones contain an abundance of black opaque minerals which would be released into the soil by weathering, it is not possible to identify fine charred particles.

**Appendix 3 Pollen analysis – assessment report** James Greig

Samples for pollen analysis were collected by the author from the Shooting Box barrow (six samples from the barrow mound and a further six from the outer bank), and from the Devil’s Mouth cross-dyke (one sample only).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Sample location</th>
<th>Sample no</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shooting Box barrow – barrow mound</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009 Grey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Counted – good pollen flora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009 Purple grey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not counted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010 Iron pan (yellow)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not counted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010 Iron pan (black)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not counted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011 Brown earth (B)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Not counted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011 Brown earth (lower)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Counted – no pollen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shooting Box barrow – barrow bank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 50mm below datum</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Counted – interpretable pollen flora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 60mm below datum</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Counted – interpretable pollen flora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 70mm below datum</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Not counted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106 80mm below datum</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Not counted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106 90mm below datum</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Not counted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106 100mm below datum</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Counted – Polypodium spores only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Devil’s Mouth cross-dyke</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 Buried soil</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Counted – interpretable pollen flora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Summary of pollen sampling and results
Preliminary results

Trees and shrubs

All four samples which produced pollen contained modest amounts of *Alnus* (alder) and *Corylus* (hazel). Samples 7 and 8 also contained some *Quercus* (oak) and *Tilia* (lime), which may represent traces of persisting ancient woodland; this region would originally have been covered by mixed wildwood, mainly of lime, oak and elm, with alder carr in the damp valley soils. This woodland seems to have largely disappeared from those parts of the landscape which were occupied at the time of the construction of the earthworks. The presence of oak and lime pollen in samples 7 and 8 may indicate that they represent an earlier period than sample 1. Traces of *Betula* (birch) were present in samples 7, 8 and 13, and *Fraxinus* (ash) in 13.

Heathers

Ericales pollen (heathers etc), indicating heathland, was only present in sample 1 (and a single grain in sample 13). This may represent the development of some heather moorland at a later date than that represented by samples 7 and 8, though probably not such an extensive heather cover as on the Long Mynd now.

Herbs

The great majority of the pollen (80–90% of the total excluding spores) was from various herbs. *Plantago lanceolata* (ribwort plantain) and Gramineae (Poaceae) (grasses) were most abundant, followed by Dipsacaceae (probably *Succisa pratensis*) and *Ranunculus* sp (buttercup), and a number of small records of other probable grassland plants such as Liguliflorae (Cichorioidae) (hawkweeds etc) and *Potentilla* (cinquefoil). This indicates that the Long Mynd was mainly covered by grassland during the periods represented. The presence of the thick-walled Dipsacaceae pollen, especially abundant in sample 7, probably reflects some degree of differential preservation.

Cultivated plants

There was no sign of any cultivated plants, with not even any cereal pollen found. Although cereals were probably not grown on top of the Long Mynd, one might have expected some pollen to have been blown in from the surrounding valleys.

Ferns

*Polypodium* (polypody fern) spores were very abundant, reaching over 200% of the total pollen sum. *Pteridium* (bracken) was less frequent at around 10% of the total pollen sum. Polypody is fairly widespread in the western uplands of Shropshire (Sinker *et al* 1991), doubtless favoured by the oceanic climate. Polypody and bracken would have been a part of the grassland and fern vegetation of the Long Mynd.

Preliminary conclusions

These have been incorporated into the main report.

Appendix 4  Charred plant remains – assessment report  Clare de Rouffignac

Methodology

Only the Shooting Box barrow was sampled, as none of the other excavated areas provided suitable sampling locations.

A total of five samples of between 1.5 and 2 litres were collected by the author from the barrow material and from the soil layers below. The samples were smaller than desired as the excavated area was small.
The samples were floated and sieved using a 500 micron mesh for both the flot and the residue. The resulting samples were air-dried and the flots were examined using an EMT-1 low power stereomicroscope to recover all charred plant remains.

The seeds were identified using the Hereford and Worcester County Archaeological Service’s comparative collection and standard reference works.

Results

The samples all contained charred plant material, including varying quantities of charcoal, rootlets and twigs. The charred plant remains were variable in quantity and quality. The charcoal was very fragmentary, apart from some larger fragments from 009. Very few modern roots were present in the samples.

Context 007 did not contain any seeds, but charcoal from this layer was identified by Susan Limbrey (pers comm) as *Quercus* sp (oak) and *Betula* sp (birch).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charred plant remains</th>
<th>004</th>
<th>005</th>
<th>006</th>
<th>007</th>
<th>009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cereal indeterminate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Corylus avellana</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vicia / Lathyris</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rumex</em> sp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>P aviculare</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Polygonum</em> sp</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gramineae culm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culm node</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rubus</em> thorns</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate seeds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rootlets / twiglets</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Few</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Charred plant remains from Shooting Box barrow samples

Interpretation and Conclusions

These have been incorporated into the main report.
The Roman Road from Pennocrucium (Water Eaton) to Mediolanum (Whitchurch): Its Role in the Early Conquest.

By A.C. Waddelove and E. Waddelove

The existence of ‘a significant branch road from Pennocrucium aimed in the north-westerly direction at Chester, dating surely from the establishment of a legionary fortress there’ has been noted. The evidence of its course across Shropshire over the 29 miles distance to Mediolanum was summarised by Margary – his M19 – and lengthy portions of its course are marked on OS maps. His description of the route through Lapley, High Onn, New Guild, Sutton and on towards Ellerton is detailed in places and where the road is not followed by the hedge-rows and modern by-roads mentioned by him it can be detected by crop-marks on aerial photographs. These establish the actual line as being, in places, up to 30 yards south of that indicated on OS maps but the difference is not there significant.

In the middle of the route, however, from Camp Farm at SJ 7325 2475 (Figs. 2, 3A and 7) through the vicinity of Hinstock to Tern Hill, Margary’s evidence seems far from conclusive and at the western end, from Bletchley onwards, there is very little to support his conclusions that this road joined the one from Viroconium (M6a), ‘at Heath Cottage, 1½ miles south of Whitchurch ... [and] ... was the later of the two’. It was to ascertain the course in these two localities that research from the halfway point was undertaken by the present authors, the results of which are given in this paper.

Findings

From the crossing of minor by-roads (Fig. 3A) near Camp Farm, the Roman line is followed by the modern road for about a further 900 yards and then by a bridle-path, in part a hollow-way now overgrown with briars and small trees and only passable with difficulty, for a similar distance to Waggs Brook at 7205 2555. In that distance there are two minor, compensating, deviations from the alignment, apparently made to skirt a low-lying trough on the north side. Over the final approximately 100 yards to the brook the surveyors took advantage of a natural depression through the crest of the shallow valley but even so a cutting, some 9 feet deep at its maximum, was made to reduce the gradient. However, the face on the south side is appreciably deeper than that on the north and it is possible that that work was done at a later period as part of a widening and upgrading of the road.

Crop-marks show the line across the next field and then a low terrace, lined in part by sycamore and horse-chestnut trees just inside the southern boundary of Ellerton Hall, and a drive continue it to a minor road at 7157 2587: opposite the entrance to the drive stands Ellerton Lodge Cottage and behind that the road drops in a very distinct cutting through the crest of a small but steep-sided gully (Plate I) to a stream crossing the line at right-angles. All traces of any ford have, however, been obliterated by the construction of a water-mill and its race. The southern face of the corresponding cutting rises westwards on a slight curve through the opposite side of the gully – although neither of these prominent features is mentioned by Margary – with the modern by-road, Mill Lane, converging gradually onto it to continue on the Roman alignment for another 700 yards towards Ashfields before turning away to the south.

It is at this point that Margary’s account becomes vague: ‘at Ashfields it bears a little to the west, followed by a lane and then a hedge-row. At the north end of Hinstock it turns more to the north again, and is then followed by the main road [A41], known here as The Longford, for 6½ miles through Tern Hill and Bletchley ... it makes several slight changes of direction’. Such a route, however, involves a change of line of 13° to the south from the Mill Lane alignment, succeeded after a short distance by a second, of 30° to the north. It can also be seen,
Fig 1. The course of the Roman Road from Pennocruclium to Mediolanum.

Plate I The Roman cutting behind Ellerton Lodge Cottage (October 2001).
on the maps and on the ground, that the A41 is too winding to be on a Roman alignment; only after 3 miles, at the cross-roads at 657 303, does it pick up the straight line of The Longford which is on the conventionally accepted Roman alignment.

The contrast between the course over the preceding 15 miles and these last approximately 4½ miles with its two sharp angles and many bends is quite marked, although it is apparent from the OS maps that there are four straight lengths between Water Eaton and Mill Lane: it is probable that the deviations were necessary to take the road on the dry ground around the north of Aqualate Mere and the low-lying area at its north-western corner – the latter probably wetter and more extensive prior to modern drainage.7

The overall effect of those gradual changes of line is to take the actual road first very slightly to the south of the ‘base alignment’ directly between the two Roman sites and then to the north of it by some 500 yards at the mere, after which the road converges rapidly onto the base line and crosses it at Camp Farm, 2½ miles to the west. From there the two diverge even more rapidly towards Ellerton and Ashfields.

In trying to ascertain the course from Mill Lane over the next, central, 4½ miles it is necessary to appreciate why the road had rapidly deviated from the base line: after only 2 miles from Camp Farm it is nearly 700 yards from it as compared with the maximum 500 yards divergence at Aqualate Mere after nearly 11 miles. The most likely explanation is to be found in the topography farther west where a series of wide and shallow but wet valleys, including those of the rivers Tern and Ducklow and their many tributaries, extends north-westwards for about 7 miles more or less along the base line. On the south of those there is a ridge of higher, drier ground which would have presented fewer problems for the road builders and, although it is broken by the major of
The route vaguely described by Margary does, indeed, conform to that reasoning but it necessitates two large angles where only one would suffice and it goes much farther south than required. The evidence for a more direct route a little farther to the north of this is, initially, quite sparse: a layer of stones and cobbles, laid in a shallow trench in the boulder clay, was seen in April 1989 in the north bank of a small pond at 6985 2680, north-west of Ashfields (Fig. 3A), very close to the projected line of Mill Lane and 150 yards north of the Margary line. No further certain evidence has been found until the vicinity of Lavender Cottage, nearly 3 miles away, is reached (Fig. 3B). Here, some 220 yards south of the A41, a crop-mark is visible on air photographs for about 400 yards, more or less parallel with the highway; a footpath follows it for most of that distance. Projected back to the south-east that line crosses the highway near Shakeford Bridge and meets the extended Mill Lane alignment on the crest of a small ridge, the possible aligning point, on the east of High Heath at 6875 2735; there is an angle of 15° between them (as opposed to the angles of 13° and 30° on the Margary line). Taken in conjunction with the following evidence that would seem to give a very good indication of the route over the central portion although further evidence of its precise location is obviously desirable.

There is a cross-roads on the A41 at 657 303 from which a by-road runs southwards (Fig. 3B); the straight length of The Longford, the conventionally accepted Roman alignment, begins here. However, on the western side of that by-road, some 100 yards south of the A41, there is a shallow cutting – possibly mainly a natural feature – and an old fence following it; they are in the same line as the crop-mark and footpath described above. Although the cutting, for over some 50 yards, has been almost completely filled to make a hard-standing for
sundry vehicles and also farther along with modern rubbish, it is still a well-defined feature. It gradually deepens until the fence runs on to a terrace cut in the northern slope; there are large oaks on the north and conifers on the south (Plate II). The terrace gradually gives way to an agger which increases in height until it is more fittingly termed a causeway as it approaches a small stream in a shallow, now water-logged valley; the cutting runs alongside the agger and causeway, almost as though it were a linear quarry providing the material for those features. The overall construction is 320 yards long from the by-road and is followed by a parish boundary as well as the fence; both boundaries continue together on a slightly different alignment on the opposite side of the stream and run for another 900 yards to a gateway at 6496 3093 on the minor road heading southwards from the cross-roads near Warran Farm, 650 309. The fence is alongside a low bank for most of the way from the stream, forming a property boundary between a field and what was formerly a strip of open woodland – now partially built over – occupying the space between the bank and the A41.

The highway gradually converges onto this line so that the gateway is only some 50 yards from it and although the fence and bank do not continue west of the by-way – presumably having been removed in the construction of Tern Hill airfield – the parish boundary, significantly, does so. The convergence by the A41, The Longford, continues until it makes a long gradual bend and joins the boundary and this alignment at 6448 3137 where it straightens on to the parish boundary (Plate III). It would seem, therefore, that it is only from this point north-westwards that The Longford is actually on the Roman alignment.

The parish boundary and A41 continue together for 1½ miles, crossing the valley of the River Tern by two curving cuttings – now straightened and modernised but still partially in existence on the north-east and then the south-west of the modern highway – which are typical of those seen on other Roman roads. The boundary turns off to the south whilst the original line and the A41, with a change of 4° to the north towards the base alignment from which the former is here at its maximum distance of 1000 yards, continue for a further 900 yards into the outskirts of Bletchley.

It seems paradoxical that just where the modern highway commences what appears to be a typical Roman alignment at the cross-roads at 657 303 – and which has long been accepted as such – there is firm evidence
Plate II  Roman terrace south of The Longford, A 41, at 6550 3035 (April 1989).

Plate III  Looking south-east: The Longford bending onto the Roman alignment at Tern Hill. Note edge of wood along Roman line in the distance (June 2001).
showing that the actual Roman course is as much as 100 yards away to the south, as described above. There are, however, examples of similar occurrences elsewhere. 11

Before modern reconstruction the A41 beyond Bletchley village turned to the west almost at right-angles to the Roman road, to commence a winding arc some 3 miles long before heading for Whitchurch, but the straight line of The Longford which the A41 was following into Bletchley can be seen to continue to the north-west, ascending a low ridge as a shallow hollow-way/terrace now followed by a fence and footpath (Fig. 4C).

Although from here Margary describes a slightly different course 12, it became apparent to the present researchers that on the crest of that ridge a change of alignment of 6° northwards towards the base line had been made by the Roman surveyors: the hollow-way dropped into a small gully in which a lane now runs north/south, but the length between two sharp bends is on the new Roman line for some 50 yards, and where the lane then turns away northwards a curving cutting, now followed by a hedge, shows it ascending through the western face of the gully.

Further evidence can be seen after another 300 yards: the road rises from a small stream at 6160 3435 where it is first on a low causeway before passing through the crest in a shallow cutting. A crop-mark on air photographs 13 confirms the course for 700 yards across the next field to a minor road north-east of Hightree Cottages at 612 358, and was formerly followed by a hedge, now uprooted, for the last 400 yards (Plate IV). The crop-mark continues, but more faintly 14, in the same line on the north of the by-road from a stream at 6085 3529 for a further 450 yards, passing east of ‘The Lawn’ (formerly ‘Sandford Lawn’ 15) and Willaston Lawn, and almost exactly through the T-junction of minor roads at 605 356 to a small stream at 6035 3582: a very low ridge in the field to the south-east of that junction is the only surface evidence of the road to have been found across the much cultivated fields.

After a gap of a further ¼ mile in which no trace of the road has been found a 200 yard long crop-mark 16 crosses a small field in the same line towards Sycamore Farm, 589 374, in Ightfield Heath and, following a break of rather more than 900 yards, another commences at 5857 3790 on an alignment 6° south of the one
maintained from Bletchley and continues for a little over 200 yards\textsuperscript{17} (Fig. 4D). On the west of Ash Lane a very clear crop-mark begins at 5729 3905 and runs for some 570 yards across three fields to Ash Road at 5690 3938\textsuperscript{18} (Plate V) and another could possibly indicate the road at 5630 3992\textsuperscript{19}.

The 6° change in the line on the outskirts of Bletchley, as described above, has here taken the course of the road across and to the north of the base line, a divergence which can be seen to have been necessary to avoid the low-lying Brown Moss, leaving it on the south, just as Aqualate Mere was by-passed. Again here, as there, it can be expected that that area was wetter and of a greater extent then than now.

At 5612 4020 there is a compensating angle of 5° to the south, as indicated by a bridle-path following a low ridge (Plate VI) across a field north of Edgeley Hall to a crossing hedge-row at 5575 4043. Another crop-mark shows the line south-west of Broughall Fields Farm\textsuperscript{20} from 5541 4075 with a boundary hedge-row on the north following the alignment for some 300 yards to a shallow depression in which a small stream crosses the Roman line. The road was seen in February 2003 to have continued to the north-west in a rising cutting through the western bank to the field above (Plate VII), but this feature was not apparent two years later, after the Whitchurch industrial estate had been extended to the hedge alongside it. This boundary continues for a further 300 yards to a crossing railway embankment and again, on the western side of that, to another embankment of a now dismantled branch; a brick-lined tunnel, now demolished but originally through the latter, is on the road alignment, perhaps indicating that a public right of way existed before the railway’s construction. Beyond the tunnel an open swathe through a belt of trees leads to a crossing small stream at 5488 4105 through the north-western bank of which there was originally a cutting, now filled with modern rubbish and builders’ rubble.
Plate IV  Crop-mark of road north-west of Bletchley.

Plate V  Crop-mark of road between Ash Lane and Ash Road.
Plate VI  Looking north-west along bridle-path. Note tower of Bargate church in the distance (February 2002).

Plate VII  Hedge rising in cutting west of Broughall Fields Farm (February 2003).
Plate VII  Crop-mark of road from *Viroconium* on east and north of Edgeley Hall.

Fig. 5.  The junction of the Roman roads north of Edgeley Hall. Features as in Fig. 4D.
No further indication of the road has been found from there onwards but at that point it was less than 1,000 yards away from the Whitchurch fort. The tower of the church at Bargate, standing close to the site of the north gate, can be seen in a notch in the trees precisely along this line from as far away as 5612 4020 (see Plate VI).

However, if the course of this road from Pennocrucium was as described, where did it meet the one (M6a) from Viroconium – since Margary’s account of their junction almost a mile to the south cannot also be correct? Did that road diverge from its line somewhere near Prees Heath to run directly into Whitchurch?

The alignment of M6a – followed by the modern A49 through Prees Heath – when projected northwards runs close to Edgeley Hall but would have passed about a mile to the east of Mediolanum. The church at Bargate stands on the highest point of the town and is thus visible for some distance from the south and there are no topographical difficulties to be overcome; it is clear, therefore, that there would have been no reason for the Roman surveyors not to align this road from the south directly to the fort, if that had been desired. The fact that its alignment across Prees Heath passes so far east of the fort indicates that it was not intended to go directly there but was laid out specifically to join M19 – which must, therefore, either have already been in existence or have been the major of the two, according to the principles set out by Margary himself. The lay-out and angle of the junction confirm this reasoning and from the T-junction in the modern lanes at 5580 4005 a crop-mark can be seen close to that projected line passing the hall to a crossing hedge-row at 5575 4044, very near where the road from Pennocrucium crosses that same hedge (Plate VIII and Fig. 5).

On the ground, confirmatory evidence of the crop-mark consists of a low terrace visible across the field immediately to the east of the hall and under the boundary fence whilst a shallow but obvious cutting leads to a gateway in an old fence on the north of the hall (Plate IX). A ‘key-hole’ investigation there revealed a cobbled surface set on a layer, at least 11 inches thick, of small stones mixed in brown sand; the width was not determined but a second key-hole dug 6 yards away on the east showed only a few stones scattered on boulder clay, thus demonstrating that the stone layer was not a natural feature.

The foregoing evidence thus seems to prove the routes of the two roads as they approach Mediolanum and converge to a junction on the western side of the hedge which crosses both; it shows also that it was the Viroconium road which joined the one from Pennocrucium, at an angle of about 45° (Fig. 5) after a small change of line in its approach.

The hall stands close to the junction on a hillock with views to the south and south-east: it seems possible, therefore, that that high spot was used by the Roman surveyors as an intermediate sighting point for both roads.
Discussion

According to Margary his M19 converged on M6a, having been constructed 'to cut off the unnecessary mileage in reaching Chester from the south by way of Wroxeter' but the more detailed evidence of the route of each on its approach to the junction at Edgeley Hall, as described in the present study, indicates the opposite. Hence M19 predated the road from Viroconium which, it seems reasonable to assume, would have been required no later than c. AD55 when the legionary fortress was established there and therefore M19, the earlier, dates from before then.
The continuation of the road beyond Mediolanum to the north-west is on a bearing almost identical to that of M19 from Pennocrucium (Fig. 6). These two lengths would seem, therefore, to have been surveyed at the same time as one road, with Whitchurch being a staging-post to which structures and ditches found to underlie the Flavian fort could belong. That road, proceeding in the same north-westerly direction – but designated as W65 from there onward – crossed the River Dee and then Halkyn Mountain in Flintshire with its lead and silver deposits, before reaching the Vale of Clwyd near St. Asaph. It has been shown to pre-date the earliest Roman presence at Chester since the link to there, from close to the mid-point between Mediolanum and Deva, required a change of direction of some 40° from the original alignment. In addition, it was argued on the basis of this...
Plate XI  Crop-marks on Camp Farm; cf. Fig. 7.

Plate XII  Ditch and bank on Camp Farm (October 2001).
early date and the references by the Roman historian Tacitus\textsuperscript{31} to an offensive against the Deceangli of Flintshire in AD49 which produced extensive booty, that the road should be interpreted as the route chosen then by Ostorius Scapula, perhaps from the 26-acre vexillation fortress at Kinvaston \(\frac{1}{2}\) mile north-east of Pennocrucium which, it had been suggested previously\textsuperscript{32}, could have dated from this campaign. That conclusion is given added credence by the latest findings, particularly the location of the Edgeley Hall junction, which have prompted a better understanding of how the road network developed. For it follows that if the M19/W65 route were in use before the subsequent links, not only to Chester but also from Wroxeter as demonstrated by the evidence, then it must have been constructed in the early conquest period.

That there was a Roman road directly into Mediolanum from the Viroconium road, probably along or close to the modern Heath Road and Prees Road as described by Margary\textsuperscript{33}, seems to be indicated by the presence of a well-built road beneath the modern A41 at 5535 3927. It was revealed in section and photographed when a cutting for a culvert was opened across the latter during modern improvements in 1991 (Plate X) and it can be seen that the lowest stratum was placed in a vertically-sided trench some 12 inches deep. This apparently represents a third development in the road system as the early, through, military traffic decreased and the importance of Viroconium, Mediolanum and Deva increased, with a corresponding increase of traffic; its purpose would, indeed, have been to cut off some unnecessary mileage resulting from use of the Edgeley Hall junction. Similarly the link to Deva was upgraded\textsuperscript{34} as the importance of the fortress there increased and that of the original Scapulan road into North Wales, W65, decreased following its replacement by the Deva to Segontium (Margary’s 67a)\textsuperscript{35} road.

In a distance of 29 miles between major forts – as from Pennocrucium to Mediolanum – it was the Roman practice to establish a post on a suitable site near the halfway stage; Camp Farm, standing on an elevated site very close to the road, seems with its name to indicate a possible location and it has, accordingly, received much attention\textsuperscript{36} but ‘no finds have been made here, nor has close ground inspection produced any signs of ditches or banks’.\textsuperscript{37} However, the present authors have noted on an air photograph a faint mark indicating a possible enclosure with a rounded corner in the north-eastern quadrant of the cross-roads\textsuperscript{38} (Plate XI and Fig. 7). In addition, an east/west bank with apparently a rounded corner is visible in the field some 30 yards north of the Roman road and parallel to it, while a rise in a crossing hedge and deep ruts caused by tractors ascending from the softer fill of what appears to be the ditch onto to the harder ground of the ‘plateau’ emphasise that bank (Plate XII and Fig. 7). What might be the crop-mark of a north/south road cutting through the enclosure is also apparent on the photograph. Despite those indications, however, the topography suggests that the prime site for a fort lies just to the west of the farm buildings in the north-west quadrant since that is the highest point in the locality. It seems possible, therefore, that if the features in the north-east quadrant belong to a Roman context they could indicate the presence of an annexe or stores depot with the main fort on the highest part. Confirmation or otherwise of these possibilities is, of course, desirable.

An alternative site for this mid-point establishment is at Ellerton Hall standing close to the northern side of M19 a mile or so to the west of Camp Farm occupying a similarly elevated site but with better natural defences – steeper slopes with the streams, Waggs Brook and the one now with the mill race, on east and west, respectively. It thus seems that this would have been a better site for the intermediate camp but, again, nothing certain has been found by the authors. Given that there are many precedents for forts of different periods occupying different but nearby sites – as in the Pennocrucium area itself\textsuperscript{39} – the use of either or both is a possibility that ought to be investigated further.
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Footnotes

1 G. Webster, *The Cornovii* (second ed.), 1991, 61 and Fig. 25.
7 Perhaps the name of the mere could have a Roman origin from ‘Aqua’ (water) and ‘latus’ (side), and hence ‘The water at the side’ – of the road.
8 ‘Sutton Heath Cottages’ on OS map, 2½ ins = 1 mile series.
10 E. Waddelove, ‘The Roman Road Between Varis and Canovium’. *Archaeologia Cambrensis* CXXXII, 1983, 95; and A.C. Waddelove and E. Waddelove, ‘Roman Roads in Delamere Forest and neighbourhood – a Century after Edward Kirk’, *Trans. Lancs. and Ches. Antiq. Soc.* 83, 1985 167–9, Fig. 3c and Plate III.
11 E.g., the Roman-looking modern A515, from Derby to Buxton, runs for two separate 2 mile lengths about 100 yards to the north of the actual, confirmed Roman line, M71a, as shown on OS 2½ ins., Outdoor Leisure Series No. 24.
12 As shown in Shropshire CC Sites and Monuments Record, feature 1029.
14 Ibid, Nos. 8069/70.
15 As on the 1st ed. 1” = 1 mile OS map.
17 Ibid, Nos. 8050/51.
18 Ibid, Nos. 7881/2 and 7868/9
19 Ibid, Nos. 7868/9
20 Ibid, No. 7869.
24 Ibid, (note 2), 293.
27 A. C. Waddelove, ‘The Development of a Roman Road Network: the Lower Dee Valley Region before AD 138’, unpublished M. Phil thesis, University of Manchester 1986, 83, explaining how each previously unknown road was given a number according to the Margary system but with a ‘W’ prefix.
29 Ibid, 88–92 and 153–4 for the detailed evidence of this junction.
31 *Annales* XII, 32.
35 See information from E. Waddelove in S. S. Frere, ‘Roman Britain in 1990’, *Britannia* XXII, 1991, 222 for sighting of the two roads 1½ miles east of St. Asaph after clearance of top-soil preparatory to re-construction of the A55 trunk road.
36 According to the local farmer there have been many callers and several low-level reconnaissance flights.
39 P. Bidwell, *Roman Forts in Britain*, 1997, Fig. 17.
Whittington Castle was built before 1138, as a motte-and-bailey with a (probably later) tower keep within what may be a large ditched enclosure of the later prehistoric period. That was used as part of the castle’s defensive circuit for its outer bailey, providing a marshy defence for the low-lying site. Whittington then became a small semi-independent Marcher lordship. As one of a chain of border fortresses held by Marcher lords, the castle was an active base for border defence throughout the 12th and 13th centuries, becoming the chief residence of the powerful Fitz Warin family by 1204. Following its destruction by the Welsh, the castle was rebuilt during the 1220s, with a circuit of stone walls and five towers around the inner bailey. However, its military role ended with the conquest of Wales. In the early 14th century, its role was as a palatial residence. The outer bailey became a pleasure garden with a viewing mound.

The successors of Fulk Fitz Warin VII, who died in the Black Death in 1349, all died young. In consequence the lordship was almost continually in wardship until the death of Fulk XI in 1420. It then passed to his sister and her heirs until John, Earl of Bath, sold it in 1545, shortly after the abolition of the Marcher lordships in 1536. At that time the castle was intact, but had not often been lived in since 1349. From that time the castle (except its outer gatehouse) was abandoned, and was used as a source of building stone in the 17th and 18th centuries. From the 19th century it was regarded as a romantic ruin, with an iconic gatehouse facing the old Holyhead Road. The castle is now being developed as a tourist and educational centre.

Whittington was a small Marcher lordship lying on the boundary between England and Wales, and separating two parts of the lordship of Oswestry. The main purpose of this article is to provide a history of the castle and of its owners. First, however, something needs to be said of the status of Whittington.

The Status of Whittington

Whittington lay in a debatable land between England and Wales. In 1536 the lordships of Oswestry, Knockin, Whittington, and a few others were added to Shropshire. Before that they were Marcher lordships in the March of Wales adjoining Shropshire, as they had been for centuries. Before the Norman Conquest of England, Wales had consisted of a number of petty kingdoms (or principalities), each with its own ruler, including Powys [in north Montgomeryshire and south Denbighshire] and Gwynedd. Sometimes one particular ruler succeeded in obtaining suzerainty over his neighbours, but generally they were independent of each other. Over the centuries after the Norman Conquest, Norman ‘Marcher lords’ succeeded in taking over many of the smaller principalities. These thus became independent sovereign states owing allegiance to the English Crown, but where the only rights of the Crown were concerned with treason and regulating the inheritance of the lordship (including the wardship of minor heirs). However, English kings frequently intervened in the March diplomatically as feudal superiors to settle or discourage disputes, which otherwise could legitimately take the form of a private war. Examples of this in disputes between Whittington and Oswestry will be mentioned later. Apart from this minimal royal intervention, the lord was absolute ruler. Certain lordships in south Wales (including Glamorgan and Gower) were styled ‘counties’. However Whittington, being smaller, was called a hundred in the 14th century.
Whittington was thus not part of England and when William Tone tried to serve a royal writ in Whittington (in about 1535) he found himself imprisoned for doing so. It appears that Tone took a writ of subpoena against Roger ap Richard Gyttyn into the Marches of Wales and was imprisoned by Hugh ap David and some of the officers of the ‘Castell of Whittington’ for three weeks, to his great injury. The king’s writ did not run in Whittington any more than in the rest of Wales and Tone thus suffered for infringing the royalties of the Marcher lord. It is not yet clear to what extent the law actually administered in Whittington was English in character and to what extent Welsh, but the lords of Whittington enjoyed jurisdiction in pleas of the Crown [that is criminal jurisdiction], which would in England have been tried in the King’s Bench or at assizes. The Marcher lord could decide whether English or Welsh law was more likely to give him the answer he wished and choose accordingly.

The status of the area has been confused in the minds of older historians, some of who may have approached the problem with a nationalist agenda (whether Welsh or English). Welsh historians perceived that the area east of Offa’s Dyke had once been Welsh, but failed to appreciate that there was a long break in Welsh sovereignty during the Anglo-Saxon period. The plae-name evidence points unequivocally to Offa’s Dyke (which runs down the western side of the lordship) having constituted a real boundary between the English and the Welsh in the final centuries of the first millennium. The ambiguity of Whittington’s position thus began in the 11th century, for it appears in Domesday Book as an ordinary Shropshire manor held in demesne by Roger de Montgomery. It had been part of land that paid half a night’s farm [dimid firma noctis] in the time of King Aethelred, but it was waste in the time of King Edward the Confessor, probably because it (like certain other border areas) was devastated around 1055 by Gruffydd ap Llywelyn, who dominated most of Wales in this period. A number of the apparently Welsh place-names east of Offa’s Dyke, such as Selattyn and Drenewydd, are in fact English in origin, but have taken on a Welsh form. In the first case this is merely orthography; in the latter the Thornes described the Domesday manor of Newetone as lost, but it surely survives as Drenewydd, which is a literal translation. There certainly were Welsh place-names in use in Oswestry by the late 13th century, but few if any can be traced back beyond the mid 12th century, and they may thus result from the settlement of the area by Welshmen after the border was pacified, rather than being pre-Norman survivals.

Many of the Marcher lordships in south and central Wales were established by a Norman lord (or perhaps a French adventurer) with his company of warriors, who attacked and conquered a Welsh district. A key feature of their strategy consisted of the construction of a castle, from which a lord could impose his will on the residents of his lordship. In the face of serious opposition, he could retire into his castle, where he would be safe against anything but a lengthy siege. This created “[a] distinctive ... society of frontiersmen, forced to rely on their own resources, vigorously independent, and deeply distrustful of the brash ways and soft habits of courtiers and outsiders. Common dangers had bred and sustained a close military companionship among them and led them to cultivate and treasure family links.”

Whittington differed from them, in that it adjoined England. This meant that the control over the lordship by its lords was probably less precarious than in the case of some of the lordships of central Wales, where there was the rivalry of a displaced native dynasty. Despite Whittington being more anglicised, however, the Normans faced opposition from two princely families in the 12th century.

Although the area had long been English, that probably ceased in the period between 1149 and 1155 when Oswestry was occupied by Madoc ap Mareudd of Powis. The confusion as to the status of this border area has been compounded by a conflict of evidence as to who built Oswestry Castle. Welsh Chroniclers attributed it to Madoc ap Mareudd of Powis, whereas Domesday Book (as Eyton pointed out) indicates that this was the work of Reginald, the Sheriff of Shropshire. In fact, one manuscript of Annales Cambriæ clearly states that Madog ap Mareudd ‘rebuilt’ Oswestry castle in 1149. Up to this time Oswestry (and Whittington) were probably in Lichfield diocese, but some time before 1160 they passed to the Welsh diocese of St. Asaph, probably during the Welsh occupation. In some ways the Welsh conquests of the end of King Stephen’s reign became more fluid when Henry II reconquered them. They did not revert to the English counties to which they had previously belonged, but became Marcher lordships. Davies and others have commented that the March grew by the withdrawal of ‘whole frontier districts out of the purview of the English royal administration’. In the case of Whittington (and probably Oswestry) this appears to have been the result of Madog’s conquest.

Early History

It has been claimed that Whittington and Oswestry were with both the Maelors [that is Maelor Saesneg, or south Flintshire, and Maelor Gymraeg, the lordship of Bromfield in south-east Denbighshire] in the lordship of a noble Welshman called Tudur Trefor and his descendants. However no ancient basis for these claims can be
found. Most modern claims about Tudur Trefor probably derive from Lewis Dwnn (1846).\textsuperscript{18} The Domesday Book does record that Rhys Saes, the father of Tudur, held the lordship of Maelor Saesneg. The later claim to Whittington of Rhys’s descendants (seen in 1175) must have come from a period after 1086, perhaps that of Madog’s conquest of the border area. The ambiguity is also reflected later.

Though Domesday Book is clear that Roger de Montgomery owned Whittington, Owain Brogyntyn [Madog’s natural son] was bought up at Porkington, which is within the lordship of Whittington, and was just on the English side of Offa’s Dyke.\textsuperscript{19} Henry II then made a grant of it to Roger de Powis in 1175, but could this merely have been regularising his possession, resulting from its occupation in Stephen’s reign? This left a disaffected English [or rather French] claimant, Fulk Fitz Warin I, the son of Waryn de Metz. His claim to the lordship seems to derive from an earlier grant to William de Peverel, though there is no surviving evidence to justify this claim.

The efforts of Fulk Fitz Warin in seeking to recover his inheritance are recorded in a medieval romance in which Fulk was an outlaw, although this appears to conflate the activities of at least two of the historical Fulk Fitz Warins. This romance (as it has come down to us in its 14th-century form) is probably a composite tale made up of parts of several different ones, with some chapters seeming to refer to other outlaws. Other events occurred overseas, with fantastic elements such as giants and dragons, but there is a core of material near the beginning that seems to be an authentic record of events in Shropshire, or at least someone with an intimate knowledge of the area wrote it.\textsuperscript{20} Some testimony of its authenticity is provided by the fact that Fulk Fitz Warin and his brothers were pardoned for outlawry in 1203, and the wives of Fulk II and Fulk III are correctly identified, even though the chronology of the family appears confused.\textsuperscript{21}

The romance also contains some very interesting references to Whittington, presented here with the French original together with a modern translation.

\textit{Ly roy apela Payn Peverel, e ly dona la Blaunche Launde e foreste, guastyne, chaces e tut le pays. E si a rice l’une monte environee de marries e de ewe, e la fyst Payn un tour bel e fort, e fust la mote apelee Wayburs, e si court une ryvere deles qe de Payn Peverel tinte le nown, e si est apelee Peverel, mes pus fust apelee Pevereye.}\textsuperscript{22}

\textit{Cesty William fist en la Blanche Launde un tour, e la apela Blanchetour, e la ville q’est entour est encore apelee Blauncheville, e[n] englois Whytyntone. En Ellesmere fist un autre tour, e sur l’ewe de Keyroc un autre.}\textsuperscript{24}

\textit{Fouke vint a Blauncheville, e trova ileque Mahaud, sa femme, e ces enfanz, qe molt furent lee de sa venue, e grant joye entreffen. Donqe fist Fouke aporter ces tresours e ces richesses.}\textsuperscript{26}

\textit{Finally, the king called Payn Peverel [of Dover] and gave him Blanche Lande, with its forest, waste lands, chases and all the surrounding country. On that spot there was a great mound surrounded by marsh land and water. On that height, which was called the Berth, Payn built a tall, strong tower. A river named after Payn Peverel runs nearby. It was once called the River Peverel, but the name was later changed to the River Perry.}\textsuperscript{23}

\textit{William [Peverel] also built a tower in the Blanche Lande, which he called Blanchetour, and the town nearby is still named Blancheville, or, in English: Whittington. He built another tower in Ellesmere, and a third over the River Ceiriog.}\textsuperscript{25}

\textit{At long last Fouke came to his stronghold at Whittington, the beautiful castle he had built on marshy ground. There once again he found Matilda, his wife, and his children, who greeted him with great joy. Fouke proceeded to have all his treasures brought to Whittington.}\textsuperscript{27}

The Romance (as it has come down to us) derives from a period considerably after the events in question. Despite the appearance of the fantastic and also stories about Kent (probably) borrowed from another romance, the portion quoted contains at least a kernel of historic fact. The River Perry rises at Whittington, flows east from the village and then southeast, to join the Severn near Montford Bridge. It is fed by the springs that still form the water defences at the castle. However, its name is now not thought to derive from Peverel.\textsuperscript{28} There is also a topographical difficulty concerning the location of Wayburs, which the translator has identified with The Berth, a prehistoric fort with a large mound about 2km north of Baschurch and 12km south east of Whittington.\textsuperscript{29} A case for the association with this site has been argued on the placename evidence, the fact that the marshland around the site also drains into the Perry and on the Romance’s author’s apparent willingness to twist evidence in favour of links with Payn Peverel.\textsuperscript{30} The geographical description of Wayburs fits well with The Berth, although there is no evidence to suggest 12th-century occupation of the site, nor any evidence for substantial masonry structures.\textsuperscript{31} An alternative might be to identify Wayburs with Berghill, one of the Domesday berewicks of Whittington and subsequently regularly named among its townships. Today the road
crossing the River Perry into Whittington is Berghill Lane. This uncertainty illustrates the difficulty of making factual judgements from a work of romantic fiction.

The town of Oswestry, three miles from Whittington, is described as being in ‘the region adjoining the Blanche Lande’\(^52\), and the term Blanche Lande itself is also interesting, because the traditional Welsh name for Whittington was Y Dref-wen, or the White Town.\(^33\) It is possible that the reference to white refers to plants that grew in the area at the time. The reference to the tower built on a great mound is most interesting, because we now know that the motte of the original castle at Whittington was used as a platform for a tower keep, the footings of which can still be seen.\(^34\)

**The origins of the Castle**

We have no certain knowledge of when the original castle at Whittington was constructed, but the earliest reference to it is in 1138, when it was one of the castles that William Peverel [nephew of William Peverel of Dover] fortified for the Empress Matilda against Stephen.\(^35\) The others were the nearby castles of Overton [Flintshire] and Ellesmere, together with Bourne in Cambridgeshire.

Border warfare at the time consisted mainly of the Welsh raiding English (or Norman) held lands and driving off livestock. When the Welsh attacked in strength, the defenders could shut themselves up in the castle. When, however, the Welsh attackers then rounded up and began to drive cattle home, the garrison was able to sally forth and counterattack. The Welsh were by then quite scattered as they were herding home slow moving droves of cattle, and could be picked off piecemeal.\(^36\)

Little is known of how Whittington was garrisoned in this early period, but for other Shropshire castles (such as Oswestry and Shrawardine) there were serjeants [lightly armed mounted men] holding lands in Shropshire and Staffordshire by a military tenure later rated as half a knight’s fee.\(^37\) We do have some details of additional mounted troops that were assigned to Whittington at the expense of the Crown, to top up the local garrison. In 1161 there were 10 serjeants at the castle costing £8 20s. \((sic)\), though in 1162 the 10 cost £8 13s. 4d. Later in that year there were 20 serjeants at £7 6s. 8d., while an undisclosed number cost £8 13s. 4d. in 1163.\(^38\) It is interesting to see the standard feudal quota of 20 foot to each knight \([2 \text{ mounted serjeants equalled } 1 \text{ knight}].\) Perhaps here we have the feudal service owed for the castles and lordships of Whittington, Overton and Chirk. In 1234 Whittington was assessed to supply 1 knight for foreign service in Brittany.\(^39\) Later, in 1295, the lordship of Whittington raised 200 men to fight Prince Madog ap Llywelyn which might suggest that a force of 10 knights was possible.\(^40\) In 1322 Whittington raised 100 fighting men.\(^41\)

King Henry II held the castle as Royal demesne from at least 1160 until 1164. He then granted it to Geoffrey de Vere, who was Sheriff of Shropshire and also the brother-in-law of William Peverel’s niece. Geoffrey had a hereditary claim and, unlike the other claimants, he was in royal favour. He was also lord of the Fitz Alan lands through marrying William Fitz Alan’s widow and therefore had a strong hereditary claim dating from the early 12th century.\(^42\) Geoffrey held the Lordship briefly, from 1164–65, but by the summer of 1165 King Henry had repossessed the castle, compensating him with other lands in Edgmond.\(^43\) Eyton believed that the King’s resumption of control in 1165 was in order that he might confer the castle on Roger de Powis, who had recently been engaged by the Crown to fortify other castles in the area including Overton and Shrewsbury.\(^44\) The transfer to Roger may have happened as early as 1171, when he had no other emolument from the Crown; an entry in the Pipe Roll for 1173 suggests that he had a castle of his own, which may have been Whittington. By 1187 both Roger and his eldest son were dead, and the ownership appears to have passed to Maurice or Meuric de Powis [Welsh Meurig], another of Roger’s sons.

During the 12th century, the Fitz Warin family had also pressed a claim to Whittington through their link with the Peverels (see below), starting with Fulk Fitz Warin I, who supported Henry II’s cause.\(^45\) After King Stephen’s conquest of Shropshire in 1138, Fulk joined the retinue of the Earl of Gloucester from whom he received lands in Gloucestershire, shifting his centre of influence south and east of the March. Fulk died in 1170–71 and was succeeded by his son Fulk II, who does not appear to have been a close associate of Henry II, or of Richard I who succeeded him in 1189. Fulk II married Hawise de Dinan, the wealthy daughter and coheir of Joceas de Dinan [Constable of Ludlow], probably before Joceas’ death in 1167. This match elevated Fulk’s social position, but he appears to have had difficulty in enforcing his claims to the Dinan lands in Berkshire and Wiltshire. By contrast, he established his right to the lands that his father held in chief, but was only partially successful in attaining the lands that his father had acquired from the Peverel family, which may have included Whittington.\(^46\)

Fulk’s claim to Whittington was apparently not recognized, and the lordship was held during Henry II’s reign by Roger de Powis and his heirs, as mentioned above. Fulk II continued to press this claim, eventually winning a judgment in 1195, although it appears that the fine was never paid.\(^47\) This recognised his right to Whittington,
but, despite the legal position, he still did not have possession of the castle at his death in 1198, and Fitz Warin occupation of Whittington only happened under his son, also named Fulk. Before this happened, Meuric de Powis fined 50 marks (for the possession of Whittington) with King John on 11 April 1200, to be paid by 17 marks on 14 May, 17 marks on 29 Sept 1200 and 16 marks at Easter [24 March] 1201, but soon after this the Fitz Warins apparently killed Meuric.49 His son Werennoc then offered 60 marks for the lordship on 1 August, and the King accepted this in preference to an offer of £100 by Fulk Fitz Warin.51 Interestingly, Werennoc paid only 50 marks in 1201 to have confirmation of his ownership of Whittington and Overton.52

Fulk III continued to press his father’s claim for Whittington, eventually rebelling in 1200, when he and his associates were in direct challenge to King John, but in November 1203 52 rebels, including three of Fulk’s brothers (William, Philip and John), were pardoned for conspiring with Fulk and other excesses. In the following year Fulk recovered some of his forfeited land and on 17 October 1204 the King ordered the Sheriff of Shropshire ‘to give Fulk Fitz Warin the castle of Whittington and all its pertinences as his just right and inheritance’ for 200 marks and two destriers [warhorses].53 In recognising the long claim to Whittington by the Fitz Warins, King John compensated Werennoc for the loss in 1205, with a payment from the royal manor of Worfield.54 Werennoc had obviously been worried about losing Whittington, for in 1203 he offered the king a further £100 and 4 palfreys for having a confirmation of his father’s land of Whittington.55

The Castle of the Fitz Warins in the Welsh Wars

The transfer of Whittington to the Fitz Warin family heralded the greatest period in the castle’s history. It passed down the family from father to son through the direct male line from Fulk III until the death of Fulk XI in 1420, with a succession of owners all named Fulk. The Fitz Warins do not appear to have come to England until after the Conquest, and do not figure as landowners in the Domesday Survey (1086). The rather cloudy origins of the family are generally traced back to Warin de Metz [Sheriff of Shropshire], who supposedly came during the reign of the Conqueror, and married Melette, allegedly the niece of William Peverel. This link to the Peverels provided the basis for the later claims of the Fitz Warins to Whittington. We know with certainty of a Roger Fitz Warin from 1136 and his brother Fulk from about 1145 and their favour with King Henry II suggests that they may have been supporters of the Empress Matilda during the Anarchy. In 1149 Fulk I received the Gloucestershire manor of Alveston from the King Stephen, suggesting that Roger had died without heirs.56 King Henry II confirmed this grant in 1155.57 His close dealings with the king continued through the 1150s, reaching a high point in 1160 when he is recorded as the person in charge of arming and provisioning Dover Castle.58

Perhaps the greatest of the line of Fulks who held Whittington was Fulk III, a hero of legend as well as an important historical figure, who married Matilda the daughter of Robert le Vavasur in 1207. She was a wealthy widow, who brought him additional lands, as well as elevating his social position.59 In 1211 he held Whittington by a knight’s fee, yearly worth £10.60 His relations with King John appear to have been good in the years preceding Magna Carta (1215), but he joined the rebel barons in that year. Meisel suggests that a factor influencing Fulk’s position was the scale of debt he owed to the Crown. In 1219 the total debt stood at £1,054 8d., together with three war-horses, one palfrey, one goshawk, one tiercel [male hawk] and two spaniels, with Whittington Castle accounting for £268 6s. 8d., plus two war-horses.61 It is possible that kings actually preferred having barons heavily in their debt, because this made them easier to control. This second rebellion was less successful for Fulk, but by 1218 he had settled his disputes and spent the following years developing a good working relationship with the government of the new king, Henry III.

In 1221 Fulk was granted limited authority to strengthen the border castle of Whittington. A second writ of 11 November 1222 is urgent upon the Earl of Chester to see that the castle ‘be made not stronger than was necessary as against the Welsh, or than it was before the Barons’ War’, suggesting that King Henry’s government still had mixed views about Fulk’s loyalties.62 If any work was done quickly it does not seem to have been effective, as before March in 1223, the King permitted Fulk to remove all his horses and livestock from Whittington to be depastured in Lyth Forest, just to the south of Shrews bury. Llywelyn ab Iorwerth [Prince of Gwynedd] had crossed the frontier and captured Kinmerley Castle [near Knockin] perhaps in pursuance of a claim to it by Madog ap Gruffydd of Powys Fadog [later Bromfield, i.e. south Denbighshire], a descendant of the Madog ap Mareuddu who had rebuilt Oswestry castle in 1151.63 Llywelyn then captured Whittington Castle, apparently without a siege, as the castle seems to have been abandoned. However, he simply returned it to the king as part of the peace process. It was recovered, and was returned to Fulk soon after 6 July 1223, when the Sheriff of Shropshire was ordered to give him full seisin of Whittington.64 Although the Welsh vacated Whittington, it appears that they held Fulk’s other castle at Alberbury until 1226.65 Suppe has suggested that the horses at Whittington were probably very fine animals from the stock in nearby Powis.66 These animals were probably descended from imported Spanish stallions, which Robert de Bellême had bred in the previous century, on his Welsh lands around Carreg hologa, just to the south of Oswestry.
The rebuilding of the castle in the 1220s was evidently on a much more substantial scale. Hitherto it had been a motte and bailey, strengthened with a tower keep (whose foundations survive) standing on the motte in the centre of what is today the inner bailey. Then, the inner bailey of the castle was rebuilt as a raised fortification surrounded by walls and five towers, with buildings around a central courtyard. This fortification has provided most of the structures whose foundations survive on the site. From the dimensions of the various rooms as described in 1545, the previous stone keep must have been demolished before that time, although it is probable that the keep was retained in the rebuilding project of the 1220s.67

A truce was in place by 1228 between Llywelyn on the one part and Fulk and Thomas Corbet [lord of Caus, on the Long Mountain] on the other. At about this time Fulk planned the marriage of his son and heir, Fulk, to Angareth, the daughter of Madog ap Gruffydd, the prince of Powys Fadog, on whose behalf the aggression of 1223 against Whittington had probably taken place. Such marriages were often agreed to settle a border dispute, but this union was opposed by Llywelyn and does not appear to have actually taken place.68

Fulk performed various royal duties, and in 1229 he was asked to serve with the bishop of Hereford as an escort for Prince David [Llywelyn’s son] and his sister, who were coming to London to do homage to King Henry.69 In April 1230 he was given a patent of protection for his lands while he was overseas on the king’s service and he embarked from Portsmouth soon afterwards, probably as part of the king’s army that marched from St Malo in Brittany to Nantes and to Bordeaux (through Poitou) that summer. According to Roger of Wendover, when the knights were not allowed to engage in battle they ‘gave entertainments to one another, as was the custom of the English, and devoted themselves to eating and drinking by turns, as though they were keeping Christmas, and those amongst them who were poor disposed of their horses and arms, so that for the moment they led an unhappy life’.70 Fulk returned in the middle of the following year.71

Fulk III’s position on the March was strengthened in 1233, when he bought from King Henry (for 600 marks) the wardship of the substantial Pantulf barony of Wem, following the death of William Pantulf who was married to Fulk’s daughter Hawise.72 This event (temporarily) more than doubled Fulk’s lands in Shropshire, and made him one of the most powerful of the English barons opposing Llywelyn along the northern March.

The truce with the Welsh had broken down by November 1233, when King Henry gave Fulk 500 crossbow bolts [quarrelos], suggesting that there were no longer royal restrictions on the defence of Whittington, where the supplies were presumably destined.73 Shrewsbury was sacked the following month and much of west Shropshire devastated, but Whittington appears to have survived unscathed.74 In 1234, as already mentioned, Fulk was ordered to send a knight to assist the Count of Brittany (as part of Henry III’s inadequate assistance to him).75 With the situation still fragile in 1236, Henry decided to appoint several men to supervise and maintain the truce. The three dictatores [dictators or standing arbitrators] for North Wales were Fulk Fitz Warin, Henry Audley, and Hervey Bagod. The four for South Wales were Ralph, bishop of Hereford, Elias, bishop of Llandaff, Walter de Baskerville, and William Fitz Warin [Fulk III’s younger brother]. The selection of two members of the Fitz Warin family indicates Henry’s trust in the man who had twice rebelled against the Crown.76 It perhaps also suggests that civil war was raging in England and the traditional defenders of the Marches had been arraigned against the King and hostages had been taken from them for their future good behaviour.

Fulk’s role as a dictator continued until the end of 1237, but the truce expired early in the following year and Fulk was one of the Marcher lords summoned to meet with King Henry at Oxford to discuss the Welsh situation.77 However, hostilities were avoided. Despite the tension in the region, Llywelyn appears to have married Fulk’s daughter Mabel in 1239, the year before his death78, suggesting that peace was restored, at least temporarily.

Fulk was summoned from serving with the Constable of Dover in 1242 to follow the King abroad for the campaign that included fighting a battle at Saintes in Poitou79, and he acted as spokesman in 1245 for the barons assembled at Dunstable, with the task of telling the papal nuncio to leave England.80 Also in 1245, he was mandated to arbitrate a dispute arising from conquests in the Welsh war. By this time, he was an old man of about 70 years, so his recorded duties end at this time, although Meisel suggests that he probably lived until 1258, when he would have been at least 79 years old.81

Fulk IV began to play an active role in his family’s affairs long before his father died in 1258 and had been summoned for the Gascony campaign in 1253.82 His domestic problems included a number of disputes with his neighbours, Thomas Corbet [lord of Caus] and John Fitz Alan [lord of Oswestry]. Thomas had incensed Fulk by referring to his father as a ‘traitor’ and in 1256 Henry appointed a commission to hear Fulk’s complaints against John Fitz Alan, when Fulk described ‘his parks broken and destroyed, his lands plundered and burned and his men taken, wounded and imprisoned’.83 The commissioners were to command John Fitz Alan ‘to deliver the men of Fulk whom he detains in prison without delay and forbids him, upon all his lands which he holds of the king in Wales or England, to enter the lands of Fulk to do evil’. The resolution of the complaint does not survive, but by 1264, Fulk, John Fitz Alan and Thomas Corbet were all supporting Henry III. Such private wars
seem to have been a regular (though not a frequent) feature of life in the Welsh March and several further instances of these will be mentioned below. There were also ‘lovedays’ for reconciling local disputes.84

In 1257 Fulk was active in Welsh affairs, being appointed one of the men in charge of keeping the March, and on 8 August Fulk, Thomas Corbet and six other men were made responsible for the defence of the entire northern half of the Welsh border. On 14 March 1258 he was summoned to be at Chester in June to resume the campaign against the Welsh, and a truce between King Henry and Llywelyn ap Gruffudd was agreed soon afterwards. Llywelyn broke this late in 1259, and in 1260 Fulk was one of the ‘barones de Marchia’ who were ordered to defend the March against Llywelyn. His actions in this capacity apparently exceeded instructions, as he and others were summoned to answer to the King for their actions, which were ‘against the king’s peace’. Any displeasure was evidently short lived, and Henry summoned Fulk to Shrewsbury in September for another abortive campaign against Llywelyn.85 By this time Henry’s own position was deteriorating and on 18 October 1261 Fulk was sent an urgent summons to come to London as quickly as possible to discuss the Welsh situation, which preoccupied him for the next two years so that in January 1263 he (like the other Marcher lords) was given a patent of protection for his lands because of his service to King Henry in Wales.86

Like his father, Fulk IV was a loyal supporter of Henry III and fought with him against the de Montfort rebels, but at the battle of Lewes on 14 May 1264 he drowned in flight, trying to cross the bay to Pevensey Castle, having successfully engaged the Londoners as one of the Marcher contingent.87 On 20 December of that year, using the King’s great seal, Simon de Montfort committed ‘during pleasure to Peter de Monte Forti [Montford] the castle of Whytenton, late of Fulk son of Warin deceased, tenant in chief, so that he answer for the issues at the Exchequer ...[and ordered] Fulk son of Warin the younger to deliver it to him’.88 The younger Fulk was aged only 13 at the time, but he and his guardians were actively hostile to the de Montforts, and the surrender does not appear to have happened.

On 22 Jun 1265, Henry III (as a captive of Simon de Montford) signed the Treaty of Pipton. By this act, Llywelyn was to have the lordship over all the magnates of Wales, and Painscastle, Ellesmere, and Montgomery and ‘touching the castle of Whittington (Wytinton), he shall have the lordship so that the heir of the said castle shall do him service’. To achieve this the king promised ‘to aid him in the conquest of the rest of the lands and castles belonging to the right of the said prince and his magnates, which are in the hands of the common adversaries of the king and him, and the king will grant to him the said lands and castles so conquered, especially the castle of Montgomery’.89 This appears to have been done, for on 29 September 1267 the Treaty of Montgomery confirmed the overlordship of Whittington to Llywelyn.90

Following the Battle of Evesham on 4 August 1265, King Henry gave custody of his lands and heirs to Hamo le Strange on 8 August, as Fulk V was still a minor91, having been born at Whittington on 14 May 1251.92 Le Strange’s custody of his person cannot have been very long lived for he joined Prince Edward on Crusade in 1270.93

This Fulk married Margaret daughter of Gruffydd ap Gwenwynwyn [Lord of Lower Powys] before 25 Feb 1276/794, and in 1283 (when the King Edward I was campaigning in Snowdonia) was granted free warren for himself and his heirs, ‘in all his demesne lands in Wytinton by Osewaldestre’.95 This suggests that Fulk had done his duty in the ongoing war. He appears in summonses for Edward I and in 1277 was described not as a knight but a serjeant; in this case he served with another serjeant to make up his fee owed for Whittington, when he acknowledged the service of one knight’s fee for the muster against Llywelyn.96 In 1283 ‘Fulk [Fitz] Warin or ... his bailiffs of Witinton’ were amongst the people ordered to assist Richard de Bosco to choose footmen to be taken to the king at Montgomery.97

The Exploits of Warrior Lords

Until the late 13th century, the March remained essentially a land of war, interspersed intermittently with periods of peace. With the English conquest of Wales, the focus of military activity moved outwards, to Scotland, France, and Ireland. This left the March in peace, allowing Whittington Castle to change its role from being a fortress to being a grand residence. However, the military role of the March did not cease; contingents from there came to play a leading role in the armies of the kings of England and those of their captains, many of whom were also lords of the March.98 Whittington was active in the supply of troops for decades to come. Fulk was regularly summoned for military service between 1276 and 1314, including in Gascony in 1294.99 On 10 July 1296, he was at Montrose in Scotland, where he made pleas before King Edward I’s army concerning the ownership of some horses.100 His other duties included participating in the Military Council, Parliament and the coronation of 1308, while the summons to Parliament in 1295 made him Lord Fitzwarine.101

On 14 February 1293, Fulk accused Earl Richard of Arundel [and lord of Oswestry], of entering his lands at Whittington with horses and arms and banners displayed and spoiling the inhabitants of their goods, slaying
some of Fulk’s men and committing other enormities. It was claimed that ‘oxen, kine, and foals worth £300’ had been carried off. Fulk’s complaints caused King Edward to call Arundel to him, when he objected to the summons on the ground that ‘he was a baron of Wales where it was approved custom that the barons of those parts, whenever a quarrel of this kind arose, should meet in a certain place, and that there such quarrel should be adjusted by the friends of both parties’. The Earl further stated that he and his ancestors had observed this rule and asked judgement as to whether he should therefore be judged by English law against Welsh custom. After prompting from the bench he then denied the force, injury, homicide etc and declared that he was in Sussex at the time, both long before and after, and finally appealed to a jury. Fitz Warin renewed his charge and the court ordered the Sheriff of Salop to appear with 24 knights and others before the King concerning the matter. Some years later, on 10 August 1301, the King ordered Fulk and Richard Fitz Alan, Earl of Arundel, to abstain from attacking each other in this long-standing dispute.

Contingents from Whittington fought in the decisive battle of Maes Madog on 3 March 1295. At the start of January that year the Earl of Warwick’s Montgomery army consisted of ‘127 constables and 13,800 infantry from Shropshire, Staffordshire, Worcestershire and Herefordshire together with 400 Welsh of Powys, 100 of Cedewain and 200 of Fulk Fitz Warin’. Between March and May Earl William Beauchamp of Warwick, captain of the host in the region of Montgomery, requested respite of the tenths owing from the lands of certain men, who were serving in the region of Montgomery. These included those of ‘Fulk [Fitz] Warin in Wilts, Salop, Gloucs and Yorks [and] Robert Corbet in Salop and Leicester’. From 12 to 18 May ‘100 men of Fulk [Fitz] Warin were with Warwick’.

Fulk did homage and fealty for his lands in Wales to Edward, Prince of Wales, at Kenilworth on 27 May 1301, confirming the overlordship conceded to Llywelyn by Simon de Montfort in 1265 and confirmed by King Henry in 1267. Regarding Whittington Castle, ‘the Prince should have the lordship, so that the heir to the castle should do him service as the ancestors of the heir did to his predecessors, and if the heir offend against the Prince, he should make amends according to the law and custom of Wales’. This issue resurfaced two generations later, when various Marcher lords objected to the growing powers of the Black Prince and appealed directly to King Edward III; in April 1354 the Marcher lordships were formally annexed to the Crown, not the Principality.

In 1310 Fulk conveyed the manor of Whittington to John de Beauchamp of Somerset, who regranted it to him ‘to hold for life, with remainder to his son Foulk and Eleanor his [the latter’s] wife and the heirs of their bodies, and final remainder to his [own] right heirs’. This marriage settlement gave Eleanor [Beauchamp’s sister] greater rights to her husband’s estate than was normal, and would have prevented the estate becoming subject to wardship, if her husband died prematurely. Beauchamp was a military colleague, who had been knighted with Fulk VI in 1306. It may perhaps be inferred that there had been problems during the minority of Fulk V [the settlor].

When Fulk V died in November 1315, his son Fulk VI was in foreign parts, and special livery of Whittington was granted to Eleanor. The younger Fulk had already seen service in Scotland in 1300 and 1303, and later raised levies and recruits from his Lordship of Whittington throughout the reign of Edward II. This king’s service took him to Ireland in 1317, along with his brother William and nephew Peter. In 1322 ‘Fulk [Fitz] Warin, lord of Whityngton’ was required to select 100 foot for service against the Scots, to rendezvous at Coventry. In the following year an instruction issued in York authorized the payment for ‘footmen, archers, and other armed men’ chosen to travel to Newcastle on Tyne to join the ‘army to set out against the Scotch rebels’. In a long list of providers, 50 footmen were to be supplied ‘from Fulk [Fitz] Warin’s lands of Whityntoun’, in addition to the 500 archers supplied from the counties of ‘Salop and Stafford’. Fulk was on the Saint Sardos campaign in 1323, when the English attacked and burnt the town, which had been newly fortified [French bastide] by King Charles IV of France. He was also in Gascony on King Edward’s service in 1324 and 1325, and for the 1324 campaign ‘to the duchy of Aquitaine’ he was accompanied by his son Fulk, and was one of the two ‘captains and leaders of the barons, knights, men at arms, footmen and others for the duchy assembling at Plymouth’. His finest military achievement was at the battle of Dupplin Moor in 1332, when he encouraged the English troops to stand firm against a superior Scottish force, which they routed.

An interesting episode in 1322 provides us with some idea of Fulk’s personal valuables, for he was robbed in Oxfordshire by William de Burle and Walter de Novo Castro, who were later arrested in Cambridge. The recovered goods included ‘eight silver dishes, a silk girdle, a gold brooch, and a chest with certain muniments, part of the jewels and goods whereof Fulk was robbed’.

Early in 1330, Fulk VI was accused of being an adherent of Edmund, Earl of Kent, and orders were given for him to be brought before King Edward III, with his lands seized if he refused. On 27 April ‘his castle of Whittington was committed to a keeper’ named Warin de Rugge. On 31 May his wife, Eleanor, had a temporary grant of 40 marks a year and his house in Wantage as a residence for the support of herself and her children: his sons Fulk and Iouen were detained in prison at Shrewsbury with instructions that they should be
treated without duress. Fulk himself had fled the country, but received a safe conduct to return from beyond the seas on 25 November 1330. He was eventually cleared, and Whittington Castle and his other lands were restored to him soon afterwards.\textsuperscript{123}

While the castle was confiscated, an extent of the castle and lordship was taken by an inquisition on 3 July 1330, which provides some interesting descriptions of both the castle and manor with the earliest detailed description of the castle:

‘There is a castle which ought not to be extended because there is no profit and the greatest expense; there is a certain house contained in the Castle which is worth per year in houses gardens curtilages fruits herbage and all receipts five shillings; there is a certain old and ruinous dovecote worth 6d pa; there are three water mills worth £4 10s; ...; there is a certain court held from three weeks to three weeks called the Hundred of Whittington worth £10.’\textsuperscript{124}

Fulk VI was possibly the most active warrior of all the Fulks, seeming to be away on military duties almost every year. His extended absences were perhaps a factor in the incursion into his lands at Whittington, for on 26 February 1331 he complained that:

‘William de Hulle, Waryn de Rugge, Nicholas de Chirk, Richard Madok, Richard de Hanewode, Howel ap Thomas and others at Whytynton in the March of Wales took away 5 horses, 100 mares, 100 colts, 48 oxen, 40 bullocks, 40 cows, 40 heifers, 500 sheep and 100 swine of his, worth £1000, broke his park, hunted there, carried away deer, cut down his trees, fished his stews and carried away the fish and timber.’\textsuperscript{125}

He died shortly before 6 June 1336 and was succeeded by his son Fulk VII, who, like his father, was accused of being an adherent of Edmund, Earl of Kent, but was similarly cleared, with his lands in Gloucestershire being restored to him on 8 December 1330.\textsuperscript{126} Another call to arms took place in 1338, when ‘Fulk Fitz Waryn, John de Cherleton the younger, Robert de Harleye, knight, and Griffin Cragh’ were appointed ‘to choose 200 Welshmen in the king’s lands in North Wales, and 500 other Welshmen’\textsuperscript{127} All the men chosen were to be at Ipswich on the appointed day. Fulk VII accompanied King Edward to La Hogue on 12 July 1346, being in the retinue of the Earl of Northampton, and was at the battle of Crécy and the siege of Calais, serving continuously in that retinue until, by the King’s permission, he returned to England. He died on 25 July 1349\textsuperscript{128}, probably due to the plague [i.e. the Black Death].

\section*{A Lordly Residence}

At some time during the first half of the 14th century, the castle underwent a major transformation\textsuperscript{129}, for the situation in the March changed at the end of the 13th century, following the subjugation of the Welsh in Gwynedd by Edward I. Thereafter, although there was still a need for vigilance and preparedness, the atmosphere in many areas of the March changed. As Davies noted:

‘On the whole the fourteenth century was for the March a century of peace. Accordingly the castle’s functions, which even in the past had never been exclusively military, became more varied. A few of the Marcher castles became favoured residences of their lords and in the process shed some of their austere military functionalism.’\textsuperscript{130}

He cites Shrawardine, Monmouth, and Caldicot as examples of Marcher residences receiving lavish improvement during this period.\textsuperscript{131} Whittington was evidently another example of this development. Until then the moated outer bailey, possibly originating as a prehistoric fortification, would have been used as an area into which cattle and people could come for safety from Welsh raiders. Instead, the castle became a high status dwelling for a wealthy lord and his family. In this period the water management system was altered from a defensive function, to create an ornate medieval landscape. The outer bailey was divided by a shallow ditch, splitting it into two halves, one for domestic use and the other as a pleasure garden. A large mound, next to the garden and constructed as a separate island, may have been a viewing mount, overlooking the pleasure garden and perhaps surmounted by a gloriette [summer house]. Unfortunately the records do not tell us when this landscaping took place, although there is archaeological dating evidence supporting a 14th-century date.\textsuperscript{132} It is inconceivable that it could have happened before the end of the 13th century, and, as we shall see, during the second half of the 14th century Whittington was almost continuously subject to wardship. The three potential builders were therefore Fulks V, VI and VII, all of whom lived to middle age and were accomplished military
men. Whittington was presumably the country retreat built by one of these men, as a suitable place to rest after the wars in other lands.133

Whether the apparent primary function of the castle was military or domestic, it must be remembered that these castles always fulfilled a variety of utilitarian functions, whether in peacetime or war. Matthew Johnson recently examined this subject in depth in an important study of the subject.134 The functional issues were also summarised neatly by R. R. Davies in an earlier work:

‘Only a few of the castles, however, were singled out for such distinction; for the majority their role was a more humble, but nevertheless crucial, one as the administrative and judicial headquarters of their respective lordships. There the lord’s ministers had their chambers and official residences; there the rents and tributes of the lordship would be brought; there at the exchequer the accounts would be audited and the bailiffs examined; there the chief courts of the lordship would be assembled and there also would be the lord’s gaol. The castle was the meeting point of lordship and community: it was there that the common assemblies of the lordship congregated; it was there at the castle gate that the tenants would be arrayed for the selection of troops to serve in the lord’s army. The castle, so wrote the surveyor at Holt in 1391 in an almost rhapsodical passage, “is the common focus for the whole lordship, for it is to this castle that the whole lordship is dependant, interand annexed as its principal seat.”’135

Following the death of Fulk VII in 1349, the inquisition (of 1350) records a rather poor state of repair, when the area was recovering from the plague [the Black Death], and the two water mills were ‘worth now only 20s yearly because the tenants are dead in the present pestilence’.136

Minorities and Absentee Lords

The Black Death marks the start of a long period of neglect and the main residence of successive lords seems to have been in Devon. Furthermore, there were only about 31 years out of the 88 between the Black Death and 1437, in which the owner was a minor in wardship. This ended only when the lordship passed to William Bourchchier and his wife Thomasia, whose mother was the sister of Fulk XI.

The new lord in 1349 was Fulk VIII, born at Whittington on 2 March 1340/1, but as he was a minor, the castle was held in wardship from 1349 by his uncle William Fitz Warin.137 He attained his majority in 1362, and married Margaret, daughter of Sir James Daudleye [De Audley] of Heighley Castle in north Staffordshire, a share of which, with Redcastle in Shropshire and Llandovery and other estates, later passed to descendants of Margaret. Fulk accompanied the Duke of Lancaster in his expedition to France in 1373, being in the retinue of the Earl of Warwick, but died 12 February 1373/4138, when his heir was his son Fulk IX, aged only 8 years.139 A document of 1367 relates a call to arms issued to several of King Edward’s representatives including ‘James Daudley lord of Whitynton’, so that they ‘can act speedily in the event of a French invasion in Wales or elsewhere’.140 Although Fulk was married to James’ daughter Margaret, it is not clear why James is referred to as ‘lord of Whitynton’ at this date.

Immediately following the death of Fulk VIII on 12 February 1374, an interesting period in the castle’s history took place with the brief ownership by Alice Perras, the mistress of Edward III, who acquired, by various means, a vast landholding of over 50 manors (in 25 different counties) between 1367 and 1377.141 Alice was granted guardianship of the lands formerly of Sir Fulk Fitz Warin, including the manors of Wantage [Berks], Stanton Fitzwarren and Crofton [Wilts], Bentham [Gloucs] and the castle of Whittington [Shropshire]. In 1377 the King died and she forfeited her properties following the Good Parliament that year. The subsequent Inquisition at Whittington in 1378 records that ‘the castle is of no net value, but is in great need of repair. There are two gardens worth 5s yearly...’.142 The Inquisition also describes open land, meadow, a park, pastures, a wood called ‘Babynch’, four water mills and ‘2 ponds now worth nothing, because they were destroyed in the time of the said Alice’.

According to a later inquisition in 1383, James de Audeley [Lord of Heighley] occupied the castle and lordship after the forfeiture of Alice Perras in 1377.143 Audley similarly took the Fitz Warin manor of Bentham [Glos.]. In August 1378, ‘James Daudele knight’ had been required to agree a rent for ‘Whityngton castle lately in the late king’s hands’ but recently committed to him.144 The bailiff’s accounts for 1385 record building work at the castle, including work on the castle walls, the shingle roofs of the towers, the old hall and the thatching of the lord’s stable. A carpenter named Jevan Waryn was engaged to make a louvre or chimney [fimerel] upon the castle hall, for which 200 ‘bord nails’ were purchased.145

Sir Fulk IX was born 2 March 1361/2 at Combe Martin in Devon146, and on 3 Nov 1383 King Richard II took his homage and fealty, and he had livery of his father’s lands.147 He married Elizabeth Cogan and had livery of
her inheritance in 1388, but he died at Heighley Castle on 8 August 1391, aged only 29. The escheator for Salop and the March adjoining was ordered to assign dower to Elizabeth on 11 December 1391. One of the executors of his will was his uncle Philip Fitz Warwyn, who is referred to in a grant of 1391 (for lands outside Shropshire) as ‘Philip fitz Waryn of Whittington’. Following the death of Fulk IX, an inquisition was taken in 1392 at Whittington, which records that the castle was ‘utterly in ruins’.

Fulk X was born 1 April or 3 May 1389, and was consequently only two years old at his father’s death. During his long minority, the castle and manor were granted in wardship to John Devereux of Maugne (from 1392–93) and to Thomas de Percy (from 1393–94). Also during the minority of Fulk X (on 7 November 1389), the office of chief forester of Whittington hundred and park was granted to Dafydd Fychan, Steward of Cantrefmawr.

Ivo Fitz Waryn (1343–1414), whose father William was the younger brother of Fulk VII, held the wardship from 1394. The grant was confirmed on 18 June 1395, when the castle was in poor repair, and Ivo was allowed to spend the rent of 20 marks on repairs:

‘Grant, with the assent of the Council, to Ivo Fitz Waryn, because retained for life to stay with the king, of 40 marks a year at his own hands from the issues of the castle and manor of Whityngton in Wales, in the king’s hand by reason of the minority of Fulk Fitz Waryn, and by letters patent lately committed at farm to the said Ivo during the minority of the heir at the yearly rent of £60; and further, with the like assent, grant to him of 20 marks a year from the same issues for expending on the repair of the castle and manor, in addition to what he is already bound by the said letters patent to expend hereon, as they are in a very ruinous state.’

Henry IV renewed the grant on his accession in 1399 and an account was probably then passed. The next ‘Account of Ivo FitzWaryn, farmer of the castle and manor of Whittington’ (covering 1401–03), states that £26 13s 4d was spent on the castle, recorded in particulars delivered to the Treasurer (which do not survive). It gives only a general description of what it had been spent on, but includes the hiring of carpenters and masons.

Whittington figured in the Glyndwr rebellion at the beginning of the 15th century. The rebellion began with Owain Glyndwr’s supporters attacking various English towns across north Wales including Oswestry, which was burnt on 22 September 1400, and Welshpool, which was attacked the next day. However they failed to take any of the border castles either then or later, but as a Marcher lordship, Whittington may have been caught in the crossfire. Certainly Ivo FitzWaryn, as keeper of the castle and lordship, had to obtain protection from Englishmen crossing the lordship to attack the Welsh. Although they ‘and their predecessors and ancestors have always been loyal lieges [of the king], nevertheless since rising of the Welsh ... divers Englishmen ... have robbed and despoiled [them] of their crops, cattle, wood and other goods and chattels’, Such protection was granted on 19 March 1403. At least the tenants at Whittington did not suffer the indignity of those in Ellesmere, who were deceived by John Kynaston into marching to Myddle so as to meet their lord, Richard Lord Lestrange, but then found themselves part of Henry Percy’s army and on the rebel side at the battle of Shrewsbury.

The rebellion was certainly damaging to Whittington. On 12 April 1404 Yvo FitzWaryn, ‘chivaler,’ was discharged from the rest of his rent for the wardship of the lordship ‘in consideration of the wasting of the manor of Whitington in Wales by the rebels, so that he can receive no profit from it, and his great expenses on the safe-custody of the castle and the losses of the tenants and residents of the manor through the carrying off of their victuals and goods by the men of the marches’. A difficult situation arose on the death of David ap Youet, a loyal liege at Whittington with an estate worth £20 per year. The heiress was his sister Angharad, who (like her husband Ieuan ap Paynol [or Paynot]) was an adherent of Glyndwr. This was reported to the government, which granted the lands to David Holbache. Ieuan and Angharad were pardoned on 26 October 1407 because they ‘were compelled to adhere to the said Owin and to stay for some time in his company’, but that did not restore the land to them. David Holbache was a loyal Welshman, who was on the Commission of the Peace for Shropshire and seems to have been the Earl of Arundel’s main deputy locally, both as steward of Oswestry and also in other capacities. He had lost lands worth 200 marks per year and goods and chattels worth 2000 marks.

The rebellion was brought to an end through vigorous action by Marcher lords and the garrisons of their castles. King Henry IV pardoned the Arundel lordships including Oswestry and Chirk on 1 July 1406 and their lord followed suit on 30 August. Glamorgan followed the next summer. The tenants of Abergavenny and Powys were pardoned in November 1407, and the Mortimer lordships (in what became Radnorshire) in January 1408. For some reason it was only on 20 Nov 1408 that a pardon was granted for Whittington:

‘At the supplication of Elizabeth de Botreaux [Fulk X’s mother-in-law], keeper of the lordship of Whittington in the march of North Wales, which is of the inheritance of Fulk Fitz Waryn, a minor in the king’s keeping, to
all tenants of the same lordship who adhered to Owain Glyndoure, rebel, on account of the hard war which he made on them and have surrendered to the king’s grace, for all treasons, rebellions, insurrections, adherences, murders, rapes, felonies and crimes committed by them in England or Wales.’

Though full details cannot be given here, it is clear that the northwest and west of Shropshire suffered considerably during the rebellion. The most serious Welsh incursions into Shropshire probably mainly occurred in 1404 and early 1405, forcing the county to seek a three-month truce with the ‘land of Wales’.166 Whitchurch and Overton [Flintshire] had been burnt in 1403.170 Even as late as 1431, some of the devastation in Whittington had still not been repaired, as it was reported that ‘70 cottages and 150 acres of arable land belonging to the cottages are wasted and burnt in war and not yet repaired and the aforesaid land lies vacant in the hand of the lord for want of tenants’.171

As Fulk X approached adulthood, he married Anne Boteaux, but he died (probably at Whittington) aged only 18 on 31 October 1407, leaving a son.172 The castle was then again taken into King Henry IV’s hands by a writ of 8 November 1407. The subsequent inquisition describes the lordship: ‘The castle and lordship of Whittington and the advowsons of Whittington and Selattyn in the Welsh March, held of the king in chief by barony, worth nothing because the houses of all tenants of the same are destroyed, devastated, and burnt by the invasion and access of the rebels.’ Property belonging to Redcastle in central Shropshire was similarly ‘devastated and burnt by rebels’, but the Fitz Warin share there still had some value.173

Dower was assigned to the widow Anne in 1408 in the presence of the farmers of two parts of the lands of Fulks FitzWarin, and of John Artour and William Foretop, next friends of the heir in ‘a third part of the castle, lordship and hundred of Whittington ...’.174 She married again (with royal licence) on 13 August 1409, to Sir William de Clinton of Maxstoke, Warwickshire. In 1413 she and her new husband applied for her dower to be assigned by metes and bounds; the object of this may have been to provide them with a grand house in which to live. However this might not have worked out quite as they intended, as she was assigned the barbican, which we know from the 1545 survey (see below) was usually used as servants’ quarters. Her husband probably resolved this by acquiring the wardship of her son. This assignment of dower is especially interesting (though very illegible) in that it provides a reference to the formal garden with encircling water ditches. On 24 July 1413 she was given, ‘the outer barbican in the castle in the north part of the same [illegible] barbican with houses in same gate as well above as below with new stable in same barbican [illegible] with garden ditched around with water lying in the north part of castle there’ (cum gardin circumfossat aque in parte boreal castri ibidem). This document also provides the first clear reference to the gatehouse (barbican), which is the most prominent feature of the castle to survive.175

She and her husband must subsequently have acquired the wardship from Ivo FitzWarin (who died in 1414) or a successor.176 In this period William was plaintiff in two Chancery proceedings, both of which must date from before the deaths of Fulks XI and Anne in 1420. In one of these the defendants were Howel ap Eynyon Gogh, lieutenant for the earl of Arundel at Oswestry, and others. This concerned an oak tree cut down by Thomas Lloit of Oswestry in the forest of Babynge in Whittington. Clinton’s servants carried this away. This resulted from the raising of hue and cry by Howell and other officers and the invasion of Whittington by ‘400 men well mounted armed and clothed for war with bacynettes launces swords bows and arrows’. A few days later there was another hue and cry, resulting in the removal of an oak from Whittington Park. Subsequently, Clinton sent a wagon and four horses to Shrewsbury to buy food. On the way back a party including William Preston, constable of Shrawardine Castle, and other tenants and servants of the Earl of Arundel, ambushed and stopped the wagon ‘in the high road of our lord the king’ at ‘a place called Monyford [now Montford] Bridge’ and gave Clinton’s servants a severe beating which left them unable to work.177 In the second Chancery proceeding, the defendant was John Wele, Captain of Oswestry and Lieutenant of the Earl of Arundel. In this issue, William Clinton was seeking damages for the theft of large numbers of oak trees from the ‘forests and other woods of the lordship of Whittington’. Servants and tenants of the Earl had allegedly ‘cut down the woods and underwoods, illegally made charcoals ... and the trees and charcoals [were] sold to the people of the county for the maintenance and support of the said John Wele to the value of £100’.178

The last of the Fulks was Fulk XI, who was born 20 January 1405/6 and died aged just 14 on 21 September 1420, bringing the direct male line of the Fitz Warins to an end. His mother Anne died a few weeks later on 17 October 1420 and her husband William Clinton in 1431.179 After Fulk XI, the heiress to the title was Elizabeth, his sister, who was aged 17 at the time of his death and then already married to Richard Hankeford,180 whose father had been Lord Chief Justice of England. They were granted livery of the lands of her inheritance on 5 December 1420.181 She died in 1426 or 1427 and then Richard ’held by the law of England [i.e. curtesy] after the death of Elizabeth his wife the Castle or lordship of Whittington...’.

On 12 November 1422, about two years after they inherited the castle, it was seized by a relative, possibly the senior male of the Fitz Warin family, to whom it would have descended if it had been entailed on male heirs.
Richard and Elizabeth petitioned Parliament that ‘William Fitzwaryn and Richard Laken, with a great number of Welshmen, armed and arrayed for war [had] climbed [eschaleront] and entered their castle of Whittington by night as if in time of war’ and were still holding it. They asked (and were ordained) that, by authority of this parliament, proclamations should be made in Shropshire and the March of Wales adjoining the castle, and by the Sheriff of Berkshire, that William Fitzwaryn and Richard Laken should appear or personally surrender themselves in Chancery within fifteen days following the proclamations to answer to the king for the forcible entry and misdeeds; that those who feed, sustain or conceal them and their allies in the castle, after the proclamation has been made, should incur the aforesaid penalty; that if they and their victuallers did not appear, they should be convicted of these offences, and incur the ordained penalties; that if those who made forcible entries, routs and unlawful assemblies did appear, that the Chancellor was empowered by Parliament to hear and determine the matter; and that he might grant the writs to make the proclamations, and all others which are necessary. William Fitzwaryn was probably the lord of Appleton near Oxford [then in Berkshire].

His father John (who died in 1401) could (like Ivo’s father) have been a younger brother of Fulk VII. Alternatively, he could have been Ivo’s younger brother in which case his wife must have been much older than him. He was certainly only distantly related to Elizabeth Hankeford. Evidently, she and her husband recovered the castle; he outlived her, dying on 8 February 1431.

Although various lands are listed with values (meaning that they were occupied), the inquisition on the death of Richard Hankeford (of 1431) still referred to damage done over 20 years before. The jury said:

‘that Ivenhale [Ebnull] is a certain capital messuage ruinous and devastated worth nothing beyond outgoings; in the member of Frannton [Frankton] are 12 cottages ruinous and part destroyed; and 70 cottages and 150 acres of arable land belonging to the cottages are wasted and burnt in war and not yet repaired and the aforesaid lands lies vacant in the hand of the lord for want of tenants.’

The co-heiresses of Richard and Elizabeth were Thomasia (b 23 Feb 1422/3) and Elizabeth (b 1424), but Elizabeth died in 1433, leaving Thomasia as the sole heiress, the description of the lordship at Elizabeth’s death being similar to that at her father’s. Before 3 Aug 1437 she married William Bourchier, thus carrying the Fitz-Warine peerage into the Bourchier family. On 15 Aug 1437, William and Thomasia obtained livery of the lands of her inheritance; she died 3 July 1453 and he before 12 Dec 1469.

A manorial account for the year to Michaelmas 1451 indicates that there was no longer waste, and this suggests that during the 14 years of his lordship, William Bourchier was successful in recruiting tenants to take up these lands. The rents totalled £35.9s.6d., ‘farms’ [rents under leases] £47.7s.2d. and, with other profits, the total was just over £110, with only 33s 6d. listed as decrease of rents. This is slightly more than the gross receipts in 1385 or 1527.

Other accounts also record the salaries of the various officers of the lordship. These people no doubt constituted the lord’s household in peacetime and the garrison in wartime. In 1527 these were a constable [probably also the steward], an understeward [probably also the recorder], a bailiff, a receiver, a woodward, and also an auditor, a clerk of account and an attorney. An undated 14th-century account lists slightly fewer officers, but there was a ‘Captain of the Castle’ who was paid £12.19s.9d, compared with £5 for a 16th-century constable and half that for most other officers.

The son and heir to William and Thomasia was Fulk Bourchier, Lord Fitzwarin (born 25 Oct 1445), who received special livery of his father’s lands on 12 Dec 1469 and died on 18 Sept 1479 aged 33. In 1481 the Inquisition post mortem for ‘Fulk Bourchier de Fitzwaren knight’ was held at Wenlock, when he was seised of the castle and manor of Whittington, which were then valued at £20. William and Thomasia had in May 1443 settled these on themselves in tail.

Fulk’s son, John Bourchier, was born 20 July 1470, and received livery of his father’s lands on 29 March 1491, without proof of age. He accompanied Henry VIII on the French expedition in 1513 and was created Earl of Bath on 9 July 1536, but died on 30 April 1539. The second earl was his son, also called John, who was born in 1499 and held the title until his death on 10 February 1560/1. This John later became one of the first to declare the right of Queen Mary to the Crown, and was also a Commissioner for the trial of Lady Jane Grey. The third earl was William (1557–1623) and the fourth Edward (1590–1636/7). With Edward’s death the Barony of Fitz Warine fell into abeyance, but the title Earl of Bath was held for one more generation by his cousin Henry, the fifth earl, who died in 1654. With his death the Earldom became extinct, as did apparently the house of Bourchier. Although the earls did not retain Whittington (see below), they did keep many of the Fitz Warin lands, particularly in Devon, but also including the important manor of Wantage in Berkshire. Their main seat was at Tawstock in Devon and they also owned property in London.
After the Fitz Warins

The 1530s saw the greatest changes in the status of Whittington for several hundred years. As already mentioned, in 1536 Whittington and several other lordships were annexed to Shropshire and at the same time the jurisdiction of Marcher lords was abolished. In most Marcher lordships this made little difference, as they had already passed to the Crown as part of the Duchy of Lancaster, or of the Earldom of March, or by attainder, or for other reasons. However it deprived the Lord of Whittington of considerable status that he had enjoyed. The lordship had passed to the Earls of Bath, but despite his loss of jurisdiction in pleas of the Crown, John, second Earl of Bath appointed an Attorney-General (an Oswestry lawyer), rather than just an attorney, and did this by 'letters patent'. It is suggested that this was an assertion of his lost regalities as a Marcher lord. However, he abandoned his pretensions in 1545 when he exchanged Whittington with the Crown for manors and farms in Devon lately of the monastery of Dunkeswell.

Immediately after they had passed into royal ownership, a detailed survey was produced in 1545 for the lordship and manor. We are extremely fortunate that this contains a detailed description of the surviving structures, which provides us with our best record of the castle at any date. The following extract is a complete recital of the part dealing with the castle structures:

‘The viewe of surveye of the lordshypp and manor of Whyttyngton in the countie of Salopp made the xth day of March anno xxxvi Regis nostre Henrici viii

Fyrste uppon the seyte of the seyd mannor standyth a castell in a good fertyle and plentyfull coutry of pasture and arabull land within two myles of Oswestree a good markett and borough town and iii myles from the kinges majesties castell of Chyrke. Moted aboute with a mote of fayre freshe runnyngge water conteynyngge in breeth xxxvi foote with a drawe byrdge of tymber over the same conteynyngge in length xliii foote and in breeth vi foote

And at the entre in the seyd castell be twoo great rounde towers of stone on eyther syde of the gate, of iii stores in heght in everye storey one chamber or rome conteynyngge in length xxiii foote and in breeth xxii foote sumwhat in decay for lacke of reparations covered with syngle and gutters of leade and from the same on the northe parte is a gallyry with walls of stone and covered with single with wyndowes openynge into the mote conteynyeth in leghth lxv [deletion] foote and in breeth v fote leading to an other tower of lyke hyght and rooms

Adjoynyng to the same is an old hall partly in decaye conteynyngge in length xliv foote and in breeth xxvii foote covered with syngle the walls of stone with a decayd butterey and pante at the nether ende of the same and at the upper ende of the same is one other rounde tower of lyke hygheth and romes as the other towers before and adjoynyng to the same is a fayre chappell the wales of stone and covered with single wherein is masse daylye celebrated conteynyngge in length xxxiii foote and in breeth xxiii fote and adjoynyngge to the same on the west is a halle of tymber covered with single conteynyngge in length xl fote and in breeth xxxvi foote, with a chimney in the same and at the upper ende thereof is one chamber conteynyngge in length xxvi fote and in breeth xiii fote, and adjoynyngge to the same is an other round tower of lyke fassyon as is aforesayd and from thens is a gallyry conteynyngge in length lxvi fote and in breeth vi fote leadinge to the seyd two great towers at the gate all which byldinges are rounde about a square courte conteynyngge in length clix foote and in breeth cxl fote and in the north syde of the same is a kychyn of tymber and covered with single conteynyngge in length xxx fote and in breeth xxvi fote with one oven in the same and withoute the gates and mote of the seyd Castell is an old gate and on the est parte of the same below is a place where the lord kept his courtes and on the weste parte of the seyd gate be twoo small stabulles rome for vi or vii geldinges with loftes over the same for xii lode of heye and over the seyd gate house and courtehouse be foure lyttell chambers with one chimney wherein the lords officers accustomably doe lye.’

During the short period of royal ownership (to 22 Dec 1549), the manor and lordship of Whittington were leased inter alia to Anthony Strelley, knight, for life at a yearly rent of £20. Shortly afterwards, in 1552, Henry Duke of Suffolk and Thomas Duport, gentleman, received a grant of ‘the lordship and manor, the castle, the chace, the park and the advoson of the rectority of Whittington, Salop, formerly of John earl of Bath ...’. Following the Duke’s attainer, Queen Mary granted Whittington to Henry Earl of Arundel and his heirs.

The Earl, with son-in-law and daughter, John, Lord Lumley and Lady Jane mortgaged the castle and lordship in 1562 to Richard Lambert [a grocer], Richard Carell [a mercer], Richard Pype [a leather-seller], John Isham [a mercer] and William Albany [a merchant tailor], all citizens of London. William Albany later acquired the property as his sole right and it passed through his son, Francis, to his grandson, also named Francis. Both the Earl (during his ownership) and Albany (during the early part of his) enfranchised many of the tenants, both
leaseholders and copyholders, who thus became freeholders paying a rent and a heriot to the lord of the manor. William Albany, his son Francis, grandson Francis, and the latter’s widow all probably lived at Fernhill Hall. The younger Francis Albany died in 1636, shortly after the holding of an inquisition in lunacy. Much of the estate was then in the hands of creditors, and was not recovered by his daughter and heir, Sarah, until the 1650s after her marriage to Thomas Lloyd of Aston. Their descendants still own the castle.

The Period of Decay

The long decay of the castle in the late medieval period became irreversible in the following centuries. As early as 1536–9, the traveller John Leland seemed uninspired when he reported only ‘a village in a valley containing a hunderith houses, and hath a dichid round castelle not very large in the midle of the village’. In 1623, Francis Albany [William’s grandson] was heavily in debt and sold Babbinswood to Arthur Kynaston of Shrewsbury, who was given ‘liberty to build iron works and draw water and to carry stone from the castle of Whittington for the iron works and houses [at Ebnall], and liberty to dig for iron stone and minerals thereon or in any of the wastes of the manor of Whittington’. This was the first of a series of occasions when the castle was used as a quarry. In 1632 Francis Albany let to Edward Prichard of Bergill (yeoman) ‘the buildings called the Castle Gatehouse and Court House, and garden or court within the walls of the Mayne Castle in Whittington’ at a rent of 2s annually. The tenant was to repair the premises being allowed ‘sufficient mayne timber ... and freestone out of the castle’ for the purpose. This is no doubt the garden that (with fishponds, probably including the moat) is mentioned in a survey of 1617. In 1638, Prichard leased the same property for the same rent to George Williams of Shrewsbury, mercer.

There is no evidence that the castle played any role in the Civil War; it was not garrisoned, and was probably no longer defensible. After the Parliamentary troops took Oswestry in June 1644, a large Royalist force tried to retake the town and Parliamentary reinforcements were called in from Cheshire. Sir Thomas Middleton ‘appeared upon the scene with his horse at 2 o’clock, on the afternoon of July 2nd, and was immediately charged by the Royalist cavalry near Whittington.’ After some indecisive skirmishes, Middleton’s foot arrived and turned the battle. According to the Parliamentarians, ‘the enemy had taken the passage of water neer Whittington, and very furiously assaulted and charged us, but were repulsed.’ After the skirmish, the Royal troops were chased five miles towards Shrewsbury ‘to a place called Felton Heath’. It is interesting to note that examples of musket shot have been found in the castle grounds in recent years. A selection of pre-Civil War armour (perhaps originally ‘parish armour’) was also held in the gatehouse until 1977.

The castle was let in 1673 to Thomas Lloyd of London merchant [probably a relative of Thomas Lloyd its owner] who must have been a romantic who wanted to retire to a castle. The lease included ‘...Whittington Castle and dwellinghouse in the County of Salop (the use of the kitchen below and dining room above stairs on Court days only excepted) with outhouse garden and appurtenances ...’. The landlord was to put the dwellinghouse of the said castle in ‘repair [and] make up the wall of the garden door being only that part of the wall which he caused to be made up and built three years since’. Other works are also mentioned, including ‘pulling down the old cowhouse behind the dovehouse wall of Whittington Castle’, building ‘a sommer house’, a ‘necessary house’ and ‘a sufficient stable of sawed timber (upon the ground called the Rountons)’ [the area of the castle ditches], flooring ‘several rooms in the Castle’, making ‘a strong iron bar bolt and appurtenances for the lock and [to] make fast the Castle Gates’.

The exclusion of rooms on court days from the lease confirms that this refers to the gatehouse, rather than the castle proper, for the manor court was recorded as meeting in the gatehouse by 1545. It is thus probable that the gatehouse has continuously been maintained, partly because it contained the courtroom of the manor court and partly because it was suitable as a dwelling, though perhaps not a very convenient one.

The subsequent history of the castle is one of continuing decay. Its 19th-century historian, William Davies recorded:

‘About the year 1760, the eastern tower fell into the moat after a severe frost, and some years afterwards, one of the northern towers and the western wall were taken down to repair the roads leading from Whittington to Halston Bridge. The northern tower that now remains was undermined for the same purpose. In 1809, a smaller tower, used many years as a pigeon-house, was taken down to repair the exterior gateway...’

The owner, William Lloyd, recorded the structures and their destruction in his memoranda of 3 April 1809:

‘Persons have informed me that they remember very considerable remains of three other Towers the foundations of which may yet be seen. Thomas Griffiths a carpenter who gave me this information was employed
with many others to undermine & throw down the towers by Mr Mytton of Halston during the minority of my Father for the purpose of making the public roads in the neighbourhood."  

William’s father was John Robert Lloyd, born 21 February 1758 and married to Martha Shakespeare on 25 February 1779, after his own father [Rev. William Lloyd] had died in 1774.221 The new turnpike road between Whittington and Ellesmere was completed ‘through lands of John Mytton’ by 26 September 1776, after ‘large quantities of stone, sand and gravel have been taken for the purpose out of his lands contiguous to the new road’.222 A drawing of 1780 by G. Haultier confirms that the towers were demolished by that date.224

A Mr. Hale produced the earliest surviving plan of the castle in 1778.225 This shows the twin towers of the main gatehouse, with the extension at the rear of the northern tower and an L-shaped building is clearly marked in the area to the north of the gatehouse, close to the pool.

Restoration

William Lloyd’s period of ownership brought in a new attitude to the castle, which for two centuries had been regarded as a useless ruin, with no purpose save as a source of stone for building and road making. Otherwise the only part of any value was the gatehouse, which provided a dwelling, and (of course) accommodation for the manor court. The new interest of that period in the picturesque, however, brought with it a new appreciation of the castle in its own right, as a romantic ruin. Fronting as it did the Holyhead main road, the gatehouse attracted passing travellers, some of whom made pictures of it, including the young Joseph Turner who produced two pencil sketches in 1794.226 Later views show the gatehouse much as it is today, but the 18th-century ones show something rather different. The present form of the gatehouse is therefore as William Lloyd ‘restored’ it in 1809, after he ‘received a plan from W Harrison of Chester for repairing the gate way to the Castle of Whittington which I intend to restore to the form in which it had been originally built by Foulk Fitz Warren & by this means I hoped to preserve in some degree the appearance of this venerable building’.227 This followed the building of a new stable with a thatched roof in 1803.228

Davies reports the following details of the inner bailey area early in the 19th century:

‘The keep is now used as a garden, at an even depth under which, is a pavement of free-stone; at the north corner is a well, which was discovered and opened in 1809, when there were found the handle of the bucket, a pair of large iron fetters for the legs, a large jug, the remains of stags’ heads and swords; and upon removing some rubbish about the same time, there appeared a curious, carved stone head, and some highly gilt glass bottles.’229

At the time of the gatehouse restoration the castle grounds were evidently used for farming. In 1808, William Lloyd leased the castle (and other lands totalling over 47 acres) ‘late in the tenure of Edward Davies’ to Thomas Broughall of Whittington, farmer.230 This lease included other land ‘lately purchased by Lloyd from the trustees of Thomas Vernon’, and the whole agreement was for 13 years at £122. The lease was extended by agreement (with an endorsement on it) for a further 13 years from Lady Day 1821, and Broughall was still the occupier in the tithe survey of 1839 and at the time of the fire in 1841 (see below).

The tithe map of 1839 provides the first accurate survey of the village, complete with landowners and tenants.231 The gatehouse towers are clear, though the north tower appears to have some additional rectangular structures added to the north side. The L-shaped building still shows clearly, with a smaller rectangular structure close to the south of this. These buildings are partly enclosed by two features (apparently ditches) that form an acute L-shape along their north and west sides. The north part represents the current line of the stream along the north side of the bailey. The west side must be the ditch that divides the outer bailey from north to south. Also within this area is a small enclosure.232 On the night of 8 December 1841, a major fire destroyed the farm buildings at the castle. This was believed at the time to be the result of arson.233

On 4 May 1863, an agreement was made between Louisa Lloyd of Aston [William’s widow] and Thomas Hughes of Whittington, for the rent of the castle at £10. This included the ‘Dwelling house, yard, stable and garden with appurtenances known as Whittington Castle’. The agreement required the occupant [Thomas Hughes Junior] ‘not to fall, lop or top trees’ on penalty of a £10 fine each time. The landlady was to ‘keep the outside walls and roof in repair’.234

The Rev. Hugh Holbech undertook some further excavations late in the nineteenth century, when ‘the foundations of the old buildings were found, some in good condition, and formed of very fine stone. Part of a buttress that was exposed attracted a good deal of attention, and the opinion was expressed that it had formed part of the chapel.235 The position of the well cleared in 1809 was located again, but ‘apart from a large piece of
lead and pieces of stags horns, [Holbech] found nothing of any historical value.’ In 1878, G.T. Clark published
the first notable survey of the castle structures, producing a plan of the castle and correctly identifying that there
had once been a series of islands, separated by a water management system that made unauthorised access most
difficult. His description of the surviving remains includes the statement, ‘The castle seems to have been laid
out as a fancy garden a century or so ago, as there are traces of pebble-laid walks, and here and there modern
brickwork.’\textsuperscript{236} E.A. Downman surveyed the castle and earthworks again in 1906,\textsuperscript{237} and the Victoria County
History reproduced a simplified version of his survey in 1908.\textsuperscript{238}

Between 1929 and 1957, requests were made for the castle to be taken into state guardianship, but these were
not agreed.\textsuperscript{239} Oswestry Borough Council subsequently leased the castle from the owners, using it as a public
recreation area with play equipment in the outer bailey. The inner bailey was excavated in 1970 and the remains
then consolidated.\textsuperscript{240} The castle gatehouse continued to be occupied as a dwelling until the 1990s, having also
served as a laundry, café and branch library. The Whittington Castle Preservation Trust was formed in 1998,
with the intention of protecting the site in perpetuity and promoting it as an educational and recreational facility
for the benefit of the public; the Trust secured a 99-year lease of the castle from the Lloyd family in 2002.\textsuperscript{241}

Conclusion

This article has traced the history of Whittington Castle from its origins in the 12th century to the present day.
During that time it has been a frontier fortress, the residence of a powerful baron, the neglected centre of a
lordship owned by absentees, a convenient source of building stone, and finally in the last two centuries a
tourist attraction, a role which should be enhanced by its being in the hands of the Whittington Castle
Preservation Trust. This has led to the publication of the first guidebook to the castle\textsuperscript{242}, and to archaeological
investigations, which will be published separately.\textsuperscript{243} However Whittington has a wider interest, which it has not
been possible to explore fully in this article. It has touched on relations between Whittington and its neighbours,
but it has hardly been possible to look at its inner workings. As a Marcher lordship, albeit a small one, justice
was administered in it at all levels. Research on the Court Rolls of the Lordship of Ruthin [or Dyffryn Clwyd]
indicates that its courts were to a considerable extent administering Welsh law for its Welsh subjects.\textsuperscript{244} Court
Rolls for the Whittington lordship survive from 1283 and then fairly continuously from 1362 until after the
abolition of the unusual jurisdiction of Marcher lordships,\textsuperscript{245} but these have not been much used here. They
would repay study, as little is known of what customary law they administered or how it was implemented. The
long neglect of these court records no doubt reflects the equivocal status of Whittington, as a place that has in
the past millennium sometimes been in England and sometimes in Wales, and has led to its neglect by scholars
from both.

Postscript

This article was completed before the appearance of the recent articles by David Stephenson, ‘Fouke le Fitz
Waryn and Llywelyn ap Gruffydd’s claim to Whittington’ Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological
Society, LXXVII, 2002, 26–31 and ‘Welsh Lords in Shropshire: Gruffydd ap Iorwerth Goch and his
Descendants in the Thirteenth Century’ Ibid., 32–7. Both address issues touched on here, and add some detail
on them. It is perhaps a pity that the author did not also consider the history of Overton Castle [in Maelor
Saesneg], where similar issues arise. We were not able to do so as it was beyond the scope of our subject.
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A ‘MUSHROOM’ FAMILY: THE FLEMINGS OF WESTHOPE, SIBDON, AND SHADWELL, 1650–1775

By JANET VERASANSO

In 1909 Evelyn Martin wrote an article for The Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological Society on the manor of Westhope, which had been left to her forbears by Frances Harries, née Fleming, in her will of 1792. With new information, this present essay attempts to enlarge upon Martin’s research into the Fleming family. It will place them within the context of 18th-century polite society by describing their legal background and countywide acquisition of land, their aspirations, disputes, strategic marriage alliances and the eventual tragic failure of the senior male line.

The title is taken from a term current in the 17th century to describe families who ‘like a mushroom, rose on a sudden and vanished as soon’. Although the Flemings’ social status was no greater in Shropshire than that of the squirearchy they are a striking exemplum of this rise and rapid extinction. The principal parties with whom we are concerned were members of the legal profession. Most worked in Chancery where they had opportunities to loan money on mortgage to impoverished landowners and, on the failure to service these debts, the Flemings could foreclose; estates so acquired might be retained or subsequently sold for profit.

Henry Fleming (d.1658), an attorney ‘of the Chancery office’, is considered by both Martin and V. L. Oliver to be the founder of this family. However there is a possibility, as yet unproven, that the Shropshire family was descended from a medieval landed family of South Wales which, by the end of the 16th century, was in reduced circumstances. Their coats of arms were identical. It is, nevertheless, entirely possible that Henry, on his acquisition of an estate, assumed these arms to establish status – a known occurrence at a time when lineage was still of vital importance. His marriage to Helen Povey, sister of a future Lord Chief Justice of Ireland, may have given him useful connections; patronage permeated political and professional life throughout this period. In his will of 1657 Henry left substantial legacies, including a generous bequest to his late master’s family. An early death, however, left Henry’s widow with the responsibility of four young sons and although his estates in Shropshire and Montgomeryshire were retained Medborne Over in Leicestershire was sold.

Without contemporary evidence it is impossible accurately to judge Henry’s motives in acquiring rural properties. It is known that lawyers purchased properties for investment purposes alone, in both town and country, and Henry may have wished to secure an income for his young family. It is, however, likely that his ultimate objective was to realise dynastic aspirations and found a landed family. The purchase of Westhope Manor in 1654/5, including previous modest purchases in Ludlow and Culmington, confirms this hypothesis. In contrast to barristers, attorneys were members of the lesser branch of the legal profession, engaged in drawing up settlements, wills, mortgages and conveyances. Their reputation was poor. It was claimed that they were ignorant, venal petitfoggers; indeed a century was to pass before their reputation was redeemed. Nevertheless this situation did not prevent some attorneys from accumulating considerable wealth. A successful career in the law could satisfy territorial ambition and lead to positions of social consequence; the foundation of several landed families can be traced back to a successful attorney.

In Henry’s heir, John (1652–1716), clear evidence emerges of the Fleming propensity for illiberal and oppressive behaviour. Although obligated by his father’s will to provide for his younger brothers, he failed to comply, which resulted in a court action in 1677. Henry had devised £600 to each younger son. John, however, had refused to distribute the legacies, asserting that he would pay at his convenience, in whatever amounts he chose. To show that John was able to pay these legacies it was stated that he had sold the Montgomeryshire lands and had received a considerable portion on his recent marriage to Elizabeth, daughter of Sir John Edwards of Heath House, Clungunford. This denial of their inheritance rendered the younger sons ‘destitute’.

During 1684 John purchased the large property of Shadwell, near Clun. He was living there in 1707 when his wife brought a case of extreme brutality against him in the ecclesiastical court held at Ludlow. This case,
however, may not have accompanied the usual social disgrace which attended marital break-up. Her suffering was well known; in 1694 her friends had petitioned John Walcot of Walcot to intercede on her behalf but due to her husband’s intervention nothing further was done. The prosecution resulted in a judicial separation, with the court awarding Elizabeth sixteen shillings a week alimony, later described by John as a ‘plentiful and handsome maintenance’. The Hereford diocesan Acts of Instance records show that John was repeatedly brought before the court for non-payment and he was, in 1711, excommunicated.10

John and Elizabeth had 18 children, twelve of whom survived infancy. Family discord became apparent before the separation, when the elder children took sides, Richard, Gilbert and Dorothy acting in their own interest. Between 1703 and 1707 John had conveyed Shadwell, Westhope and other lands to his heir, John jnr, of the Middle Temple, with agreement that he would pay his father £100 per annum. However John jnr. died in 1707 and in his will nominated his brother Richard as sole executor. Displaying familiar Fleming traits, Richard immediately seized his brother’s property, personal effects, deeds and leases. His father claimed that he defaced and removed seals from documents, and refused to mortgage Westhope (which had been agreed between John and John jnr), or pay his siblings their portions of £50 each. Dorothy was also implicated, seizing documents and household goods. As the principal parties in this dispute were unable to arrive at an amicable resolution, it resulted in a court case brought by their father against these elder children for the annual payment of £100.11 The full story, however, remains hidden and the judgement has not survived.

As second son, Richard (1681–1748) was now heir to John. His marriage to Elizabeth, daughter of Sir Edward Acton Bt of Aldenham, in 1708, was a social coup giving him potentially useful new kinsmen among the landed elite. Their marriage settlement has survived.12 Her portion of £2,000, described as a ‘good fortune’, was used by Richard’s father to repay the mortgage on Shadwell and the Broneth (an adjacent farm) and these, together with Westhope, were settled on Richard for life.13 Employed in the Six Clerk’s office in Chancery, Richard had excellent opportunities to acquire information about properties whose owners were in difficult financial circumstances and who were keen to raise cash to satisfy their creditors. In 1725 he acquired Sibdon Castle for £2,410 and foreclosed on Dinmore Manor, Herefordshire in 1727, both of which were retained by his descendants. According to Robinson in his Manor Houses of Herefordshire, Downton Hall also belonged to him for a short period.14 Among his family and relatives Richard was considered a hard and unpopular man; in the year of his death Lady Elizabeth Acton of Aldenham wrote to her son ‘I can’t say that I am much concern’d to hear of your Uncle Flemings illness as I think whenever he Dies he will be no loss to the world and so beleive it had been better for our fammily had he Died some years agoe.’15

Richard’s brother Gilbert (1689–1762), after studying law at the Middle Temple left England for the West Indies where he spent much of his life. Residing initially in Antigua, in 1727 Gilbert was returned to the Assembly of St. Kitt’s to represent the parish of St Ann Sandy Point and in the following year he was made Receiver of all the money arising out of the sale of lands on the same island. 1733 saw his appointment as Lieutenant Governor of the Leeward Islands. Becoming well established in the West Indies, Gilbert purchased plantations on both Tortola and St Kitt’s and in his will left slaves to his widow.16 The most successful of the Flemings, he returned to England on several occasions – to marry, for the second time, in St Paul’s cathedral in 1752 and five years later to seek leave on medical grounds. His daughter Katherine’s marriage portion of £20,000 reveals a distinct advance on the wealth of his forbears and siblings; his heir, Gilbert Fane, married into the aristocracy.17

The last Fleming in the senior line to survive was Edward (1713–1773), son of Richard and Elizabeth Acton (Plate I). Like his younger brother Richard, Edward studied law, but as eldest son and heir he ceased practising on marriage. A man of consuming pride and territorial ambition, his complacent self-centred conduct destroyed his family and, ultimately, himself. Outward appearances guided his decisions; his alterations to Sibdon Castle were designed to enhance his standing among the settled oligarchy of south Shropshire. Certainly Lord Lyttelton who visited Sibdon in 1756 during a journey into Wales was impressed. Writing to a friend, Lyttelton describes coming ‘by a gentleman’s house ... in a taste much superior to that of a mere country esquire’. On visiting ‘we found it the neatest and best house of a moderate size, that ever we saw’. Indeed it was ‘a place a monarch might envy’. These encomiums, emanating from a member of the aristocracy, would have pleased Edward but he was not at home to hear this praise.18

Edward’s character and behaviour can best be demonstrated in his courtship letters to his fiancée, Ann Cooper (Plate II) of Trowbridge, together with his subsequent treatment of her.19 The draft copies of these letters, written during the winter of 1739/40 disclose a honing of his calculated phrases in order to ensure a satisfactory outcome of the marriage negotiations. At this period pragmatism and parity of rank guided the choice of partner. It would be unusual to discern true passion. In spite of the formal nature and conventions of 18th century letters, these suggest, in their stiff endearments, that Edward possessed one of the contemporary letter-writing manuals open on his desk. They do not possess the ring of genuine affection; no attempt was made to express the usual feelings of unworthiness or of gallantry, but rather he writes that Ann will be ‘as happy as any woman upon Earth’ once he has ‘received her at the altar’. Although his insincerity shines through...
PLATE 1. EDWARD FLEMING, AGED 42, BY HUDSON. WITH RIGHT HAND RESTING INSIDE HIS COAT IN A MANNER FASHIONABLE AMONG GENTLEMEN, EDWARD'S COLD SMUG GAZE REVEALS HIS SELF-SATISFACTION.

PLATE 2. ANN FLEMING, NÉE COOPER, BY HUDSON. HER RATHER HOMELY FEATURES ARE IN STARK CONTRAST TO THE HANDSOME BLUE SILK AND ORGANZA DRESS FESTOONED WITH PEARLS. BOTH THIS AND EDWARD'S PORTRAIT REMAIN WITH THEIR DESCENDANTS.
all his letters, in one undated letter to Ann his self-interest is betrayed. He writes that his father has agreed to 'convey Westhope and Sibdon Estates absolutely to me ... this grand step to my Happyness has put me under the greatest Rapture of Joy'. As a seriously indebted barrister of the Inner Temple Edward was fearful that the negotiations might collapse. He requested Ann to prepare her parents for the visit of his father, who was a difficult man, so that proceedings might be brought to a swift and satisfactory conclusion. Ann’s short replies reveal her to have been a modest, unaffected girl, who clearly accepted the inevitability of the proposed marriage. In conformity with the etiquette of the day she displayed no affection for her future husband; girls were expected to appear distant during the period of engagement. After Edward’s visit she writes to him of her family’s indispositions, but she does hope that his journey to London in the depth of winter was without incident. Her marriage portion involved the usual protracted wrangling between the parents with Edward encouraging Ann to intercede on their own behalf – for their future ‘happyness’. In reality however, Edward’s problems required a solution and her £10,000 portion would reduce this burden considerably. The marriage settlement has not survived. Nevertheless his will rehearses the important clauses of the final settlement. Westhope, Shadwell and Broneth were settled on Edward for life with remainder to Trustees to preserve contingent remainders. Ann was to receive a jointure of £600 per annum secured on the settled estates during her widowhood and £8,000 was to be raised by sale for the portions of any children other than the eldest son.

How did Edward and Ann meet? His fiancée, the daughter of a wealthy Wiltshire clothier, had been introduced to Edward by his uncle Gilbert at Bath, where families with marriageable daughters would spend a few weeks during the two social seasons in the expectation of finding suitable husbands. Gilbert abetted the marriage and was vital to the successful outcome of the negotiations, corresponding with Edward and cautioning him to assume a conciliatory demeanour towards his father with whom Edward was not on good terms. After the introduction and recommendation made by Uncle Gilbert, who was doubtless aware of the large portion Ann would bring to the marriage, Edward wrote to her describing his ‘persuasion on his first waiting on her [that] he could love her forever’.

The marriage took place on 27 March 1740. The Trustees of the settlement purchased Sibdon from Edward’s father for £4,600 (the money raised by the sale of South Sea stock bought by Ann’s father as a part of her £10,000 portion) and Edward commenced his improvements to the house. His schemes for enhancing Sibdon – constructing an impressive battlemented entrance, oak panelling throughout the interior, extensive tree planting and increasing the fenestration of the castle to present a more imposing frontispiece – all required a considerable financial outlay. Furthermore he purchased parcels of land in Shropshire whenever the opportunity arose, alarming his father-in-law with his extravagance. The latter advised Edward to live within his means; £1,500 a year was not enough to support a growing family, improve his home and present to the world the image of a patrician country squire. Retrenchment was not in his nature and Edward would have seen it as a derogation and loss of status.

The Flemings’ carefully calculated and financially successful marriage alliances with the Acton, Edwards and Cooper families placed them securely amongst the ‘better sort’ of south Shropshire gentry. This clearly convinced Edward that a gentleman of his calibre needed to support his position in society by entertaining both lavishly and ostentatiously. The provision of hospitality was a prerequisite for anyone hoping to establish gentle status within polite society on which Edward, in common with others of his rank, placed great importance. In 1752 his Uncle Gilbert’s return from the West Indies with a 146 lb turtle provided an opportunity to impress genteel society with an invitation to an exotic dinner. Edward’s Acton relatives, who were his social superiors, accepted but the evening was marred by Lord and Lady Powis’s failure to attend. Other Fleming kin were invited: Gilbert’s arrival from the West Indies and their living within an easy ride of Sibdon may have precipitated their invitations. At this period it was customary among the gentry to foster kindred relationships outside the nuclear family, and to correspond with and visit affines, but, significantly, only Ann’s brother accepted an invitation to attend the turtle feast.

Edward maintained a number of other outward appearances suitable to a gentleman of his standing. Even before the purchase of Sibdon in 1744, he established a pack of hounds. Entertaining, participating in the social events of the nearest market town, hunting and sitting on the bench, caring for his tenants and acquiring yet more acres were routinely part and parcel of a gentleman’s life. But in Edward’s situation discord at home (his only son and heir was a dissolute alcoholic) and constant financial problems were likely to have heightened his concern to maintain the norms of social interaction acceptable within his class. Indentures, mortgages and bills of sale survive in which it is evident that Edward lived very close to the edge of bankruptcy; only his legal training and devious nature prevented his world from total collapse. Bills were never paid until the last minute; the artist, Thomas Hudson, waited almost three years to receive payment of £32 19s. 0d. for the portraits he painted of Edward and Ann. Even within the family his widowed sister-in-law and later his nephew had to threaten legal action for the repayment of loans contracted 12 years before. Ignoring her letters, Edward surpassed his usual excuses for non-payment (‘the children are ill’, ‘the tenants lately dead’) when he
wrote out a letter for Ann to send under her signature. Edward was no longer considered by her family as a man of honour; debts to family and creditors could wait. The estimation of local society informed his behaviour. His estates of almost five thousand acres, built up acre by acre in many parts of Shropshire, were mortgaged and remortgaged, the whole in such parlous state that after his death his three sons-in-law had difficulty in preserving the estates and continued to remortgage.

By 1763 Edward’s marriage to Ann was close to disaster. Placing herself outside the bounds of propriety, in her misery and despair she ran away from home. Leaving behind a pathetic note, Ann wrote that ‘nothing but your repeat’d ill usage could have made me leave my house & Children.’ She hoped he would have seen his ‘errors & behav’d as a Husband and Gentleman for the Credit of the family’ but, as he ‘dayley’ tells her he is ‘determin’d’ to make her as miserable as possible. ‘I must tel you bread & water is to be prefer’d with Content before living in plenty in the Distracing manner I have for some years past.’ She hoped that, as the object of his hatred was removed, Edward would be happier and behave with tenderness to the children. Staying with his youngest brother, she was persuaded by a Ludlow friend of the family, Daniel Cunyngham, that her duty was to her husband and children and, indeed, ‘a reconciliation would give less offence to the world’. After her return to Sibdon, however strained the domestic atmosphere must have been, Edward would have insisted on preserving outward appearances. The flight of his wife after years of suffering clearly occasioned considerable local gossip, and to counteract this social reversal it is easy to imagine that both husband and wife contrived to provide their acquaintance with a picture of a happy reunited family, attending social events wherever it was prudent to be seen together.

Ludlow, as the centre of south Shropshire society, to which the Flemings belonged, provided elegant and harmonious entertainment: balls were held in the Assembly Rooms attended by titled elites. Theatre performances and race meetings added further enjoyment, and hospitality was dispensed by the ton in their town houses. In the year after Ann’s death in 1770, Mrs Libbe Powys vividly described an exhausting round of activities: a morning visit to the theatre, after which the gentlemen dined at the ordinary and ‘every lady of any consideration’ accepted an invitation to take refreshments with the wife of a prominent attorney. After races held at the edge of town the ladies returned to their lodgings to prepare for the ball at the Assembly Rooms. Finally supper was served at Mr Hill’s lodgings at 4.00 a.m.

Edward made his will in February 1773. Two months later he was dead, poisoned at the instigation of his only son, Gilbert, who connived with two of his sisters to persuade the cook to mix arsenic in his father’s ‘pottage’. Edward died in great pain. The cook was tried but escaped punishment. In pursuance of the settlement made at the time of his marriage and repeated in his will, in which £8,000 had to be raised to satisfy the terms of this contract, plate, furniture and household goods, including 53 dozen bottles of madeira, were auctioned. Gilbert died of alcoholism in the following year; his tragedy perhaps the result of parental indulgence. After his death further household goods were auctioned but the family portraits did not find buyers: in spite of Edward’s carefully nurtured position amongst Shropshire polite society the reputation of father and son had finally made them unacceptable. By virtue of a partition deed Gilbert’s sisters divided the estates. Sarah, who had married a lawyer, John Baxter, against her father’s wishes – ‘without my consent or approbation’ – became the lady of Sibdon Castle which remained in the Fleming-Baxter family until 1927. Frances inherited the heavily mortgaged Westhope estate and Ann Shadwell, which her daughter later sold.

The rise and rapid extinction, within four generations, of the senior male line culminated in Edward’s death. His brother, Richard, who had inherited Dinmore Manor, Herefordshire and lands in Radnorshire and Montgomeryshire, married Frances Stukeley, daughter of Dr William Stukeley FRS. Their only son never married. Edward’s youngest brother took holy orders, but, as with his siblings, his line also came to an end.

Edward’s story brings into sharp focus the elusive nature of family survival and demonstrates the inability of some recently risen families to maintain a significant social position unsupported by a network of affines or a secure landed base.
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EMISSION FROM HIGHLEY, 1841–1881: A FLIGHT FROM THE LAND?

By GWYNETH NAIR AND DAVID POYNER

Since the classic work of Ravenstein on the censuses of 1871 and 1881, census statistics have been used to study migration around and from Britain.1 For thirty years and more, original enumerators’ returns have been used to investigate at a nominal rather than a merely statistical level.2 Studies have investigated the frequency and extent of migration, the growth of cities and the nature of their catchment areas, age- and occupation-specific migration, and so on. We have been able to look at where people came from, in terms of their birthplaces. Studies of particular places have been able to demonstrate a ‘loss rate’ of out-migration, although its computation is cumbersome and tedious. But it has not been possible systematically to investigate where people went when they left. Now, thanks to the release by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints of an indexed version of the 1881 census for Great Britain, we are able for the first time to study the dispersal of natives of a particular town or village throughout the British Isles.

What advantages does this bring? Firstly, it allows a more rounded picture of migration than was previously possible. Instead of a one-sided view of in-migration to our chosen community, we can provide an account of all migration – not just where people came from but also where they went. A detailed look at out-migrants also enables us to answer some questions which have previously only been answerable obliquely, by inference. Were some demographic or occupational groups more likely to leave than others? Did some travel greater distances than others? Hitherto, our method of looking at migration into cities and towns has been from one end only – the area drawn on for in-migration. Now we can also investigate the sending communities. It has become widely acknowledged that in the period of agricultural depression in the 1870s rural depopulation gathered pace.3 The 1881 census is ideal for demonstrating the nature and results of this depopulation. In short, it is now feasible to provide a more rounded study of migration, both in- and out-, in the later nineteenth century.

As a source, the indexed census database is not without its problems. It allows a search by birthplace, but, of course, records only what the enumerator wrote or was told. There are also some obvious errors of transcription. The first problem in tracing all those born in a particular village is clearly that not everyone knew where they had been born, or knew correctly which county it was in, or had any idea of how to spell the name. The further away the migrant had travelled the less likely we are to find local knowledge aiding in the accurate spelling or identification of a place-name. It is almost certain, therefore, that any attempt to trace everyone born in one village will result in a few cases being overlooked.

Sometimes, informants were simply wrong. Unless under-recording of baptisms in rural parishes was much greater than we have reason to believe, some people named as birthplace a parish where they were not born. Presumably, there were conversely some people who were born in the parish but who did not name it. Married women, of course, are a further complication here, as it is only in a few cases where the marriage is recorded and the woman’s maiden name traceable that we can even search for a baptism. Similarly, women who left a parish and subsequently married are impossible to trace in any systematic way. Nevertheless, even with these caveats, there is much that we can do to add to our knowledge of migration in nineteenth-century Britain.

Within Shropshire, whilst there has been some demographic work on the 19th century (often by local historians)4, this has not studied emigration in any detail. Migration in the East Shropshire coalfield has been studied through census returns and other sources.5 However, this work has mainly concentrated on immigration into the coalfield. The most recent study has concentrated on ‘persistence’ (the number of individuals recorded in two consecutive censuses) from 1881 to 1891.6 Within the county, population movements have been characterised as ‘complex’.7 Particularly by the late 19th century, the dominant Shropshire experience was emigration as industries declined and agriculture struggled.8 Shropshire is an interesting county in which to examine migration. As a predominantly rural county it could provide a useful counter to the majority of studies that have concentrated on movement into urban areas.
It is particularly instructive to add the dimension provided by the 1881 database to the study of a parish where some investigation of migration and its context has already been done. Such a parish is Highley, in south Shropshire. This was a small rural parish situated on the River Severn. From the 1820s, when the Stanley coal mine which had been worked for twenty years closed, until 1879 when another, larger coal mine was opened, agriculture was the chief occupation. The total population had declined from 407 in 1861 (when it was artificially boosted by the presence of men building a railway) to 293 in 1871. By 1881, the growth in population that mining was to bring had begun and the total had recovered to 363; nevertheless, the underlying trend amongst the agricultural population was still downward. Surrounding villages, too, experienced population decrease. Examining the Shropshire parishes on the west bank of the River Severn within 7 miles of Highley, the total population figures were 4166 in 1851, 4129 in 1861, 3993 in 1871 and 3738 in 1881. Situated on the still-navigable Severn, and with a railway opened in 1862, Highley was not by 1881 particularly isolated, although its roads were poor and the nearest towns some eight miles away. For 50 years, the village economy had relied on agriculture, with a little stone quarrying. In many respects, the population history of Highley in this period was typical of rural parishes throughout the entire county.

To carry out our analysis, an attempt was made to trace every individual in 1881 who gave Highley (or a close variant of the name) as his or her birthplace but who was not in 1881 living in the village. A total of 254 such individuals was traced. For the moment, analysis excludes members of their families born elsewhere. This immediately gives an idea of the scale of emigration, as this number represents 86.7% of the total population of the village in 1871. The various characteristics of this group are considered below.

Age Profile of Migrants

The 254 migrants who can be traced comprise roughly equal numbers of males and females (51.5% female, 48.5% male). The mean age of the migrant population was 37 ± 1.25, with no significant sex difference. By contrast, in both 1871 and 1881 the mean age of Highley inhabitants was almost 15 years younger. This discrepancy is largely due to the low numbers of infants and children in the migrant cohort. Throughout the period 1841 to 1871, although the mean age of Highley residents was increasing, about 30% of the village were 14 or younger. Only 14% of the migrant group were below this age. The mismatch between the two groups is most marked amongst the very young – below 5 years of age – but the other cohorts are also reduced in size. These figures do not however mean that children were not leaving the village; on the contrary, this seems to have been the case. Instead, they represent the consequence of a constant exodus every year of a mixed, albeit predominantly young, population. If this occurs at the same rate over several decades, so that the numbers of new migrants roughly balances the number of old migrants who die, then the mean age of the entire group will inevitably be in the late 30s. By contrast, the low average age of the village can be maintained only if there is considerable migration of young adults, leading ultimately to under-representation in the older cohorts. Thus the figures for the migrant population reflect how Highley-born individuals left the village before starting or completing their families. The age structure for the Highley resident population from 1841–81 clearly shows a deficit in the 15–19 year old cohort; most of these would have married and not returned to Highley. Thus the emigration data supports other evidence suggesting that many left the village in their late teens. It has previously been reported in studies of migration using persistence between adjacent censuses that migration was highest for the youngest cohorts; it is reassuring that with a different methodology, this is also noted in the present study.

In fact the age at which the majority of the migrant population left Highley is not easy to recover. The exact date of migration cannot generally be established, but a comparison of registered births with census listings is useful. We have carried out a cohort study on those born in 1831–40, to get as complete a sample as possible prior to the 1841 census. This cohort would have the average age of 45 in 1881; most who had survived to adulthood would still be alive. The 1831–40 sample comprised 54 individuals. Of these, eight had died prior to 1841 and a further three died in Highley in subsequent years. By the 1841 census, 24 individuals had left Highley, 44% of the total born in the village but 60% of the migrant population. By the 1851 census, a further six individuals had gone, 15% of the migrants. Subsequent censuses showed a net loss of five individuals in 1861, one person by 1871 and four individuals by 1881. At that point, there were only three survivors of the cohort still in Highley. Within the 1831–40 cohort, it is possible only to identify 14 of the migrants in 1881. However, five of these were individuals who had gone by the 1841 census and a further five had left by 1851. It becomes progressively less meaningful to repeat this analysis on subsequent cohorts; they represent younger individuals and so greater proportions will be expected to leave earlier in their lives. However, there is no reason to think that the 1831–40 cohort was exceptional. It is clear that the majority of those born in Highley left as children. It has previously been demonstrated in the period 1800–1819 how 75% of children baptised in
Highley apparently left early in their lives. This was considered in part to be due to the industrialisation that the village was experiencing; the rise and fall of a colliery over this period would result in many miners passing through Highley. However, the 1831–40 cohort was born into an almost exclusively agricultural village. The agricultural labouring families, perhaps contrary to expectation, were at this time as mobile as their earlier mining counterparts had been.

**Destination of Migrants**

In-migration, when it occurred, was over relatively short distances. Highley’s social networks, as shown in birthplaces of incomers and origin of marriage partners, were firmly based on the surrounding parishes. They tended, where they extended further afield, to encompass the area to the east rather than the west. This pattern is mirrored when we look at the places where the Highley-born had settled. The mean distance of migration was 16.6±1.25 miles; there was no significant difference between the sexes. Figure 1 shows their places of residence. Despite the advent of the railways, much migration remained short distance. Because Highley is situated close to the county boundaries with both Worcestershire and Staffordshire, the county is a potentially misleading unit of analysis. Instead, if we look first to those parishes which adjoin Highley, we find that together they account for over 20% of all migrants.

![Figure 1. Destinations of short- and medium-distance migrants from Highley, as recorded in the 1881 Census.](image-url)

CROSSES INDICATE PLACE OF SETTLEMENT. MAIN URBAN AREAS ARE SHOWN BY SHADING.
Table 1 Migration to Contiguous Parishes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chelmarsh (N)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinlet (S)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arley (SE)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alveley (E)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billingsley (W)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, the River Severn, which separates Highley from Alveley and Arley, does not appear as a significant barrier, although there was no bridge for several miles to the north or south. The river was readily fordable and several ferries existed. The nearest bridges were at the nearest market towns – Bridgnorth in Shropshire to the north, and Bewdley in Worcestershire to the south. Both towns had attracted migrants from Highley, as had Kidderminster some four miles further on from Bewdley.

Table 2 Migration to Market Towns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridgnorth (N)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bewdley (S)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidderminster (SE)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the parishes bordering Highley and the nearby towns, 14 (5.5%) individuals had moved within 5 miles of Highley, 12 of them to small villages west of the Severn. By contrast, individuals moving 5–10 miles from Highley largely settled east of the river, in the rural hinterland leading to the edge of the Black Country. Of the 11 who had moved west, 8 had settled in the small market town of Cleobury Mortimer.

Table 3 Other Migration within Ten Miles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South-east Shropshire and South Staffs (E)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-east Shropshire (W)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villages north of Bridgnorth (N)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Worcestershire (S)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 shows these clusters of migrants in the adjoining parishes and nearby towns, and a scattering in the small villages in between. Clearly the ten-mile radius which has become acknowledged as the chief focus of migration in early modern England retained a considerable role in migration into the late nineteenth century. In total 139 (55%) of the migrants were living within this radius. A number of studies have come to similar conclusions about the importance of short distance migration. However, these have predominantly been studies of urban communities, where because of the concentration of services, jobs and opportunities, short moves might be expected to be as effective as longer moves. It is interesting that in a rural community short moves also remained the norm. This in agreement with the work of G. T. Lewis on Cardiganshire.

When we look at medium-distance migration, say between 10 and 25 miles, we find a drift to the east rather than the west. We have calculated the straight-line distances between Highley and these places; the real distances by road or rail would have been much longer. Clearly, the urban areas of the Black Country were a magnet, and Highley migrants are found in towns such as Wolverhampton, Bilston, West Bromwich, Stourbridge and Rowley Regis. It is significant that by this date migration to east Shropshire was negligible. In earlier times this had absorbed significant numbers from the rural hinterland of Shropshire, and there is evidence for movement of families between this area and Highley at the start of the 19th century when Stanley Colliery was in operation in the village. By 1881, at least as far as Highley was concerned, the area was not an attractive destination as its industries declined.

Table 4 Migration 10 – 25 Miles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Country and Birmingham (E)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Staffs and Cannock Chase (NE)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broseley and Madeley (N)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in Shropshire (W and N)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire and Herefordshire (S)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was also some long-distance migration. It is hard to compare with patterns of migration in earlier periods, but the indications are that this kind of migration had increased: in the early modern period only the wealthy appear to have migrated over considerable distances to Highley.\footnote{GWYNETH NAIR AND DAVID POYNER}{FIGURE 2. \begin{figure}[h] \centering \includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure2.png} \caption{Destinations of long-distance migrants from Highley, as recorded in the 1881 census. Crosses indicate place of settlement. Square around Highley indicates area shown in Figure 1.} \end{figure}} There are some surprises in the general pattern of long-distance out-migration. There was little movement into Wales, despite both its proximity and the rapidly increasing population of industrial south Wales. London does not appear as the magnet that one might have expected. Birmingham, just on the edge of medium and long distance by our criterion, does feature as a destination. Lancashire was a not uncommon destination. As Figure 2 shows, there was more movement up and down the country than laterally across it, with no movement at all to the eastern counties. It is tempting to link this movement to the railways: certainly it was easier to reach, say, Lancashire than Suffolk by rail. But by no means all destinations were easily reached by rail; neither does the relatively small number of migrants to London fit comfortably with this explanation. Clearly other factors were at work, perhaps such as pre-existing kin groups or other social contacts.
Taking the data as a whole, several trends appear important. It is interesting to consider the relationship between the age of migrant and distance moved (Table 6). For the most part there are no marked deviations from the overall population mean. However, there is a trend in the 15–19 years group to move shorter distances. Many of these would be teenage, first-time migrants and this suggests that these individuals moved only fairly short distances. A substantial number were female servants working in the houses of the local gentry. The age 40–49 cohort shows a very short migration distance. It is difficult to rationalise this, especially as the 50–59 cohort show much greater migration distance. However, the over 60s again show limited mobility. Of the 26 longest distance migrants in the whole population (those who moved more than 40 miles), only 5 were older than 42; half of what would be expected for the numbers involved.

Two factors might explain the shorter migrations associated with older age-groups. A handful of those involved can be identified as elderly dependants who had left Highley to live with relatives; however, this type of movement would probably be less likely if the relatives were living many miles away. By far the majority were those who had moved away from Highley early on, before 1862 and the arrival of the Severn Valley Railway. These look like the remnant of the pre-Railway age migrants who necessarily could travel only shorter distances, for whom ten miles really did represent the limits of mobility. Whilst transport had improved enormously by the late 19th century, these individuals had not taken advantage of this and remained close to where they had moved perhaps twenty or thirty years previously. The tendency of agricultural labourers (the probable occupation of most of these individuals) to move within a ten or so mile limit has previously been noted.19

Of course, we do not know whether migrants had reached their current destination in one ‘move’ from Highley – or indeed if this was to be their final destination. A recognised feature of migration is that it often happens in stages, with the migrant getting progressively further away from the point of origin.20 This may well be an explanation for at least part of the picture described here, especially the relatively short distances so far travelled by the 15–19 age-group.

**Employment of migrants**

It might be expected that, in a rural depression, the majority of emigrants from Highley would have moved to towns to take up new, urban occupations. However, it is clear that this is far from being the whole picture; although 126 (49.6%) of the migrants were living in towns in 1881, the rest had moved to villages. In the light of this statistic it is not surprising that the biggest single male employment group remained the agricultural workers, both labourers and farmers. The employment patterns of male migrants are shown in Table 7, together

---

**Table 5 Longer Distance Migration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Distance Moved (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Potteries and North Staffordshire</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire and Flintshire</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire and Derbyshire</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire and Gloucestershire</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Wales and the West Country</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London and the South East</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6 Distance moved by age groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Distance Moved (± standard error)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24±7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20±6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18±4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11±5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24±5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19±4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5±0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–59</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19±5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–69</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14±2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11±5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with the mean distance moved and age of each group. The male employment distribution for Highley for 1871 is shown by way of comparison. The next largest group after those in agriculture was made up of those providing services – shopkeepers and tradesmen. Some of these were following distinctly rural occupations such as wheelwrighting or blacksmithing. Thus a substantial number of men continued either in agriculture or occupations related to agriculture. They had not flooded into industrial towns and industrial jobs. There was always a degree of mobility associated with agricultural work, as labourers moved to seek better or more convenient terms of employment. Thus, prior to 1850, there had been considerable movement of farm workers in and out of Highley. Even in times of agricultural depression, it appears that the local labour market remained fluid and dynamic.

Nevertheless, it does seem that a significantly lower proportion of the migrants continued in agriculture compared with those who were living in Highley. Within Highley about a quarter of men followed assorted employment in extractive industries, in service, on the railway, as professionals or were retired pensioners. Collectively, a similar percentage of migrants also come within these groups. However, 17% of the migrants were working in urban areas either as general labourers or in specialised occupations such as brewing or ironworking. Whilst some of the general labouring might be similar to unskilled work in Highley, clearly some had turned their hands to very different occupations. Inspection of Table 7 strongly suggests that those in this group would have supplemented the number of agricultural labourers had they remained in Highley. So although not a majority, a significant minority of men were turning their backs on the land.

Table 7 Occupations of Migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>% amongst migrants</th>
<th>% amongst Highley residents 1871</th>
<th>mean distance moved</th>
<th>mean age of migrant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural workers</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7.35±1.2</td>
<td>39.9±2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extractive industries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.8±0.2</td>
<td>32.7±4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.8±7.8</td>
<td>43.0±4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway worker</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.6±7.8</td>
<td>24.6±2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servants</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.3±3.3</td>
<td>34.8±5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/retired</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.8±20.1</td>
<td>53.1±7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/general labourer</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.9±3.8</td>
<td>38.8±3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are some striking differences in the mobilities of the different occupational groups. Those in the extractive industries are made up of two quarry men and one collier, all of whom migrated to neighbouring parishes. The very small sample size precludes much comment, although in Madeley, miners also typically only moved to adjacent parishes. The agricultural workers also largely remained close to Highley. The chief exceptions were a cluster who migrated to Gloucestershire, having arrived in the village from the same area about ten years earlier. They appear to have been associated with the movements of a particular tenant farmer. The pattern of movement of agriculture labourers is consistent with the Madeley study, which demonstrated that the agricultural labourers were the most mobile of all occupation groups examined, moving over intermediate distances; indeed this reflects the probable national pattern. Movements of the industrial/general labourers reflect the distances of the urban centres, largely ranging from Bridgnorth to the Black Country. The service workers and those employed on the railways show still greater mobility; the former would clearly find more openings in large urban centres. The professional classes moved the furthest. The different occupational groups mostly show similar average ages. The youth of the railway workers is notable, although given the small size of sample it would be unwise to read too much into this data.

Female occupations are far harder to recover. Only 36 women are shown as being in employment, out of a sample of 132. Not surprisingly these are almost all either unmarried or widows. It is impossible to know what economic activity was being undertaken by most of the married women. Out of the 36 women with recorded occupations, 31 were in some form of service; mostly they were young women, working prior to marriage. By this date, the ‘servant problem’ was exercising the middle classes, and numbers of female domestic servants were beginning their slow decline. It is argued that, on the one hand, domestic service was becoming unpopular and less likely to be undertaken by young (especially urban) women who had an alternative; on the other hand, rural girls were increasingly seen by employers as more reliable and desirable as servants. Thus girls from villages such as Highley were making up an increasing proportion of servants in towns and cities. However, 13 of these 31 women were working elsewhere in Shropshire, in settings usually as rural as their home village.
Another seven were relatively nearby in north Worcestershire (Bewdley, Wolverley and Kidderminster). Only 11 could be said to have gone any considerable distance to take up posts: two in or near Birmingham, three in Lancashire, three in Sussex, two in Staffordshire and one in Surrey. In three cases, pairs of sisters had gone to the same household, although we cannot say whether they had gone at the same time. Women tended to move over shorter distances than did men – a feature noted in Ravenstein’s contemporary studies. While male migrants had moved an average of 14.3 miles, the figure for women was a mere 5.4 miles.

It is possible to analyse the occupations of migrants in terms of socio-economic group, although this is not always an easy exercise. In Highley we can divide households into four groups: Group 1, large farmers and the ‘gentry’; Group 2, small farmers and tradesmen; Group 3, manual and agricultural labourers; Group 4, requiring parish relief or destitute. Local knowledge makes it easy to separate small from large farmers or make similar distinctions. It is much harder to do this for migrants. Nonetheless, the figures in Table 8 are probably a fair guide; they compare the socio-economic grouping of the male migrant population with that of the village as a whole in 1881.

Table 8 Migration by Socio-economic Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>All migrants</th>
<th>Long-distance migrants</th>
<th>Highley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures reveal that the migrants were broadly similar to the village population in social structure. Migration was not particularly effective in increasing social mobility. However, it is probable that the migrants working in towns or in villages close to the Black Country were better paid than their counterparts in Highley. Thus there probably was an overall economic gain from migration. The major subgroup of migrants who stand out were those who moved the longest distances. If the 24 men who moved 20 or more miles away from Highley are considered, 60% of these were in the top two groups. These men almost all lived in urban areas and included tradesmen, shopkeepers, and two engineers; only one was a farmer. The professional classes were the furthest travelled of all migrants. This is an interesting finding as typically the upper classes are considered to show less mobility than the working classes26. The Highley group represents the predominantly urban middle class; a social category for which there was very little opportunity in Highley or the surroundings. These individuals could not have practised their professions without moving some considerable distance. Within the group of all long-distance migrants there is some evidence for greater social mobility. They almost all left Highley as children; of the 17 who can be traced, only 7 (42%) belonged to families within the top two social groupings.

Emigrants versus migrants

Whilst there was overall net migration from Highley, as noted earlier, the population was dynamic, with significant immigration also taking place. Whilst the characteristics of the incoming population have been examined previously27, it is instructive to make some comparisons between the two groups. Considering distances travelled, 44.2% of emigrants had moved more than 10 miles. Using the 1871 census as a base, 49.1% of migrants had moved more than 10 miles to come into Highley.28 Thus there is a rough parity between the distances travelled by the two groups. Furthermore, just as the emigrants from the earlier decades (i.e. before mid-century) appeared to have moved the shortest distances, so did the migrants from the same periods. Thus both groups were subject to the same constraints and opportunities regarding mobility. By contrast, there are differences between the socio-economic statuses of the groups. Well over half the emigrants were from class 3; most migrants in 1871 (and earlier years) belonged to classes 1 and 2.29 This reflects the fact that there was a steady turnover of the middle classes in Highley, farmers and the like, but their overall numbers remained static. By contrast, as opportunities for labourers decreased, their numbers declined disproportionately.
Conclusions; emigration from Highley in a national and local context

Studies of migration in Victorian England have tended to concentrate on the rural-to-urban drift which fuelled the growth of towns and cities. However, the practice of studying birthplaces of those living in newly-industrialised areas has drawn attention away from the extent to which migration from rural areas was to other rural areas. Here we see that just over half of all emigrants had gone from rural to rural situations and that the pre-industrial practice of moving frequently over short distances (the ‘classic’ ten miles) still prevailed in many instances. In the case of Highley, it is not accurate to consider emigration simply as a ‘flight from the land’.

Clark and Souden have pointed out that several of Ravenstein’s ‘laws of migration’ have held up under subsequent scrutiny, but that the motives for, and thus nature of, migration are often too complex to permit the application of anything so rigid as a ‘law’. This study demonstrates that this is indeed the case: some ‘laws’ have been found to apply, such as that which states that women move less far than do men. In other instances, however, we need to modify the standard assumptions in the light of a new-found ability to investigate out-migration in this way. The variables of age, gender and class/occupation show interesting correlations with different migration patterns. They suggest, among other things, that migration-distance had increased as the nineteenth century progressed; that the truism that women were more mobile than men on account of domestic service and normative residence patterns of couples had ceased to have the same purchase that it had earlier had, and that it was no longer just the better-off who moved longer distances (although there was a tendency for them to have gone further, though whether as consequence or cause of their higher status it is impossible to say). There may have been some economic advancement from migration, but the migrants from Highley, as elsewhere, seem often to have been those whose prospects were better either at home or after leaving.

Within a specifically Shropshire context, over half the migrants (52.7%) from Highley were living outside the county in 1881. As a village on the borders of the county, this might not be considered surprising. However, when short-distant (<10 miles) migrants are excluded, still almost 40% (39.1) of the migrants had left Shropshire. There is little or no comparative data for other parishes in the county. It would be interesting to see if the patterns observed in Highley are found in villages in the central part of the county. How far did the pull of the Black Country extend? In Mainstone in south-west Shropshire, for instance, it was concluded on the basis of indirect evidence that most migration was over short distances. Using the methodology of this study, it should be possible to check and amplify the conclusion for that and other parishes, and provide valuable insights into some of the subtleties and complexities of rural emigration.
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HUSH!, HUSH! NO LONGER

By DAVID PANNEET

Some years ago the late Professor Barrie Jones of Manchester identified features near Norbury as examples of Roman ‘hushing’, a method of revealing mineral veins by sluicing water down a series of channels. The way in which Roman writers described this method was discussed by Roger White (The Gale of Life, South-West Shropshire Historical and Archaeological Society, 2000), but he could not, however, offer any evidence that the Norbury ‘channels’ were the result of ‘hushing’. By then aerial photographs of the features had already appeared under a ‘Roman’ heading in other publications, adopting Barrie Jones’ interpretation without question. (Michael Watson and Chris Musson: Shropshire from the Air; an English County at Work, Shropshire Books, 1996, and also Roger White and Phillip Barker, Wroxeter, Tempus 1998) and these no doubt prompted Roger’s essay for SWSHAS.

From the start of all this, many others were unhappy with the ‘Roman’ label and we must now speak up before further publications perpetuate the myth. Apart from being in an area beyond the recognised distribution of lead veins, the aerial photographs clearly show the ‘ridge and furrow’ of a medieval field system, not unlike those correctly illustrated in both volumes of aerial photographs. (Watson and Musson; ibid 1996 and Shropshire from the Air; Man and the Landscape, Shropshire Books, 1993). Readers can therefore judge for themselves and take a closer look in light of the following observations.

In the Middle Ages most villages and even small hamlets had at least a nucleus of ‘open fields’ of typical ‘Midland’ type. Holdings consisted of intermingled strips scattered around two or three or four large fields, which formed the basis of the arable crop rotation. In detail, strips occupied one or more ridges, which were grouped in ‘furlongs’ or ‘flats’, all laid out for the convenience of ploughing and land drainage. Ridges were usually from six to eight yards in width, about 200 yards long (‘furrowlong’ or ‘furlong’), gently curved like a reversed ‘S’ and ended in clear headlands. Many of these had become raised with soil constantly brushed from the turning plough and team, and some at the downslope end would be cut through to ease drainage, giving a knobbly end to each ridge. If slope directions demanded, a few ridges would also taper to a point (‘gores’, ‘pikes’ etc.) Furrows (‘reans’) and headlands were normally grass, together with odd wet areas and watercourses (‘slades’ and ‘sykes’). All these provided extra hay during cropped years and common grazing after harvest and in the fallow year, when summer ploughing took place, so that strict rules were necessary to protect the grassland and these helped to control the whole field management. In the western counties, however, such as Shropshire, where alternative pasture could be found on commons and assarts, these rules could be more relaxed and thus allow the gradual breakdown of the system. Piecemeal enclosure of the fields occurred long before the well known ‘Parliamentary Enclosure’ movement of the 18th century.

Within the new closes, ploughing would continue on the best arable soils, but, as under-draining and harvesting machinery developed, old ridges would be gradually ploughed flat, leaving any survivors as rare features in the modern landscape. Hedges planted during the process of piecemeal enclosure often followed the old ‘furlong’ patterns and may provide the only clues to their former existence (e.g. Wentnor).

What is known about the history of Norbury in general (Joyce Pinnock, ‘A Place in the Sun’) and what can be seen in the surviving ridges in particular conform to this normal picture. As can be seen on the published aerial photographs (see The Upper Onny Project Group, The Upper Onny Valley, n.d., 55.) and on the ground, they occupy a stony hillside where several watercourses and actual rock outcrops break up an otherwise regular pattern. (The outcrops of these Pre-Cambrian, Longmyndian sediments happen to give a ‘grain’ in the same direction.) These would have been accommodated as extra, intermixed grassland in an ‘open field’ system but would have been a nuisance to an enclosed system requiring ‘all arable’ or ‘all grass’ at any one time within each close. For this reason further regular ploughing would have been discouraged, so that old ridges survived here while they might have almost disappeared from elsewhere in the parish.
A related aspect of this ‘Roman’ story has been the idea that a ‘villa’ at Linley was part of an industrial complex. In view of the association with woodland shown by the place name, perhaps remote ‘hunting lodge’ might be more likely. If Roman mining had taken place in this region, geology demands that it must have been on exposed veins at White Grit, Gravels or Snailbeach leaving Linley as a quiet retreat.

As they would say in court, the evidence is before you and I rest my case.
A RECENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY AT CHARLECOTTE AND TITTERSTONE CLEE, SHROPSHIRE

By ROGER WHITE

Shropshire is a county rich in the monuments and landscapes of the recent industrial past, parts of which have been judged to be of world heritage importance. Others, such as Snailbeach, have been the focus of community interest and research, and have received funding to improve their environment and present their past (Francis et al. 2000). Yet there is still much that is under-researched or neglected totally in academic terms, and some buildings and monuments still feature on the English Heritage Buildings at Risk Register as a consequence (English Heritage 2004). This situation is to be lamented but is in part the outcome of the current climate of client-driven archaeology. Unless sites are under threat, then it is very difficult to access funds to work on them, and archaeological work can be an expensive business to carry out properly. There is, perhaps, also the perception, in the academic community at least, that this particular heritage is not worthy of interest and that resources are best spent elsewhere. Among the wider public, interest in the more recent industrial past is strong (English Heritage 2000) but few realise the active nature of the threat to such sites.

The two sites discussed here have been, and continue to be, the focus of research carried out by the Ironbridge Institute. At Charlecotte, two seasons of survey have been carried out and archive reports have been submitted to the Shropshire Historic Environment Record outlining our results (West and Strachan 2003; Driver & Pearson 2004). It is expected that the final publication will be in the journal for Post Medieval Archaeology as the results are of national as well as regional interest. The second site, the landscape of the Clee Hills, is the subject of an application for funding under the Aggregates Industry Levy (Web site 1) whose outcome is as yet unclear but student work has been carried out on this site too within the last few months of 2004. (It is telling here that this bid does not encompass the Brown Clee landscape since this is not under threat from the aggregates industry, however intellectually desirable it might be to study it in conjunction with its neighbouring hill.) Both projects are the outcome of work carried out by postgraduate students in part-fulfilment of degrees in Industrial Archaeology and Practical Archaeology under the aegis of the Ironbridge Institute or the wider Institute of Archaeology and Antiquity. The aim of such projects is to get students to work together to produce professionally researched and academically credible pieces of collaborative writing that can be used as part of students’ CVs (White 2004). The advantage of such projects, of course, is that one is not tied to finance. The income to carry out the survey ultimately comes from the students themselves, and one can gear the work towards sites that would not easily attract funding.

The aim of this brief article is not to present the full results of these projects since one has only just commenced and the other is being prepared for publication elsewhere. It does draw on the existing texts to present the results, but the intention is ultimately to highlight the possibilities of such research on what are important but neglected sites. The use of students in this way allows a much greater focus on the site than would normally be possible in the commercial environment as one can afford to spend more time in the field and in research than is normally feasible. As a result, one can progress the research agenda much further than is normally the case. An additional, but desirable, outcome is that the students receive high-quality training on an interesting and stimulating site.

Charlecotte Furnace.

Charlecotte furnace (SO 638861) lies in the parish of Aston Botterell in Shropshire, 10 km south-west of Bridgnorth and 18 km northeast of Ludlow. Its rural location is typical of a charcoal-fired blast furnace of the early eighteenth century, being dictated predominantly by the proximity of raw materials: low-phosphorous iron
ore from the Clee Hills, charcoal from the wooded countryside around, and a reliable source of waterpower for the waterwheel to drive the bellows. The site is bounded on its southwest side by the Cleobury Brook, a tributary of the River Rea, which once powered many mills and some forges along its route (Booth 1996). Other furnaces and forges in the area were some miles distant from Charlcotte, which avoided undue competition for charcoal supplies.

The history of the furnace was explored by Norman Mutton when compiling his article on the site in the 1960s (Mutton 1967) but the promised report on the excavations (or rather clearance) he undertook there never materialised. Mutton refers to the obscure seventeenth century history of the site but he was only able to demonstrate the furnace’s existence from 1712, which is the record of the (existing) furnace’s sale to Sir Richard Knight, with the first recorded production dating from 1717 (ibid.). Research in the Shropshire Archives confirms a reference to two ‘corn mills’ on the site in 1620 (SRRC 1298/1; Website 2) purchased by James Grove. These same mills are referred to again in 1674 when Richard Cresswell took on ‘two water corn mills’ after they had been briefly leased to Philip Foley, the ironmaster of Prestwood (ibid.). In 1678, it was bought by Dame Mary Yate and Thomas Audley and it may be at this time that the conversion was made since it was sold by Mary Yates’ daughter as a blast furnace in 1712.

On the strength of the attention generated by Mutton’s excavations and the generally good preservation of the monument, the site was designated a Scheduled Ancient Monument (Salop 33) in 1970. At that time, the only scheduled part of the monument was the masonry of the furnace itself but recently the schedule has been extended to the rest of the paddock within which the furnace is located, as a result of the Monuments Protection Programme (MPP) scheduling review. Given the fragile state of the monument, the academic aim of the student work was to

• Record the earthworks around the furnace
• Record and assess the condition of the furnace
• Determine the water supply for the furnace.

Results of surveys

An EDM and off-set baseline survey were carried out on the monument and the immediate surrounding earthworks with a view to establishing what function these might have had and to assess their condition. The results (Fig. 1) demonstrate that the area between the Cleobury Brook and the casting arch of the furnace is filled with extensive dumps of ash and cinders from the casting process, dumped in linear fashion to form arcs and banks but still leaving space for further movement immediately in front of the furnace. These dumps have been extensively reworked and modified to provide materials for track metalling. To the west of the furnace, there are linear banks lying parallel to the stream whose function is unclear while above these is the well preserved triangular corner of the (formerly square) furnace pool. A shallow leat, only visible in oblique light, leads from the corner of this pool towards the northwest corner of the furnace (visible on Watson and Musson 1996, 45). The area to the north of the furnace is level and consists of the charging ramp and the earthwork outline of a small brick-built building shown on the 1884 Ordnance Survey plan. The function of this building is unknown. Earthworks to the northeast and east of the furnace may represent storage areas for the raw materials but this area has been much modified by modern agricultural buildings. The furnace building was found to be in a generally stable condition but with serious cracking that prevented any contact with the monument. It is proposed that the furnace will be surveyed using a laser-scan facility since this will not require touching the monument.

The initial survey of the earthworks demonstrated that extensive earthworks did survive on the site and these have now been recorded (Fig. 1). However, their function is less clear and further work is required, especially in respect of geophysical survey and excavation, to understand these more fully. One obvious problem that was identified was that an extant, and prominent, leat in the fields to the west of the monument appeared to be running along a level too low to have filled the furnace pool. It appeared instead to serve the other mill site, known to be a paper mill and now converted into a house. The extant leat, which had been noted by other authors (Trinder 1996, 14), thus appeared to relate to the second mill on the site, but it had always been assumed that the two mills shared the water supply since the lease specifies that the furnace had priority over the water supply when in blast (Mutton 1967).

In the following year, therefore, students investigated the source of the water supply for the furnace pool. Digital theodolite survey using EDM and GPS systems demonstrated unequivocally that the level of the extant leat to the west of the furnace is too low to supply the furnace pool. The feature was surveyed nonetheless, along with the extant remains of the platforms for the original corn and subsequent paper mill and the
Figure 1: Plan of earthworks around Charlecote Furnace (in centre of image). (From West and Strachan 2003, fig. 19).
earthworks of the settling tanks for the paper-making process. These monuments in themselves constitute a site worthy of further record (Driver and Pearson 2004). This still left the site of the original leat unlocated but it was noted that the modern farm track that leads to the current house continued beyond it as a slight bank lined with mature ash and oak trees (Fig. 2). The next field to the west contained no obvious trace of a path or leat but was called Flem Leasow on the tithe map and at its southwest corner, where it coincided with Cleobury Brook, inspection of the stream bed found the location of a dam which had been subsequently washed away (Fig. 3). This take-off point lies opposite the field called Weir Leasow on the tithe map. Both names are strong evidence for the existence of the leat and its dam here (Foxall 1980).

In conclusion, the analysis of the survey data makes it clear that the lower extant leat cannot have been the source of the water in the furnace pool since there is a clear one-metre difference in levels. The Paper Mill take-off leat is at height 166.826m, whereas the furnace pond is at 168.195m. The likely solution to the source of the furnace leat lies upstream, adjacent to Weir Leasow and Flem Leasow, starting at about 175m and dropping about 1.68 metres over a length of about 600 metres to meet the site of the north-west corner of the furnace pool. Discussions with both David Crossley and Tim Booth (pers. comm.) advised that this is just enough fall to drive a water wheel and bellows. What is more unusual is that the mills did not share a leat, but presumably the
The Clee Hills

Work on the Clee Hills is less advanced than that on Charlottc and so a shorter report is called for, since the practical work has yet to start. The aim here is merely to emphasise that the landscape of the Clees, and especially that of Titterstone Clee, presents excellent opportunities for research and for presentation to the public.

The Clee Hills have been characterised as a landscape of ‘social geology’, defined as ‘an archaeological and cultural landscape dominated by the nature of its mineral resources’ (SGS 2003, 24). There are few places in Shropshire, or for that matter in the West Midlands region, where one can so clearly see the complex and intimate relationship between people and their environment. It is still a living and evolving environment since the landscape includes an active quarry extracting the Clee Hill’s most famous product, the Dhustone (black stone). As such, the landscape may be categorised as typical of the sort of complex industrial uplands that are characteristic of England and Wales (Browne and Hughes 2003, 41–60) and, as with those landscapes, there is the significant addition of well preserved but little understood prehistoric monuments intermingled with the later activity. In the case of the Clee Hills, the prehistoric monuments consist of scheduled barrows of various forms, a very large univallate hillfort, the remains of later medieval to nineteenth century coal workings and mines, some of which are also scheduled, and the extensive remains of stone quarrying.

It is on this latter industry that the interest of the Ironbridge Institute has been focussed. It is certainly the industry that has the greatest visual impact on this particular landscape with quarries on both Clee Hill and on Titterstone. The stone, a Dolerite known locally as the Dhustone, was used for setts, as an aggregate for roadstone and concrete manufacture and occasionally as a building stone (as in the Cardiff Docks). The principal elements of the industry surviving today are the huge quarries, their associated tramroads, the quarry buildings, and incline planes (Stanier 2000, 143–9). The stone was worked in benches 15m thick after being broken up by blasting with powder or, more normally, fire-setting using the local coal as the fuel. This allowed

Figure 4: Titterstone Clee: Extent of western quarry study area. The inset in the bottom left of the area is an extract from the 1983 RCHM(E) detailed 1:1000 hachure survey of early bell pits. They can be seen clearly to be overlain by the later quarry spoil. The incline can be seen on the left. Source: Glynn Barratt.
the columnar plans in the rock to open into cracks causing the face to collapse. The stone was then loaded into wagons by hand and moved along light rails to the quarry buildings. Here, the stone was crushed and stored in hoppers that stood on supports to allow railway wagons to pass beneath which could then be sent down an incline (on the Clee and Titterstone Clee quarries) to Bitterley junction, or on the east side of Titterstone, by aerial ropeway to Detton (Fig. 4; Jenkins 1983). The industry began in the 1860s, utilising the opportunity of the arrival of the railway in Ludlow which provided a ready market for aggregates. The Clee Hill Quarry opened first, followed by the Titterstone Quarry in the 1880s. Working the stone was not a native industry so stone cutters were imported from Mountsorrell in Leicestershire, who brought with them their own distinctive culture into Shropshire. Quarrying continued until the 1950s when the industry was relocated to its current position on the southeast side of the hill, adjacent to the road which is now the only means for transporting the stone (Hewitt 1999).

The quarry buildings on the three disused sites consist largely of early ferro-concrete structures; thin walled buildings of often poor design and construction, but of importance due to both their early date (1912) and their being representatives of a wider industry in Shropshire, the provision for pre-fabricated concrete buildings. These buildings are not scheduled, or for that matter recorded, and yet they are under significant threat since they are poorly constructed and are vulnerable in the medium and long term to collapse (Fig. 5). Their existence is also jeopardised by the possibility that current unrestrained public access to them could lead to risk of public injury. In such circumstances, it is not inconceivable that demolition of the buildings to remove the threat would be considered a viable, and relatively cheap, option. Such buildings would normally be excluded from the provisions of PPG16 as they are not scheduled or listed.

The aim of the project on the Clee Hills, for which an application has been made to the Aggregates Industry Levy, is to carry out a fully integrated digital survey of the landscape that will provide a basis both for recording and interpreting the remains on the hill which can then be presented to the public. This work will be carried out with the community since there is clear evidence for local interest and identification with the industry (Jenkins 1983). It will also provide training opportunities both for the postgraduate students and, hopefully, for the wider public too. In doing so, it will demonstrate the great potential that Shropshire's archaeology, industrial or otherwise, has for fostering local identity.
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THE ABDON CLEE STONE COMPANY

By DAVID POYNER

The Brown Clee Hill in Shropshire is well known for the prehistoric hill forts on the summits of Abdon Burf and Clee Burf and the west ridge at Nordy Bank. There have been some attempts to document the coal and ironstone mines that dominated the summits from the 17th to the 19th Centuries. However, far less has been written about the industry that more than anything else has literally shaped Abdon Burf; the Dhu-stone quarries of the Abdon Clee Stone Company. These worked for thirty or so years from 1908 but the company has left virtually no written records. It is ironic that the only contemporary plan that gives any indication of the progress of the quarry workings was a 1928 paper, ‘The riddle of Abdon Burf’, which lamented the final destruction of the hill fort by the quarry. Today, the title could equally well be applied to the quarry company.

The history of the quarry has been dealt with in passing in an account of the Cleobury Mortimer and Ditton Priors Light Railway; the presence of Dhu-stone on the summit of the Brown Clee was one of the main factors driving the construction of this railway. This source contains an invaluable chapter on the quarry, drawing almost entirely on oral history. The only detailed contemporary account of the enterprise is an article in the Quarry Magazine in 1910, which describes the early lay-out of the plant. There are a few additional photographs but the quarry fell between the OS mappings of 1902–4 and 1954 and so is not shown in an active form on any map. Thus its history must be reconstructed from these few sources, together with the surviving remains on the ground. Fortunately there has been little attempt at demolition or infilling and so these survive, albeit in increasingly ruinous and overgrown states. It is possible to trace the main phases of workings and make some deductions about the nature of the company.

The hill has clearly been sculpted into a series of terraces, demonstrating that the Dhu-stone was worked in benches, each with a lift of about 20′. The 1928 article shows that the rampart of the hill fort that stood on the summit of the hill was the last surviving part. Given that the quarry was by now twenty years old, this implies that the first workings were close to the crusher house, at about 1600′ and that these progressively moved uphill towards the summit. Quarrying is, by its nature, destructive of evidence, but whilst the first benches will have been entirely removed, shallow spoil tips survive on the fringes of the quarry, largely overlain by larger tips. These are probably from the earliest working and suggest that two faces were worked, one on the south flank of the hill and the other on the south-east side at a higher elevation. These were progressively driven towards the summit. It is possible to identify evidence for at least seven distinct quarry floors. Oral evidence shows that following the removal of the Dhu-stone from the summit of the hill, the workings moved to a level below the crusher complex, the ‘crane hole’, where the stone had to be hauled out before it could be processed. As this is now flooded, it is likely that pumping would have been needed to keep this floor dry when it was in work. However, the general impression is of a well-ordered concern with workings laid out systematically to maximise extraction.

The 1910 article records that the quarry was originally equipped with three jaw crushers and a pair of rolls, powered by a Crossley 150 hp gas engine. It is possible to reconstruct drive arrangements from the engine to the crushing machinery and the screens. From this it seems that two of the jaw crushers were used to produce large to medium sized stone (roughly 2½” to 1½”) whilst the third crusher fed the rolls to produce ½” to 1½” stone. Oral evidence suggests that sett production was also significant. Following the First World War, there were considerable changes in roadstone construction, due to the use of tar or bitumen as a binder. The market for stone setts collapsed and instead there was a much greater demand for small stone which could be mixed with bitumen or tar. There is clear oral and physical evidence to show how the Abdon Clee Stone Company adapted to this. The arrangement in the crusher house was revised as one of the crushers was altered to feed a granulator for production of chippings. A stone washer was introduced to improve the quality of the chippings; the
physical evidence suggests that this was a cylindrical rotary washer with a vibrating drier. There appear to be the remains of two asphalt making plants where bitumen was mixed with roadstone; this operation was eventually moved down the hill to the railway terminus in Ditton Priors. There are also the remains of a small concrete-making plant on top of the hill, although as early as 1917 the main plant was at Ditton.\(^6\)

Next to nothing is known about the profitability of the Abdon Stone Quarry company; indeed one local historian has reported the opinion that it was ‘a disaster’.\(^7\) This may or may not be true; however the physical evidence demonstrates that the company met the changes in the market for roadstone in the 1920s in a dynamic and innovative way and invested in new plant and technologies. Examination of the physical remains cannot reveal whether this ever produced a profit; it does show that the company was aware of the challenges it faced and that it was prepared to spend money to meet them.

5 Smith and Beddoes, 75–81.
6 Ibid.
7 J. V. Hinton, _The ABC of Three Villages_, n.d. but c. 1990, 93.
THE SHROPSHIRE BARYTES INDUSTRY

By MICHAEL SHAW

At times in its history Shropshire has been a significant player in the mining of coal, iron, lead and barytes. The first three of these get due recognition but barytes does not. During the period of useful records (1845–1938) the county produced 589,000 tons or 30% of UK production, more than any other county or the whole of Scotland. Comparable figures are not available from 1939 but Shropshire production held up well until the late 1940s when coherent production finished. Huglith Mine, which produced nearly 300,000 tons between 1910 and 1945, was, in its day, one of the nation’s biggest producers.1

The name of the substance presents problems; barite is now the correct form but throughout the county’s activity it would have been barytes, hence its use here. It is chemically barium sulphate, often known as heavy spar, distinguishing it from the similar but lighter calcite. Ideally it would have been white but it was often stained by iron, copper or mineral pitch, the latter rendering it useless. The other colours could be bleached out.

Barytes occurs in the west of the county and, with an exception in the Breidden Hills, is limited to about a five mile radius of Shelve. Some mines crossed into Wales and some companies ran small mines just over the border. The mineral occurs, for different geological reasons, to the east and west of a fault which runs from Pontesford to Linley; to the west in flags etc. of Ordovician age with lead and zinc ores, and to the east in Longmyndian rocks of Precambrian age with copper ore.

The material was distinguished from limestone in the late 18th century and barium was recognised as an element in 1808. Early uses were in medicine, ceramics, bleaches and paint. It was subsequently used in the chemical industry, importantly in the Brin’s process for the production of oxygen and for numerous compounds. It was also used as an inert filler in paper, rubber, leather, floor coverings etc. Inert filler uses grew in the 20th century to become the main ones. It was used in quantity in coal washing plants and is now principally used as a drilling mud for oil wells. High quality barium sulphate is used for barium meals. Its density makes it a good nuclear shield and this provided the last major use for the Shropshire product when a quantity was dug from Snailbeach for use following an incident at the Windscale Nuclear Power Station in 1957.

The first noted extraction in the county was by the London Lead Company in 1729 who sent some up to London from their Nether Heath mine near Pennerley.2 What it was for is not recorded but later in the century a then secret but now high profile use was found; 59% of Josiah Wedgwood’s Jasper Ware consisted of barytes.

The end of the century provided the next reference when a local geologist visited John Lawrence’s Wotherton mine and noted that by then it produced only heavy spar.3 History (as yet discovered) goes quiet until the late 1820s with a lease at Wotherton.4 A few years later a lease in the Breidden Hills including ‘barites’ was granted and there is a reference to Abbey Mill, Shrewsbury, grinding the product.5 Major extraction probably did not start until the 1850s and gradually expanded until it overtook lead and zinc in importance at most mines by the 1890s. Snailbeach was the last significant exception until the cessation of pumping in 1911 when barytes became the principal substance mined. Production peaked in 1924, dipped in 1926 and recovered again to a slightly lower peak in 1935.6 Wartime figures are not available but the total production from Huglith mine of almost 300,000 tons provides evidence of a substantial contribution to the war effort. Huglith was worked out by late 1945. Its designed successors, Gatten and The Sallies, could not provide sufficient output and closed in 1948 bringing to an end coherent production. Barytes was recovered from the tips at Snailbeach into the 1960s. The subsequent history has been of prospecting, the most recent being at Cothercott in the early 1990s; the product was adequate but the economics were not. Huglith was by far the biggest mine but forty or so others made recordable contributions, 14 being of some substance, the rest small mines or large trials.

The county had several mills ranging from corn mills like Abbey Mill which could grind barytes to converted factories like the four storey Hanwood Mill, a one-time cotton mill, to the state of the art Malehurst Mill of
1925. Transport of a substantial quantity of a bulky product created problems over the years. Initial horse power to river, canal or mill was limiting. Steam road locomotives improved matters, but at a cost to road conditions. The arrival of the petrol lorry (later with pneumatic tyres) after the First World War, along with adequate road surfaces, saw great improvements. A further, successful introduction was the aerial ropeway. Two lines were built, one in about 1916 from Bog Mine to sidings at Malehurst and the other in about 1925 from Huglith mine to the then new Malehurst Mill. This latter line worked until 1948, latterly taking the production from Gatten and The Sallies which went by lorry to the ropeway terminus at Huglith. Rail transport was used above ground by two mines, Snailbeach with its eponymous railway to Pontesbury Junction, and Cothercott which had a tramway from its mines to the mill and road loading point, and which began construction of a tramway for the four miles to the main line at Dorrington, though the line petered out after little over half a mile.7

Much of Shropshire production went to the Cheshire Merseyside area either ground for paint or filler use or as a gravel for use in the chemical industry.

The best remains of mines which produced barytes are at those mines’ lead mining days at places like Snailbeach and Tankerville. Huglith mine has left quite a lot of unexciting remains in thick woodland. At Cothercott a retaining wall of the mill survives, the tramways are locatable in places and stopes which have been opened up to ground level remain. Almost all the mines are still locatable but most have left little mark. Malehurst Mill survives in reuse and foundations of ropeway pylons survive.

All in all this is an industry which deserves to be remembered alongside lead mining rather than as a footnote to it.

2 London Lead Company, Minutes of the Court of Assistants, 17 June 1729.
3 R. Townson, Tracts and Observations on Natural History and Phisiology, 1799, 158-204.
4 Shropshire Archives (SA), 552/18/8/4/48-62.
5 SA261/1 and SA D3651/B/13/4/3.
6 Mines Department, Annual Returns.
A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO THE SHROPSHIRE CLAY TOBACCO PIPE INDUSTRY

By DAVID A. HIGGINS

Introduction.

The smoking of tobacco was taken up in England during the second half of the sixteenth century and spread rapidly to all levels of society during the early seventeenth century. The demand for tobacco was largely met by the New World colonies, for whom the income provided by this annual cash crop was crucial. In addition, tobacco was also grown in this country during the seventeenth century. The western part of England, including Shropshire, was particularly associated with the cultivation of this new crop.

The rapid adoption of smoking generated a demand for pipes, a demand that had not hitherto existed. The earliest pipes appear to have been produced in the west-country ports, where tobacco was landed, and in London. As the habit spread to the provinces, pipemakers moved and set up workshops to exploit the rapidly expanding market. The earliest provincial makers brought London styles with them and these are the styles that characterise early seventeenth-century production all over the country. As local makers became established they developed distinctive regional styles and it is these regional variations that provide much of the interest in studying pipes.

In general pipemakers were quite thinly spread across the countryside since they marketed their wares locally by packhorse or at regional markets. The pipemakers usually operated from small rural workshops or from the poorer quarters of the towns. In some instances more substantial numbers of pipemakers were able to operate in a favourable location. Good examples are the busy ports of London or Bristol where the export trade provided a market for the pipemakers’ products. One of the few notable exceptions to this pattern is the Much Wenlock/Broseley area of Shropshire where large numbers of pipemakers are found without an immediately obvious market for their products. The author carried out a five-year study of pipemaking in this area for his doctoral thesis (Higgins 1987) and it is from this study that most of the details contained in this article have been drawn. This paper will provide, first, a brief introduction as to why the Much Wenlock/Broseley area became such an important pipe production centre. It will go on to provide an overview of the style and nature of the pipes that were made there before finally considering how these pipes influenced other areas of the county.

The Much Wenlock/Broseley Area.

The parishes of Broseley and Benthall are situated on the southern side of the Ironbridge Gorge in Shropshire, about 4 miles ENE of the market town of Much Wenlock. At this point the River Severn cuts a deep section through part of the Coalbrookdale Coalfield. As a result, various bands of white firing pipeclays, fire clays and coal are exposed in the sides of the Gorge. These bands had been well known and exploited since at least the medieval period and, in the early seventeenth century, must have proved attractive to any pipemakers trying to establish this new industry in the county. The coalfield deposits provided not only the raw material from which to make pipes but also good fireclays from which to build kiln structures and the coal with which to fire them.

A less obvious attribute of the area to modern eyes is the river itself. In the days before the easy transport networks afforded by canals, railways and improved roads it was difficult and expensive to haul goods long distances over land. Water transport was much more economical and so rivers and coastal navigation played an important part in trade. The River Severn was navigable by flat-bottomed trows as far upstream as Welshpool.
A Brief Introduction to the Shropshire Clay Tobacco Pipe Industry
and provided an inland navigation, the importance of which it is hard to imagine today. The river was extensively used to transport the coal, iron, bricks, tiles, pottery and other products that were manufactured in the Ironbridge Gorge area. This meant that the pipemakers could work in a location which not only provided all their raw materials but also a cheap and easily accessible transport system providing links with the whole of the western side of England, as well as to the Severn Estuary and South Wales.

A final important attribute of the area was the ‘open’ nature of the settlements and the demand for labour. Newcomers could readily come to the Broseley district and erect squatting housing on waste ground. The numerous industries of the coalfield district provided plenty of labouring work as well as a supply of cheap raw materials. The economic basis of the area was firmly rooted in manufacturing rather than agriculture. These conditions must have attracted many families who then became engaged in pipe production either as a sideline or as their primary occupation.

The evolution of bowl forms.

It is not known exactly when the first pipemakers came to the Much Wenlock/Broseley area although the artefactual evidence suggests that it was quite early in the seventeenth century. Finds excavated from The Wharfage in Ironbridge include small pipes made of variously coloured local clays, which range from dark brown to pale yellow in colour (Higgins 1985a). These are marked with four different varieties of mark, all of which contain the maker’s initials PF. These initials represent an as yet unidentified local maker who must have been working close by, probably in what is now Ironbridge itself (Figs. 1–5). The PF maker soon seems to have identified the best seams from which to obtain clay and his later products are made of the typical white firing local clays. The earliest PF pipes date from around 1625–30 and are of typical London styles. By 1640 the first documentary reference to a pipemaker occurs, a George Deakin who was working at Lawley Cross, near Much Wenlock. If this is the same George Deacon, ‘an old man’, who was buried at Much Wenlock in 1646, then he may already have been established in the area well before his first documented date. As the century progressed the number of makers grew rapidly until, by the second half of the century, both the town of Much Wenlock itself as well as the developing industrial areas of Broseley and Benthall had extensive and well established pipemaking workshops.

As the number of pipemakers increased they became less dependent on the London styles that had originally been copied and they started to develop their own local styles. The bowl forms became quite long and slender with the milling being placed unusually low around the rim (Fig. 6). The pipes were always heel types, spur types being unknown in the area until the late seventeenth century. The heels were round and, during the seventeenth century, they tended to increase in size (Fig. 7). During the last two or three decades of the seventeenth century a series of profound changes took place in the form of Much Wenlock/Broseley area pipes. First, the large round heel that had developed was extended back along the underside of the stem to give it a long tail (Fig. 8). This tailed form went on to become the hallmark of the local industry for the next half century. At the same time, spur types were introduced (Fig. 9). These had a similar bowl form to the pipes with tailed heels, and were produced alongside them until well into the eighteenth century.

Around 1730 the tailed heel form died out leaving the spur form to develop for the remainder of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The bowls of these spur pipes became taller and thinner, some being produced with egg-shell like walls (Fig. 10). During this period pipemaking in Much Wenlock itself went into decline and the focus of production moved to Broseley and Benthall. This may have been partly due to the rapidly developing industrial nature of the Ironbridge area and partly due to a shift to the use of finer, imported clays. During the seventeenth century the local coalmeasure clays had been exclusively used but these were rather gritty in texture and fired to a slightly off-white colour. In the early eighteenth century finer clays from the South West began to be imported, perhaps initially for use by the stoneware potters at Jackfield, who started producing white salt-glazed stoneware at this time. This finer clay was soon adopted by the pipemakers, who may have found it uneconomic to cart overland to Much Wenlock, resulting in a shift in the focus of the industry to the Broseley area, where there was easy access to the riverside wharves.

By the end of the eighteenth century rather tall, more cylindrical forms were being produced and the finer imported fabrics had been universally adopted by the pipemakers (Fig. 11). It was probably during this period that the local pipemakers started to specialise in producing good quality long-stemmed pipes of the type that later became known as ‘churchwardens’. During the nineteenth century the bowl forms became slightly squatter again but the local pipemakers largely resisted the introduction of moulded decoration, which became so common in most other areas. During the second half of the nineteenth century short-stemmed or cutty pipes were introduced with a limited range of moulded decoration, but it was the long-stemmed churchwarden pipes that continued to form an important element of the Broseley production. By the early nineteenth century Broseley had become famous for the quality of its long-stemmed pipes and they were exported all over the world.
Despite the generally rather conservative nature of pipe design in nineteenth-century Broseley there were a few notable exceptions. Edwin Southorn (1820–76), for example, produced some innovative designs, such as his patent Narghile pipe with a glass section in the stem, as well as introducing the use of transfer printed designs on his pipes. Likewise, a number of pipes made of red clay were produced during the late nineteenth century, although these only ever accounted for a very small percentage of the total output, which was said to have reached several million pipes per year during this period.

With the general decline in the demand for pipes the Broseley makers diversified into related areas, such as the production of clay cigar and cigarette holders or into completely new areas, such as the production of dolls’ arms and legs. The commercial pipemaking industry continued until 1960 when the last works, in King Street, closed. The King Street works survived with its contents largely intact until the 1980s. It has since been refurbished as a pipe museum, which opened to the public in September 1996.

The evolution of stamp types.

One of the most consistent and interesting features of the industry that developed in the Much Wenlock/Broseley area was the use of stamped makers’ marks on the pipes. These were introduced with the earliest pipes and were almost universally applied to pipes in the area until commercial production ceased some 350 years later. Some of the earliest pipes from the area, such as those found at excavations near Wroxeter, are stamped with single letter marks (Figs. 12–13). Single letter marks are characteristic of the earliest pipes, produced during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. As yet, it is not known whether these examples were actually produced in the Broseley area or whether they were imported from elsewhere, although the former seems more likely.

As mentioned above, the earliest known pipes that can certainly be attributed to local manufacture come from Ironbridge and are stamped PF (Figs. 1–5). One of these marks (Fig. 1) consists of incuse impressed initials but the remainder of the marks are in relief. This use of incuse lettering is very unusual for Shropshire, perhaps suggesting a south-western origin for this maker since such marks were common there. From this early date until the mid-nineteenth century almost every mark used in this area was in relief. The relief PF marks occur in a variety of styles, but the later examples, dating from around 1640–60 are of circular form (Figs. 4–5). The use of relief initials, usually in a circular frame, became the standard form of marking used in this area until around 1680.

As previously stated, the earliest documented maker in the area is George Deacon, and pipes that can be attributed to him have been found at Eccleshall Castle in Staffordshire (Fig. 14). He may well have been the first of the Deacons to make pipes in this area and the family went on to make some of the finest late seventeenth-century pipes to be produced in Shropshire. There appear to have been several Samuel Deacons making pipes in Much Wenlock during the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and they are well represented by marked pipes (for example, Fig. 6). In common with other makers in the area they were generally using circular initial marks until around 1680. This type of mark was usually applied to the heel of the pipe although in some cases the same or a different mark was also applied to the bowl (Fig. 15). Sometimes the mark was applied to the bowl alone. Symbol marks are also occasionally found during this period but these tend to be more common in the south and south-west of the county than in the Much Wenlock area (Fig. 16).

One final characteristic of the mid- to late-seventeenth-century industry is the occasional occurrence of bowls with decoration made up of multiple stamp impressions (Fig. 17). Usually these pipes have the normal maker’s mark on the heel but, in addition, the bowl and/or stem is decorated with a range of different decorative or lettered stamps. This class of pipe was always rare but sufficient examples, made by different makers, have been found to show that they formed a small but distinctive part of the local industry.

The early- to mid-seventeenth-century initial marks were usually circular although occasionally other forms, such as heart shaped borders, were employed (Fig. 17). From around 1670 marks occur with an abbreviated form of the maker’s name, for example, ‘GRFE POVEL’ for Griffith Powell or ‘Rich Pris’ for Richard Price (Fig. 18). These often employ a mixture of upper and lower case initials and were still usually placed in circular frames, although other forms such as heart shaped marks or rectangular frames, sometimes with a horizontal dividing bar between the rows of lettering, also occur. From around 1680 the name is usually more fully given and occurs principally in block capitals (Fig. 19). These marks are usually square or rectangular and they now often have dividing bars between the lines of lettering.

The square or rectangular full name mark became the predominant style in the Much Wenlock/Broseley area for the next century, the only substantive modification being a change in the position of the mark. From around 1680–1730 large round or tailed heels were in fashion and the mark was placed on these (Fig. 8). After about 1730 this style was entirely replaced by spur types and so the mark was placed across the stem a distance back from the bowl (Fig. 10). From about 1690–1730 there was a second style of mark that was also in use. This
The copying of Broseley styles is another means by which the success of this area can be gauged. The distinctive tailed heel, in vogue from about 1680 to 1730, was unlike anything developed elsewhere. By the end of the seventeenth century numerous pipemakers lived and worked in the town. Documentary research has shown that several of the best known Shropshire makers, who were formerly assumed to have come from Broseley, did in fact work in Much Wenlock, for example, Michael Brown, Samuel Deacon, William Savage, Thomas Tucker and William Wilkinson.

The products of the Broseley and Much Wenlock makers are indistinguishable on stylistic grounds and, given the proximity of the two centres, they can be regarded as single source of pipes from mid-Shropshire. The reputation of this area rested on the distinctive style of its pipes and the good quality of the finish, which was always an integral part of production in both places. The Much Wenlock/Broseley pipes were typically well finished with burnished surfaces and, during the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, well milled rims. The dies used to stamp the pipes were usually well designed and professionally engraved resulting in a neatly produced, good quality product. It was the uniformity and high quality of the Broseley area products that are the principal characteristics that enable them to be distinguished from pipes produced elsewhere in the county, although details of die design and finishing techniques also help to set them apart.

The success of the Broseley area makers is clearly reflected in the distribution of their products. During the second half of the seventeenth century the trade in Broseley pipes grew rapidly to take in huge areas ranging from the Mersey in the north, across to the Midlands in the east and right down the Severn Valley to South Wales in the south. From c. 1650–1725 Much Wenlock may well have been the dominant production centre in this area. Pipes from Much Wenlock must have been traded in huge numbers since they are commonly found in places such as Stafford and Birmingham with occasional finds from as far as Warrington and even Jamaica in the Caribbean (Marx 1968, Fig. 29). One of the most important methods of disseminating the pipes was by boat and Much Wenlock/Broseley pipes are commonly found throughout the Severn Valley. So extensive was this river trade in pipes that up to 50% of the marked pipes from late seventeenth-century assemblages in South Wales were produced in mid-Shropshire.

During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries improved transport facilities enabled an even wider marketing of mid-Shropshire pipes and it was during this period that the trade became particularly focussed on the parishes of Broseley and Benthall. Early nineteenth-century-products were in demand in London, and an example of one of Noah Roden’s pipes has been found as far away as Dorking in Surrey (Higgins 1985b, Fig. 36). The Southern family exhibited pipes in the Great Exhibition of 1851 and, during the second half of the century, their products were sold all over this country. In addition, an extensive overseas trade was built up and their pipes were shipped to many parts of the world from ports such as Liverpool, where the firm had agents.

The copying of Broseley styles is another means by which the success of this area can be gauged. The distinctive tailed heel, in vogue from about 1680 to 1730, was unlike anything developed elsewhere. By the end of the seventeenth century makers from as far afield as Buckley in Clwyd, Polesworth in Warwickshire and Carmarthen in Dyfed were copying this particular style and the characteristic form of mark that went with it. The same thing occurred in the nineteenth century and later when firms such as Joseph Holland & Sons of Manchester produced pipes with the distinctive Broseley style of stem twist (Joseph Holland & Sons catalogue, not dated).
Although there were individual makers working at other places in Shropshire, such as Wellington and Shrewsbury, the trade never seems to have taken off in these areas and they relied heavily on pipes imported from Much Wenlock and Broseley. This arrangement is particularly interesting in the case of Shrewsbury since there are few other county towns that did not have their own pipemakers to meet the local demand. There are, however, two other significant pipemaking areas of the county that are worthy of mention and these are discussed in the following sections.

The South Shropshire Industry.

The south Shropshire industry is particularly interesting and complex. Around the Clee Hills there are similar coalmeasure deposits to those found in Ironbridge and these too appear to have attracted early pipemakers. The Cleobury Mortimer industry has been little studied, but it is already clear that at least a dozen pipemakers operated in this area during the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. One kiln site has already been located by the author (Higgins 2001) and sufficient local pipes collected to show that their form and finish is noticeably different to that found in the Much Wenlock/Broseley area. The pipes from Cleobury are infrequently marked and they generally lack the burnished surfaces that were common in the Broseley area. They are also often of a slightly different form, as exemplified by a pipe produced by John Newall, who died in 1719 (Fig. 24). Even when Broseley bowl forms were copied the pipes look a little different, as can be seen from a pipe stamped WS in Bewdley Museum (Fig. 25), which can be attributed to William Sheffil of Cleobury Mortimer who died in 1699. Sheffil’s pipe is not burnished and the circular mark, which is perhaps not as neatly executed as on a Broseley product, looks distinctly out of date when compared with the contemporary square full name marks which were being produced to the north.

The same is true of Ludlow, where large numbers of pipes have been recovered and where there was also a thriving pipemaking community. In many ways, these two adjacent centres mirror the situation in mid-Shropshire where Much Wenlock was the established market town and Broseley the neighbouring production centre with raw materials. Ludlow had long been an important and wealthy administrative centre and so it is not surprising that some of the earliest pipes from the county are found in the town. Local production appears to have been established by the early seventeenth century and distinctive local styles of bowl form and finish soon appeared, suggesting a thriving local industry (Fig. 26). The products of John Arthurs (stamped IA) and William Underwood (stamped WV; Fig. 27) were particularly common during the mid- to late seventeenth century. Their pipes show a mix of local and Broseley area characteristics but generally lack the burnished surface that was typical there (Fig. 27). As with Much Wenlock, the town was not on a coalfield area and pipemaking both here and in the Cleobury area appears to have died out during the eighteenth century.

The North Shropshire Industry.

The other part of Shropshire that appears to have had an important pipemaking industry was centred on Wem in the north of the county. As with both south- and mid-Shropshire there seems to have been a sudden growth of the local industry towards the end of the seventeenth century with far more pipemakers establishing themselves than would have been needed to supply the local market. At least a dozen makers are thought to have worked in the area during the 1680s and 1690s. They were based not only in Wem itself but also in small hamlets nearby, such as Burlton and Loppington. The author is not aware of any local sources or clay or fuel in this area, nor is there an obvious market for their products. It is thought that the Hatchet family worked in Burlton and that they produced not only full name marks in the Much Wenlock/Broseley style, but also initial marks (AH, GH and IH) above a representation of a little hatchet, for example, Fig. 28. Pipes attributed to this family have been found at Willaston and Chester in Cheshire and at Buckley in North Wales, suggesting that pipes from the Wem area were quite widely marketed. The pipes produced in north Shropshire are strongly influenced by Much Wenlock/Broseley styles and they are finished in a similar manner with nicely milled rims and burnished surfaces. In this respect, the Wem area production much more closely resembles the material from mid-Shropshire than that from the south of the county does. As with Much Wenlock, Cleobury Mortimer and Ludlow, there seems to have been a sudden collapse of the industry during the early eighteenth century, with no more references to pipemakers in the local parish registers, and individuals from the area seeking work as far away as Warwick (Melton 1997, 275).
Surviving evidence for the industry.

Despite the large number of pipemakers who are documented for the county there is very little surviving evidence for their workshops and kilns. One outstanding site has been identified at Cleobury Mortimer where the almost undisturbed earthworks of a seventeenth- to early eighteenth-century pipemaker’s house and workshop have been identified (Higgins 2001). Apart from this, there is very little evidence from the areas of the county where the industry once flourished during this period and much more documentary research and fieldwork is needed to try and trace these production sites.

Even in the Broseley area, where the multitude of different marked pipes shows the scale of the former industry, there is comparatively little surviving documentary or structural evidence. There do not seem to be any surviving apprenticeship records or early lists of inhabitants of the area that give occupations. An additional complication is the fact that many of the local families shared common Christian names making it difficult to pin down a particular maker even when his full name is known from pipe marks. Between 1650 and 1750, for example, there were no fewer than 22 people baptised in Broseley and Benthall with the name of John Hartshorne. At least one of these John Hartshornes is known to have been a pipemaker from pipe stamps but it is quite impossible to determine which one, let alone identify exactly where and when he was working.

Likewise, despite the large number of kilns that must have operated in the area, there are few sites which can be located with any certainty today and even fewer remains of the above ground buildings. Despite these problems some useful information about the sites and production techniques can still be gathered. There is a 1673 inventory of Samuel Deacon’s estate in Much Wenlock that includes ‘one mill to grind tobacco pipe clay’. This shows that, from at least as early as the 1670s, the workshops were large enough to warrant installing specialist machinery and that considerable care was being taken to prepare the raw materials. The inventories of the pipemakers also contain some tantalising clues as to the equipment that they were using actually to manufacture the pipes. In 1723 the estate of Thomas Roden of Broseley included a ‘curricomb screw’ and a ‘cheek screw’. These would have been the presses within which the pipes were moulded, but it is not known what these two forms looked like or why two different types were needed. Similarly, the inventory goes on to list several different styles of pipe mould, including ‘peak heel’ and ‘broad heel’, presumably the spur pipes and tailed heel pipes which were such a characteristic of the Broseley industry at this period.

Artefactual evidence for pipe production is surprisingly scarce and from the surviving evidence on its own it would be difficult to make a case for there ever having been a significant pipemaking industry in the Broseley area before the nineteenth century. At Benthall the author has excavated part of a seventeenth-century kiln dump, including a reasonable quantity of muffle fragments. A particular type of muffle-kiln had evolved for firing pipes, the muffle being a special chamber made of waste pipe stems and pipeclay within which the pipes were fired. Preliminary studies suggest regional variations in the evolution and form of these kilns, but further study is impossible until more examples have been excavated. This Benthall material derived from the kiln of Henry Bradley, a well known maker whose products were marketed over a wide area around 1670–1700.

An early eighteenth-century kiln group from an unidentified maker is also known from Benthall, but this did not produce any significant evidence for the kiln structure itself, and the only other structural evidence known is what appear to be the truncated remains of John Roberts’s kiln from Much Wenlock, which was currently under excavation as this paper went to press (August 2006). John Roberts was also working in the early eighteenth century and, after this period, there is no other excavated production evidence until the late nineteenth century, when completely different technology employing saggers was in use. The late nineteenth-century kiln dumps contain fired clay strips that were used to seal the saggers and clay sheets which were used to protect the pipes from harmful gasses during firing. Broseley was distinctive in that although round saggers, as used for pottery production, were used for short-stemmed pipes the long stemmed pipes were fired in specially made rectangular hump-backed saggers, which appear to be unique to this production centre. The lack of artefactual evidence between the late seventeenth and late nineteenth centuries makes it impossible to examine the nature and evolution of the kilns and production techniques in any detail at present. The recovery of more production and structural evidence for the kilns and workshops is clearly a priority throughout the county.

Surviving building remains are equally elusive. There is a cottage in Broseley with a date stone reading ‘Richard Legg built this 1764’. Numerous Richard Legg stem stamps have been found in the garden and so it seems reasonable to suppose that this was the house of the pipemaker. Various other properties that belonged to named pipemakers at the time of the nineteenth-century Tithe Survey survive, but these have not been systematically studied and it is not known if any trace of workshop structures or kilns survives. One of the main factory sites at this time was adjacent to the New Inn at Benthall, where the Rodens and Edwin Southorn worked. Some of the surviving structures on this site, now derelict, may have formed part of this factory complex. The main factory in Broseley was on Legges Hill where William Southorn & Co. had their factory from the 1820s onwards. Part of a unique type of kiln base was uncovered on this site during recent
redevelopment work but all the factory buildings have been demolished. The only surviving element at this site is Broseley Wood House, which provided the domestic accommodation for the Southorn family.

The most important surviving site is undoubtedly the King Street pipeworks in Broseley. This was established as the works of Roland Smitheman in 1881 and was used by that family until about 1920. In about 1935 it was taken over by W. Southorn & Co., who not only moved in their whole business and old stock of tools, but also residual material that had been purchased from Edwin Southorn’s works in Benthall upon its closure. Production continued on the site until about 1960 and most of the buildings and fittings in use at that date survive, including the kiln, which is the only complete surviving example anywhere in England.

The King Street site is important not only because it is the most complete pipemaking complex to survive anywhere in this country but also because it contained an extensive paper archive of letters and documents relating to the business. Over the last few years the site has been restored by the Ironbridge Gorge Museum and it was opened as a pipe museum on 14 September 1996. Although the buildings and displays form an impressive memorial to the pipe industry of the area it is perhaps the paper archive that will provide the most valuable insights into the nature and organisation of the trade.

Summary.

This paper provides a brief introduction to the Shropshire pipemaking industry and its products. It has shown that pipemaking was established as a new industry early in the seventeenth century and that by the end of the century significant production centres had emerged in and around Ludlow, Cleobury Mortimer, Much Wenlock, Broseley, Benthall and Wem. Some of these production centres were based in historic market towns but others emerged in developing industrial areas, where they were able to exploit the clay and coal of the Shropshire coalfields. Distinctive local styles of bowl form, finishing and mark types were developed from the mid-seventeenth century onwards and these distinctive forms were not only widely traded but also influenced pipe styles and production in other centres across large parts of England and Wales. The early industry seems to have reached its peak around 1680–1720 after which production in many of these early centres appears to have suddenly collapsed. There was a fundamental shift from the use of local coalmeasure clays to finer clays imported from the West Country and production became concentrated in the parishes of Broseley and Benthall. The term ‘Broseley’ became synonymous with a quality long-stemmed pipe and many millions were exported from this production centre all over the world. The form and evolution of the early workshops and kilns is still poorly understood and remains a priority for future research. For the nineteenth century, however, Broseley boasts the only complete surviving pipe making complex anywhere in the country as well as an associated archive of tools and paperwork that remains to be studied in detail.

Illustrations. All the illustrations are at 1:1 with 2:1 details of the stamps in Figures 1, 3–8, 10, 12–20 and 22–25. The findspots of the illustrated pipes and the collections from which they have been drawn are as follows:-
1–5, 9 & 20–23; from excavations at 36/37 The Wharfage, Ironbridge (Ironbridge Gorge Museum Trust).
6–7 & 15; unprovenanced material from the Thursfield Collection, now part of the Bragge Collection (British Museum).
8 & 10; from excavations at St. Mary’s Grove, Stafford (Stoke City Museum & Art Gallery).
11; Shrewsbury area (H. H. Judd Collection, Shrewsbury).
12–13; Excavations at Lower Brompton (J. Andrews Collection, Shrewsbury).
14; Eccleshall Castle Excavations (Stoke City Museum & Art Gallery).
16 & 25; Bewdley area (H. Porter Collection, Bewdley Museum).
17; 3 & 4 St. Mary’s Lane, Much Wenlock (A. & G. Shields Collection, Much Wenlock).
18; Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury (J. Andrews Collection, Shrewsbury).
19; from ‘Zeba’, Fish St, Shrewsbury (Private Collection, Shrewsbury).
24; found at John Newall’s kiln site, Cleobury Mortimer (John Williams Collection).
26; found at Pipe Aston, near Ludlow (Ludlow Museum, Acc. No. 18/67).
27; from Ludlow (G. Berlyn Collection, Ludlow).
28; from fieldwalking near Willaston, Cheshire (National Clay Tobacco Pipe Archive).
Bibliography.


J. Holland & Sons, of Manchester, undated trade catalogue (early twentieth century).


LEAD MINING IN SHROPSHIRE BEFORE 1815

By JAMES LAWSON

Mining probably commenced at Llanymynech in the Bronze Age. The local discovery of second-century AD Roman pigs of lead indicates mines and these were probably at Snailbeach and Shelve; the ‘Roman’ shovels from Shelve are almost certainly medieval. The alleged connection of the Linley villa with lead working is speculative and the recent interpretation of features on aerial photographs of fields at Norbury as hushing are at best imaginative. (They are actually medieval ridge and furrow.) Third-century evidence of litharge and cupellation has been found at Brompton fort near Montgomery but it is uncertain whether this relates to silver extraction from Shropshire or to Welsh lead.

Medieval exploitation is first recorded at Shelve in the 1180s and continued until at least 1278 and at Carregova near Llanymynech lead was briefly mined for silver in the 1190s; later mining there cannot be ruled out in the 14th century. A joint enterprise between the Staffords of Caus Castle and the Corbets of Wattlesborough occurs in 1378–9 but no further mining has been detected until the 1550s when market forces and the financial problems of Lord Stafford led to the granting of a number of mining leases to London merchants and local adventurers in Hogstow and Heath. In the later 16th century Lord Stafford sold Minsterley and Habberley Office to the Thynnnes, ancestors of Lord Bath, and disposed the Hogstow forest walk of Heath between the ancestors of Lord Tankerville (Prynces/Astleys) and the Lloyds of Leaton Knolls. Scarlett’s Shelve was bought by the Mores in the 1650s and Ritton and Kinnerton, where the Bog mine was later located, was inherited by the Nicholls of Shrewsbury and Pontesbury in the 1630s; they sold to the Lysters of Rowton after 1700.

There was mining in Habberley Office in 1613 (worth £14.5s.5d, not £1455 as stated in Brook and Allbutt) but otherwise there was no mining on the Thynne estate until the later 17th century when there were several leases to Derbyshire miners. These were probably for Snailbeach where continuous mining started in 1758 with a lease to Thomas Powys and partners who were succeeded by the long enduring Lovett partnership in 1782. The Powys family of Shrewsbury Abbey and Berwick were the principal shareholders in the Pennerley mine in the Joint Lordship from 1727 where there were already ‘old works’. This partnership can be traced in detail until c. 1800 when it was merged with the Whitegrit Company with which it shared several adventurers. This company was formed in the early 1780s and shared considerable mining expertise with adventurers in Cardiganshire mines, notably the agent to Lord Powis, John Probert. They exploited the More mines at the Gravels and Whitegrit, mining leases around Rorrington and in the later 1790s acquired mines in the Hope Valley from Lord Tankerville. Between 1807 and 1813 the company made expensive explorations on the Lloyd estate at Crows Nest and elsewhere. In the late 1720s the London Lead Company had a brief interest in a mine near Pennerley. The Bog mine may have started c. 1684 and there was mining there in the mid 1730s and the 1740s. By 1760 a Shrewsbury consortium headed by a draper, Jonathan Scott, was mining there and by 1778 he was in partnership with Edward Jefferies of Shrewsbury and Glandyfi who had mining and smelting interests in Montgomeryshire and Cardiganshire. Scott had earlier been involved in Merioneth with the Shrewsbury attorney Henry Bowdler in the ‘Shrewsbury Company’. (Bowdler and others had been mining on Bromlow Common in 1749–50.) Edward and Robert Jefferies later had an extremely profitable mine, probably in the Hope valley, on Lord Tankerville’s property which yielded a royalty of £7,717 between 1789 and 1794. Scott and Jefferies ceased mining at the Bog c. 1786 but continued to own a smelter at Malehurst and to mine coal there and at Westbury. The next lessee in 1788 was John Weston, a Caernarvonshire mining engineer, who floated sixty £100 shares in the ‘Good Chance’ mine on the London market. Dogged by heavy expenditure and problems with pumping engines, he ceased mining by 1796. A local consortium took the mine in 1809.

Wherever possible drainage of the mines was by levels. At Pennerley the ‘great’ level, probably the ‘Boat’ level, was driven between 1728 and 1750. It was not extended to the Bog until after 1809 and when it was
driven into the Bog workings in 1812, three miners were drowned. As it could only be driven to the Bog above the deepest workings it failed to solve problems at depth. In the Hope valley the ‘Wood’ or Hope level on Lord Tankerville’s property had been driven by 1801 when a lease of the Gravels and Whitegrit mines on the More estate was conditional on it being extended southwards to drain both mines. The 1760 Bog mine plan indicates a level, but endemic water problems at depth already required both water and horse driven pumps. John Lawrence, who was managing agent both there and at Snailbeach, had a level at the latter by 1766 and was probably using a similar mix of pumps by 1769. When the Snailbeach Company took over after 1780 they soon installed a steam engine.

Steam engines, purchased from Boulton and Watt, were first used in the ore field at the Bog in 1779 (relocated to Westbury colliery in 1784) by Scott and Jefferies, who had another engine at their Malehurst colliery, adjacent to their smelter. John Weston acquired a new engine for the Bog in 1789. This was relocated to Nuneaton by 1796 on the failure of his enterprise. The engines, although commissioned to specification, were difficult to drive effectively, partly due to faulty parts and boilers and the lack of skilled drivers. Similar engines were purchased by the Whitegrit Company for the Gravels and Whitegrit mines in the 1780s; the latter was quickly relocated to Scotland. Memoranda by John Lawrence in the 1790s reveal the high cost of carting coal from the Pontesbury mines, exacerbated by bad roads. Even relatively efficient steam engines could be justified only if the returns were high. The extension of levels after 1800 was clearly an economic necessity.

Smelting took place on the ore field until c. 1700. Evidence of undated bole furnaces has been found on Lord’s Hill above Snailbeach and the leases in the 1550s included wood for smelting. A 1696 lease on the More estate mentions cupolas. The 1727 Pennerley lease excludes the right to build a smelter, and by that time smelting was probably taking place in the Severn Gorge where it is documented on possibly four sites during the 18th century. This arrangement was hardly efficient and in 1766 some of the partners in the Pennerley and Snailbeach mines acquired coal-mines at Pulley just outside Shrewsbury, with licence to build a smelter. In the 1780s the focus of smelting moved to Malehurst and later Pontesford on the Pontesbury coal field, remaining there until the mid 19th century. John Lawrence had a smelter at Shelvefields by the 1790s, powered by a small Boulton and Watt engine.

The adventurers in the mines in the 17th century included Derbyshire men but in the 18th century (the Bog 1788 excepted) they were primarily Shrewsbury based. The longevity of some of the partnerships argues at least modest profitability. Three generations of the Lawrence family were certainly active as mine agents, although not necessarily as entrepreneurs. The mining population probably fluctuated (there was a barracks at the Bog in the 1790s) and some of the miners both then and at the Bog in the 1760s came from Cardiganshire. By 1800 there were already a considerable number of cottages on the Tankerville and Lloyd estates in Upper and Lower Heath where cottages in the forest had been recorded from the mid 16th century. Such evidence as exists suggests that in the 18th century the main market for smelted lead was Bristol via the Severn Navigation with some sales en route and locally. Some ore was used for lead glazing in the East Shropshire coal-field.
SHROPSHIRE ARCHIVES REPORT FOR 2004

By MARY McKENZIE, County Archivist

I am pleased to have the opportunity to write a brief report on the work of Shropshire Archives.

The year 2004 has seen significant changes for the service including a major staffing restructure. The aim of the restructure, which was funded by a modest increase in the service’s budget, was to increase capacity for cataloguing and conservation, and to clarify areas of responsibility. Initial results of the restructure appear to be positive but this will be reviewed in the future.

November 2004 also saw the retirement of Tony Carr. Tony’s contribution to local studies in the county since he came to Shropshire in 1974 cannot be overestimated. We wish him all the best for his retirement.

In addition, the Community Archaeologist, Hugh Hannaford, has moved into the Shropshire Archives building. This has resulted in improved co-operation and partnership working, including a joint series of summer walks. We look forward to working closely with Hugh in the future.

Projects

During the year the completion of the Secret Shropshire and Shropshire Routes to Roots projects has created important digital resources about the county. (See www.secretshropshire.co.uk and www.shropshireroutes.org). Building on this success the service was successful in a partnership bid, with other elements within Shropshire County Council, to the Heritage Lottery Fund to support a project to link the county’s sites and monuments record with the archive and museum databases on a web site. The Discovering Shropshire’s History project will start in 2005.

Shropshire Archives also worked closely with the Ludlow Historical Research Group to establish the Ludlow History Access Project. This project aimed to encourage the use and accessibility of local history sources by providing copies of documentary material relating to the town in the new Ludlow library. The Ludlow Historical Research Group is also providing regular volunteer advice sessions for users of the sources. These new resources have proved very popular with the local community and it is hoped this project will become a pilot for other venues across the county.

Friends

The Friends of Shropshire Archives have had a busy and productive year. Events were held at Highley and Ludlow and the Your History Day local history conference at Shirehall in Shrewsbury attracted over 25 groups exhibiting their research and over 150 people attended. Fundraising by the Friends has resulted in the purchase of a new microfilm/microfiche reader printer for the public service. This is a much needed replacement for the old machine. Many thanks to all who contributed to this effort.

Events

Family history was the theme of a number of events during the year including a two-day family history festival at Shropshire Archives in November linked to the BBC’s series about celebrities tracing their ancestors ‘Who do you think you are?’ Over 300 people attended during the two days, a record for the service. We plan to repeat this successful format in 2005.
Accessions

Accessions received during 2004 have included:
Bridgnorth Congregational and Methodist Church records, 1925–82 (SA 7101)
Welshampton Church of England School records, 1863–1991 (SA 7107)
Shrewsbury Borough Council and Atcham Rural District Council records, 1948–68 (SA 7110)
Severn Horse Towing Path Trust records, Shrewsbury, 1795–1940 (SA 7112)
Shrewsbury Methodist circuit records, 1870–2001 (SA 7117)
St. Leonard’s Church of England Infant school, Dawley, records, 1896–1980 (SA 7121)
Hyssington parish records, 1701–20th century (SA 7122, 7188, 7207)
Little Drayton parish registers, 1933–96 (SA 7127)
Annscroft, Longden and Church Pulverbatch parish registers, 1935–90 (SA 7130)
Orleton Lane infants school, Wellington, records, 1950–2004 (SA 7133)
Institution of Production Engineers – Shrewsbury section records, 1953–92 (SA 7136)
Shrewsbury and District Teachers’ Association minutes, 1969–93 (SA 7137)
Ship Money Roll for Ludlow, 1640 (SA 7143)
South Shropshire Methodist circuit records, 1919–98 (SA 7166)
Bridgnorth and Aldenham Roman Catholic records, 1837–1968 (SA 7173)
St. Andrew’s Church of England primary school, Shifnal, records, 1863–2004 (SA 7179)
Watling Street Turnpike Road Trustees’ Minute Book, 1767–1816 (SA 7182)
Hughley parish records, 1851–1944 (SA 7193)
St. David’s Presbyterian Church, Shrewsbury, Marriage Registers, 1927–88 (SA 7196)
Telford Methodist circuit records, 1867–2001 (SA 7200)
Account books of a carpenter and coffinmaker of Petton, 1864–1942 (SA 7201)
ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS IN SHROPSHIRE IN 2003

By SALLY THOMPSON

A summary of the work undertaken in 2003 in the County of Shropshire and the Unitary Authority of Telford and Wrekin that was subsequently reported to the Sites and Monuments Record, Shropshire County Council.

The references in brackets beginning PRN are the County Sites and Monuments Record numbers for individual sites and the references beginning ESA are the County Sites and Monuments Record numbers for individual events or activities such as archaeological excavations. I would like to thank the contributors who provided summaries for some of the reports included in this review.

Alveley; SO 760 844. A sandstone wall (PRN 08226) was uncovered during garden work at property on Daddlebrook Road, Alveley, Shropshire. This could represent the remains of foundations for a late medieval or post medieval timber building. If so, the building had disappeared by the time of the 1902 Ordnance Survey 2nd edition 25” map, on which the site is marked as an orchard. Further investigation of the site would be needed to confirm the function of the wall.

(Hannaford, H. R., 2003: Daddlebrook Road, Alveley, Shropshire: Notes on a site visit, ESA 5226)

Alveley; SO 770 826. A building assessment was carried out at Lowe Farm, Alveley, in July 2003 to investigate its history. Built by a Thomas Lowe, it is thought that he redesigned an existing farmstead to incorporate the latest Victorian ideas. This is still visible today as the buildings retain many features including cast iron columns and window detailing typical of many mid 19th- century farms.

(Cook, M., 2003: Building assessment at Lowe Farm, Alveley, Shropshire, ESA 5376)

Alveley & Highley; SO 748 839. The proposed replacement of the Highley to Alveley Bridge led to an archaeological assessment of the bridge and the area surrounding it in 2003. The bridge was built in 1936–7 to carry coal from the Alveley Colliery (PRN 07049) to a screening plant across the river. The former settlement of Pottersload (PRN 07047) was also assessed as it lay within close proximity of the bridge. There are no visible remains of the settlement. The dates of the site are unknown but it was definitely in use in the early 19th century and is likely to have been a post medieval farmstead. Although the colliery was of a relatively recent date, it was one of the last operating deep pits in the Shropshire coalfield.


Ashford Bowdler; SO 519 705. Watching brief carried out at St Andrew’s Church, Ashford Bowdler (PRN 10688) in 2003 on renovation works to identify any archaeological features or graves affected by renovation works. Trench two revealed three burials of Christian individuals and 19th and 20th century burials were shown to be present in the south western area of the churchyard. All human remains disturbed during these works were retained for immediate reburial elsewhere in the churchyard.

(Poole, B., 2003: St Andrew’s Church, Ashford Bowdler, Shropshire: a report on the Watching Brief, Archaeological Investigations Ltd, Report: 566, ESA 5486)

Baschurch; SJ 422 218. A photographic survey of farm buildings at Moor Farm, Nobold, was carried out in 2003 by Marches Archaeology. No medieval farm buildings survive on the site; the earliest remains being part of a sandstone barn incorporated with a later stable or cowshed. In the later 20th century the farmyard expanded to the west and south with much larger, more open buildings. The majority of the buildings are now redundant.

(Stone, R., 2003: Moor Farm, Nobold, Baschurch, Shropshire: A report on building recording and analysis, Marches Archaeology, Report: 275, ESA 5113)
Berrington & Condover; SJ 517 068. In November 2003 a desk based assessment was undertaken of a section of the unclassified Shrewsbury to Acton Burnell road between King Street and Cantlop Bridge, in advance of carriageway improvements. The work consisted of aerial photographic analysis and documentary research, together with a walk-over survey of the area. (Hislop, M. & Palmer R., 2003: King Street to Cantlop Bridge Carriageway Improvement, Shropshire, Birmingham Archaeology, PN.1130, ESA 5817)

Broseley; SJ 685 028. An archaeological evaluation was undertaken of a proposed development site off Calcutts Road, Jackfield, in 2003. The site sits to the south west of the Jackfield Tile Museum (PRN 07240) and contains structures relating to concrete manufacture, an earlier tileworks and possibly clay mining prior to that. Due to the extensive and lengthy use of the site from the 17th century onwards and the nature of these industries, it is possible that the remains beneath the present ground level could be extensive. (White, S., 2003: Land off Calcutts Road, Jackfield: An archaeological Evaluation, Ironbridge Archaeology Report 143, ESA 5482)

Church Stretton; SO 452 936. In October 2003 four evaluation trenches were excavated within a site off Church Street, Church Stretton. The evaluation revealed some limited evidence of archaeological activity, including a probable burgage boundary ditch (PRN 05416). (Jones, P., 2003: Land off Church Street, Church Stretton, Shropshire, Border Archaeology, Report: BA0303MHCP2, ESA 5884)

Clun; SO 302 808. Archaeological excavation and monitoring of groundworks were carried out during the clearance of the former Clunside Garage site, High Street, Clun, in August 2003. Large parts of the site had been severely affected by the insertion of buried fuel tanks and the construction of the buildings and forecourt. A wall consisting of roughly coursed sandstone blocks (PRN 05459) was discovered in one of the two evaluation trenches, but little artefactual or dating evidence was recovered. (Sherlock, H. & Maurice, G., 2003: Clunside Garages, Clun, Shropshire: a report on an archaeological evaluation, Archenfield Archaeology, Report AA/03/60, ESA 5267)

Clun; SO 316 758. Dendrochronology survey carried out to ascertain the date of construction of the cruck elements of the farmhouse known as ‘Bryn Cambric’ (PRN 20539) Chapel Lawn, Clun, Shropshire. Eleven timbers were sampled from the main cruck frame, of which four of the timbers gave felling dates of winter AD 1499/1500 to summer AD 1501. It is believed that they form the primary phase of the construction of the building dating it to AD 1501 or shortly thereafter. (Worthington, M. J. & Miles, D. W. H., 2003: The tree-ring dating of Bryn Cambric, Chapel Lawn, Clun, Shropshire, English Heritage, Centre for Archaeology, Report: 92/2003ESA 5529)

Cockshutt, Ellesmere Rural, Hordley, Llanymynech and Pant, Oswestry Rural, West Felton, Whittington & Baschurch; SJ 335 263. A landscape archaeology report was prepared for British Waterways as part of their Montgomery Canal Conservation Management Strategy. A desk based assessment and field survey was carried out of the archaeology, and particularly the pre-canal archaeology, along a 2km wide corridor centred on the Montgomery Canal from its junction with the Shropshire Union Canal at Lower Frankton in Shropshire to Freestone Locks near Newtown in Powys. The canal corridor was also examined in terms of the historic landscapes through which it passes and broad historic environment management recommendations were made in the report. (Jones, N. W., Silvester, R. J. & Britnell, W. J., 2003: Montgomery Canal Conservation Management Strategy: landscape archaeology assessment, Clwyd-Powys Archaeological Trust, Report: 550, ESA 5527)

Condover; SJ 477 042. In March 2003, a photographic survey was carried out at Gonsall Lane Bridge (PRN 08668) near Dorrington in the parish of Condover, Shropshire. A programme of bridge strengthening works had been undertaken on a number of minor road bridges in the county. As part of this programme of work, the 19th century bridge was to be replaced and in view of its historical significance it was considered that a photographic record should be made before this replacement. A series of colour slides and a series of black and white slides were taken of the bridge before the works began. (Hannaford, H. R., 2003: Photographic survey in advance of Gonsall Lane Bridge replacement, Shropshire County Council Archaeology Service, Report 223, ESA 4919)

Cound; SJ 560 055. Evaluation carried out at Cound Hall in connection with a planned residential development. Five evaluation trenches were excavated within the walled garden of the hall with a sixth trench
dug just outside to the west. No evidence of the earlier manor was seen, with only modern features being exposed. It is now presumed likely that the manor was sited on the platform identified in the 1990 study to the west of the drive (PRN 08576).


Eaton-under-Heywood; SO 489 891. A dendrochronology survey was undertaken to ascertain the date of construction of New Hall (PRN 10905), Eaton-under-Heywood, Shropshire. New Hall is a three unit building comprising a three bay hall range, with three bayed cross wings at the north and south ends. All three units were thought to be constructed in one phase. Twelve samples were taken in total, of which nine provided precise felling dates. Analysis confirmed this with five of the precise dates coming from timbers used in the primary construction of the building. The felling of the timbers dated to between winter AD 1562/3 to winter AD 1564/5. The other dates related to a series of repairs to the roofs of the hall range and south cross wing. Wall paintings found on inspection are thought to be part of the original decorative scheme for the building and therefore date to shortly after AD 1565.


Ellesmere Rural; SJ 346 384. A watching brief was carried out at St. Mary’s Church, Dudleston (PRN 12211) in June 2003. A number of grave cuts were exposed, four of which contained visible skeletal remains. The line of the path from the churchyard gate to the south porch has remained unchanged since the late 18th century and so the burials are very likely to be earlier than this date. All the human remains disturbed during these works were retained for immediate reburial elsewhere in the churchyard. No other archaeological features or deposits were encountered during the watching brief.

(Hannaford, H. R., 2003: A watching brief at St Mary’s Church, Dudleston, Shropshire, Shropshire County Council Archaeology Service, Report 227, ESA 5222)

Ellesmere Rural & St. Martin’s; SJ 293 385 to SJ 365 376. A desk-based assessment and field inspection of the route of the Chirk to Overton gas pipeline. This identified that the route crossed the presumed line of the scheduled monument, Wat’s Dyke (PRN 01001), but that otherwise it was likely to cause minimal damage to any identified archaeological remains. A strategy for further assessment and mitigation was provided which would enable the archaeological resource to be adequately conserved and understood.

A subsequent archaeological watching brief was later carried out later on groundworks for the new gas pipeline. A substantial quantity of post-medieval pottery was retrieved from a spread at the eastern end of the pipeline route, an area in which the presence of a pottery industry had been previously indicated through documentary research. While the pottery recovered cannot be clearly defined as pottery wasters, the evidence suggests an industrial rather than a domestic source for the material. All archaeological features such as drainage ditches, boundary features, as well as an area of ridge and furrow within the area of works were recorded and related to the medieval or post-medieval agricultural landscape although none could be securely dated.


(Stone, R., 2003: Overton to Chirk gas pipeline, Wrexham Borough and Shropshire: report on further archaeological watching brief, Marches Archaeology Report: 286, ESA 5733)

Harley; SJ 599 010. A survey of earthworks was carried out in October 2003 near to the Old Mill, Harley. The Old Mill lies along the north side of the Harley Brook, to the south of the village of Harley. The area of investigation lay immediately adjacent to the Old Mill. The well preserved earthwork remains were associated with the former mill leat and mill pond, part of which had been damaged by recent groundworks. The results of the survey demonstrated the substantial nature of the earthworks of both the leat and pond which are likely to date from the late 18th or early 19th century.


Kynnersley; SJ 672 167. An archaeological watching brief was undertaken in late 2003 during groundworks connected with the excavation of soakaways and drainage channels at the Church of St. Chad, Kynnersley (PRN 12888). No archaeological deposits were observed and no artefacts were recovered.

(Leigh, D., 2004: Archaeological Watching Brief at St Chad’s Church, Kynnersley, Shropshire, Northamptonshire Archaeology, ESA 5877)
Leebotwood & Longnor; SO 490 992. In October 2003, Shropshire County Council Archaeology Service made site visits to road works for the relaying of fords at two locations on the line of the Roman road Watling Street (South) near Longnor (PRN 00108), Shropshire. At each ford, the existing cobbles and formation were removed to a depth of about 300mm and were seen to be of modern construction. No archaeological features or deposits were recorded in the groundworks at either ford.
(Hannaford, H. R., 2003: Watling Street, Longnor, Shropshire: Notes on a site visit, ESA 5835)

Little Wenlock; SJ 647 068. An archaeological assessment was carried out at St Lawrence’s Church, Little Wenlock in conjunction with investigations into depressions at the east end of the north aisle. The church was substantially enlarged in the 19th century, with a new chancel built alongside the old, but portions of earlier fabric have survived, including part of the medieval north wall and much of the Norman chancel, which retains two 15th-century roof trusses. A small trench was excavated at the site of the depressions but the deposits encountered provided no further information on the medieval building. The most complete summary of the development of the church remains that in the Victoria County History. However, the fabric of the former chancel has more potential for analysis and interpretation, in particular, the north side and the masonry at the east end.
(Meeson, B., 2003: St Lawrence, Little Wenlock: archaeological assessment, Historic Buildings Consultant Report: 03/18, ESA 4994)

Longnor; SJ 493 002. A watching brief was carried out in July 2003, on the dredging of the moat surrounding the moat house, Longnor (PRN 00743). No significant archaeological features were revealed during the works. The excavated silts produced pottery and glass of 19th- and 20th-century date.

Ludlow; SO 513 746. An archaeological evaluation was carried out in January 2003 at the Museum Resource Store, Old Street, Ludlow, by Shropshire County Council Archaeology Service. A desk-based assessment was carried out along with the monitoring of test pits excavated for engineering purposes. The evaluation found evidence for possible terracing of the site in the post-medieval or medieval periods. The eastern boundary of the site lies along the line of the town walls (PRN 01177), a scheduled ancient monument.

Ludlow; SO 508 744. An archaeological evaluation was carried out in June 2003 at Chapel House (PRN 00517), Dinham, Ludlow. It was found that the ground had been disturbed, presumably during restoration works carried out in the 1970s and no archaeological features were identified. The deposits included an abundance of clay pipe stems, far more than normally recovered from a house clearance, suggesting considerable levelling had been undertaken in the past.
(Frost, P., 2003: Chapel House, Dinham, Ludlow: archaeological evaluation, Castlering Archaeology, Report: 151, ESA 5219)

Ludlow; SO 510 744. Two evaluation trenches revealed a medieval stone surfaced yard, a well and a small building, perhaps of an industrial nature, close to the rear of Palmers Hall (PRN 06240), Ludlow. The medieval remains were of good quality, were well preserved and had been truncated only where service trenches had been excavated. The excavators considered it likely that similar deposits existed throughout the western part of the development site. To the east, further from the medieval frontage, the land was probably a garden from the medieval period to the 18th century.

Ludlow; SO 512 746. Three evaluation trenches were excavated to assess a proposed development site, the former Antiques Centre, Pepper Lane, which lies within the medieval core of Ludlow (PRN 06191). A 19th-century cellar had removed part of the street frontage, and a 19th-century alleyway or courtyard and brick building were located to the east of the existing warehouse. Towards the back of the property, structures dating to the late 16th or early 17th century were located, built over medieval made-up ground, which was also seen in the trench to the east. The existence of medieval made-up ground suggests that medieval structural remains may survive elsewhere on the site, although none were found in the evaluation trenches.
Madeley; SJ 696 041. A watching brief was carried out in 2003 in the grounds of St Michael’s Church, Madeley (PRN 05212) on restoration of the Grave of the ‘Nine Men of Madeley’ (who perished in a 19th-century mining accident). A record was made of the grave prior to dismantling. The railings and slabs were removed for conservation work before being replaced and the grave rededicated later in 2003.


Market Drayton; SJ 676 343. An archaeological evaluation was carried out on the site of Longslow Dairy, Stafford Street, Market Drayton. The area had been extensively damaged by 19th-century cellarrage, but some earlier features were located, including two wells and a patch of brick flooring. Stratigraphy and finds showed the wells to be in use sequentially and that the later well was late post medieval in date. The earlier well was probably also post medieval, although its precise date could not be demonstrated (PRN 06000). No deposits securely dated to the medieval period were found, and it appears that any earlier street frontage structures had been destroyed by the 19th-century house and its cellars. The evaluation did not test the archaeological potential of the back lot area of the site.


Morville; SO 688 925. In October 2003, Shropshire County Council Archaeology Service made site visits to pipeline works for the Stoke St Milborough Area Water Mains Rehabilitation Scheme, at Bridgewalton, near Morville, Shropshire. No archaeological features or deposits were seen in the open sections of pipe trench.

(Hannaford, H. R., 2003: Stoke St Milborough Area Water Mains Rehabilitation Scheme, Morville, Shropshire, ESA 5834)

Moreton Corbet and Lee Brockhurst; SJ 574 227. In February 2003, a photographic survey and watching brief was carried out at Moreton Mill Bridge (PRN 19991) in the parish of Moreton Corbet and Lee Brockhurst, Shropshire. A programme of bridge strengthening works had been undertaken on a number of minor road bridges in the county and as part of this programme of work, the 17th-century bridge was to be strengthened. In view of the historical significance of the bridge it was considered that a photographic record should be made of it before the repairs and a watching brief carried out during the works. A series of colour slides and a series of black and white slides were taken of the bridge before the commencement of the works. No archaeological features were found although it was noted that large lumps of iron bloomery slag were observed in the ground surface by the gateway to the field immediately to the northwest of the bridge – evidence that the 17th-18th-century forge nearby (PRN 04421) was smelting iron not just smithying.


Moreton Corbet and Lee Brockhurst; SJ 574 226. A documentary assessment and building recording was carried out in 2003 in advance of proposed conversion work at Moreton Mill. The property included the site of a former 17th-century iron-working forge (PRN 04421), adapted for use as a corn mill. The present mill (PRN 15659) is a Grade II listed building and the River Roden flows south along the eastern boundary of the site. Documentary references show that an iron-working forge was operating at Moreton Mill on the banks of the River Roden by the mid 17th century. The substantial sandstone foundation layers of the east side of the mill are presumably part of the forge, which appears to have had an external wheelpit on the west side. The forge was enlarged during the mid 18th century but the last known reference is from 1790 when it appears to have gone out of use. There has been little structural change on the site since the 1880s except for the relocation of the waterwheel, which was moved from the internal pit to the external pit on the west side of the mill in the 1950s.


Much Wenlock; SJ 623 100. On 26 March 2003, Shropshire County Council Archaeology Service made a site visit to renewal work on the Much Wenlock Town Culvert (PRN 04638) at St Owen’s Well outside Back Street, Much Wenlock, and also Much Wenlock Abbey. In Back Street, the culvert was seen to be 2.7m wide, running along the middle of the street outside No. 2. The culvert was constructed of a limestone rubble arch, as seen in the various sections recorded on Queen Street and High Street in 2002. Outside the Abbey, three cuts 3m long by 1.5m wide had been made through the road surface adjacent to the Abbey car park into the top of the culvert. The culvert here was again of limestone rubble, here bonded in a white or light grey mortar. The top of the culvert lay circa 0.25m below the road surface. Close access for a more detailed inspection was not possible.
Oswestry; SJ 289 297. A watching brief on groundworks at Castle House Yard (PRN 05796), Willow Street, Oswestry, took place in June 2003. Excavations revealed the foundation courses of pre-1901 walls contemporary with the Coach House, and infill ascribed to the dumping of rubbish into an inspection pit later constructed in the northernmost compartment of the Coach House. Otherwise no archaeological features were revealed and finds recovered were entirely post medieval in date.


Oswestry; SJ 291 296. A watching brief took place in 2003 during the conversion of the old Regal Cinema, Oswestry. A grid of trenches failed to locate the medieval town wall even though the available information strongly suggested that it should cross the area. Instead, a sequence of soil horizons was found extending from the medieval period to the middle of the 19th century (PRN 05802). The excavators concluded that the area had seen little activity, being at the back part of gardens until the late 18th or early 19th century. At that time it was developed for the first time, probably as a warehouse. Within a few decades this was demolished and replaced by a fairly substantial brewery and, finally, by the cinema.


Oswestry; SJ 288 294. In October 2003 an evaluation took place at Oswestry Tennis Club to assess the implications of any future development. In one trench, medieval features were encountered at 0.55m below the present ground surface and included a pit and several post holes (PRN 05794) which produced charred cereal including oats. The other two trenches produced post medieval features including a stone wall and water-deposited silts probably part of a garden feature or pond. A 19th-century wall and pit feature was also uncovered.

(Gouling, C., 2003: Oswestry Tennis Club, Oswestry, Shropshire: report on an archaeological evaluation, Gifford & Partners Ltd, Report: 11227.01/R02, ESA 5525)

Oswestry; SJ 283 291. Following a report from a member of the public of ‘large stones with paint and holes’, Shropshire County Council Archaeology Service visited a development site in Oswestry, where a pile of large stones intended for garden landscaping was present. This included fragments of post medieval worked stone, but the developer informed the archaeologist that the stone had all been purchased from a reclamation yard.

(Hannaford, H. R., 2003: Broomhall Lane, Oswestry, Shropshire: Notes on a site visit, ESA 5896)

Pimhill; SJ 501 176. An archaeological evaluation was carried out at Albright Hussey in 2003 by Castlering archaeology in conjunction with planning proposals to erect new buildings. Albright Hussey is a medieval moated manorial site (PRN 04508) with surviving 16th- and 17th-century buildings which are now used as a hotel and restaurant complex. It was found that the ground had been disturbed and no archaeological features were identified. The deposits included a single sherd of pottery of circa mid 3rd to 4th century date. The sherd is presumed to have come from a heavily gritted cooking vessel and was deposited by plough action.

(Frost, P., 2003: Land at Albright Hussey, Ellesmere Road, Shrewsbury: archaeological evaluation, Castlering Archaeology Report: 144, ESA 4991)

Shrewsbury; SJ 495 123. A watching brief was undertaken to the rear of 48 Wyle Cop, Shrewsbury (PRN 20221) in 2003 by Castlering Archaeology in connection with rebuilding works. These works included the demolition of modern buildings and ground disturbance work near to the stables at the rear. The stables stand within the yard of the Lion and Pheasant Inn (PRN 10659), which is thought to have been operating as a coaching Inn since the 16th century. No features were found other than those associated with the stable block.

(Frost, P., 2003: Stables to the rear of No 48 Wyle Cop, Shrewsbury: archaeological watching brief, Castlering Archaeology, Report: 146, ESA 4992)

Shrewsbury; SJ 491 123. A watching brief was carried out at St Winefride’s Convent (PRN 01516) to monitor the excavation of a foundation trench for a new garden wall to separate the convent from the school. The trench was 10 metres long by 600 mm deep at its north eastern end, dropping to 800 mm deep at the south western end. No significant archaeological features or deposits were disturbed by the excavations.

(Hannaford, H. R., 2003: St Winefride’s Convent, Shrewsbury, Shropshire: notes on site visits ESA 5232)
Shrewsbury; SJ 494 126. The excavation of two evaluation trenches at Friary Close, St Mary’s Water Lane, revealed the presence of significant medieval remains (PRN 01463), likely to represent both structures and burials associated with the Dominican Friary founded in the 1220s. Other archaeological deposits, including post medieval and modern walls, deposits and drains were also recorded. Due to the non-intrusive nature of much of the work, little dating evidence was recovered for much of the deposits and features encountered. Only a general phasing of the remains was possible.

(Fielding, S., 2003: St Mary’s Water Lane, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, Marches Archaeology, Report 286, ESA 5383)

Shrewsbury; SJ 486 105. Three trenches were excavated to evaluate the area of a proposed extension to Holy Trinity Church (PRN 10681). No significant features were found in two of the trenches but a 19th-century brick privy was seen in the third trench. The privy pre-dates the present church and was probably related to the former vicarage (PRN 08487).

(Kenney J., 2003: Holy Trinity Church, Meole Brace, Shropshire: report on an archaeological evaluation, Marches Archaeology, Report: 313, ESA 5566)

Shrewsbury; SJ 494 126. In autumn of 2003, following an earlier evaluation on the site, a watching brief was carried out on redevelopment work at St Mary’s Water Lane, Shrewsbury. Four test pits were excavated below the proposed new house (which included the footprint of a previous building) to test ground conditions. Despite excavation to a depth of 1.5m, natural deposits were not seen. Foundation trenches and drainage trenches were monitored subsequently. The watching brief uncovered a small number of medieval graves associated with the Dominican Friary (PRN 01463). The human remains retrieved during the watching brief appeared to be part of a deeply stratified cemetery which may have continued in use until the 18th century. One grave contained the remains of a priest buried circa 1400 with a pewter chalice. Investigation of the earliest features and deposits indicated several periods of activity which may pre-date the foundation of the Friary.

(Jeffery, S., 2003: St Mary’s Water Lane, Shrewsbury, Shropshire: A report on an archaeological watching brief, Marches Archaeology, Report: 326, ESA 5594)

Shrewsbury; SJ 490 126. A watching brief was carried out on groundworks during redevelopment of land to the rear of 60 Mardol, Shrewsbury. The top of the medieval town wall (PRN 62401) was partially uncovered during the excavation of various phases of landfill. Six courses of the east face of the wall were revealed below the excavation level. The face of the wall was constructed of pink sandstone blocks, one of which was 0.22m wide and 0.16m high. The stone behind the face was blue sandstone blocks of various sizes set in yellow brown clay. The wall was 1.64m wide. A post medieval wall foundation, re-using stone from the town wall, had been built on top of it.


Shrewsbury; SJ 493 124. An archaeological desk-based study and outline field evaluation of the Guildhall site, Shrewsbury, was undertaken in 2003. The work involved documentary research and site visits designed to assess the potential archaeology of the site; a preliminary outline assessment was also made of the standing buildings in the study area.


Shrewsbury; SJ 493 120. In July 2003, Shropshire County Council Archaeology Service made a visit to Longden Coleham, Shrewsbury, to record a section of sandstone wall revealed in the back garden of the property. The wall had been exposed during the excavation for footings for a conservatory. The wall comprised grey sandstone blocks, red sandstone rubble and early 19th-century bricks bonded in a white to light grey mortar. The wall corresponded in location precisely to a garden wall shown on the Ordnance Survey 1st edition 1:500 town plan of 1882. No other archaeological features or deposits had been exposed by the works.

(Hannaford, H. R., 2003: 106 Longden Coleham, Shrewsbury, Shropshire: Notes on a site visit, ESA 5836)

Shrewsbury; SJ 496 121. In May 2003, Shropshire County Council Archaeology Service carried out a watching brief on the excavation of foundation trenches for an extension to the northeast side of the Barnabas Christian Fellowship Centre on Longden Coleham, Shrewsbury. A test pit revealed about 1m depth of modern (19th-20th century) yard soils lying beneath the existing driveway, over at least a further 1m depth of organic greyish brown silt. It was subsequently decided to raft the foundations and an area of the modern yard soils c10m long by 2.5m wide by 1m deep was removed. No archaeological features or deposits were revealed.

(Hannaford, H., 2003: Barnabas Christian Fellowship Centre, Longden Coleham, Shrewsbury, ESA 5837)
Shrewsbury; SJ 489 128. A documentary assessment was carried out in 2003 in connection with proposals for the erection of dwellings at Builder’s Yard, Frankwell Quay, Shrewsbury (PRN 04699). The assessment identified the possibility of remains associated with medieval and post medieval industrial (particularly the leather industry) and quayside activity, in the more northerly parts of the area. The south end of the site probably lay within the river channel until the later 18th or 19th century.


Shrewsbury; SJ 488 125. An architectural analysis and desk top assessment of the cottages 3–4 Claremont Court, Shrewsbury (PRN 20686) was carried out in advance of their proposed demolition. An outline survey of the property was undertaken and a photographic record made, but the interior was not accessible because the buildings were in a dangerous condition.

(Morriss, R. K., 2003: 3–4 Claremont Court, Shrewsbury, Shropshire: an architectural analysis & archaeological desk top study, Mercian Heritage Series Report: 188, ESA 5941)

Stanton Lacy; SO 495 788. A watching brief was carried out at St Peter’s Church, Stanton Lacy (PRN 00980) in 2003 on remedial drainage works as part of a larger programme of repairs and maintenance. The new drainage trench was largely dug within an existing trench. No archaeological features were found and no burials were disturbed. The southern wall of the south transept of the church (believed to be Saxon) probably lay circa 1 metre to the north of the trench and in any case may have been robbed out or lie at a greater depth than that of these excavations.

(Wainwright J. & Tavener N., 2003: St Peter’s Church, Stanton Lacy, Shropshire: report on an archaeological watching brief, Marches Archaeology, Report: 274, ESA 5382)

St. Martin’s; SJ 316 386. An evaluation and subsequent excavation were carried out where the proposed route of a gas pipeline was to cross an earthwork tentatively identified as Wat’s Dyke (PRN 08308). The work demonstrated that the feature was indeed a stretch of Wat’s Dyke (PRN 01001) that was previously unknown. The dyke is visible as a terrace like earthwork along the crest of the east side of the Ceiriog Valley. The earthwork is composed of an infilled ditch and the remains of a possible counterscarp bank.

(Kenney, J., 2003: Overton to Chirk Gas Pipeline: Lower House Farm, Pen y Bryn: Report on an archaeological evaluation and excavation on Wat’s Dyke, Marches Archaeology Report: 296, ESA 5480)

The Gorge; 692032. An investigation was made into features within Lloyds Coppice, Madeley, in 2003. Lloyd’s Coppice lies within an area of extensive industrial activity which has been ongoing since the 18th century. Two features were identified. An inscribed stone was uncovered during landscaping work. The inscription appears to consist of four rows of writing, two of letters and two of numbers but the text is indiscernible. Five long pieces of wrought iron (thought to have been part of a plateway) were also found. The plateway, first shown running thought the coppice on the 1st edition OS Map of 1883 would have served to transport materials from the pits of Lloyds Coppice to Blists Hill.

(Roper, S., 2003: Archaeological Investigation of features within Lloyds Coppice, Madeley, Ironbridge Archaeology, Report number 141, ESA 5230)

The Gorge; SJ 697 023. An archaeological watching brief was undertaken in 2003 on the redevelopment of existing buildings at the Nuway Site, Coalport. The site has been associated with industrial activity for over 200 years and is located adjacent to the Coalport China Works. Despite large amounts of dumped material spanning the entire history of the site (up to present day), amongst the features uncovered during the excavations were masonry warehouse river steps, a number of brick walls and a large amount of ceramic waste including tea cups, coffee cups and porcelain miniatures.

(White, S., 2003: Nuway Site: Reynolds’s Wharf Redevelopment, Coalport, Shropshire, Ironbridge Archaeology Report 105, ESA 5526)

Wellington; SJ 651 114. A desk-based assessment was carried out in 2003, on an area to the rear of 17 Tan Bank, Wellington, due to its proximity to the historic core of the town (PRN 05278). The historic maps suggest that Tan Bank began to be built up in the 1820s but the level of detail on these maps does not allow the exact details of 17 Tan Bank to be discerned. Cartographic and documentary evidence suggest that the land was not built upon until the cinema was built in 1911. The depth of disturbance from the construction of the cinema is unclear due to the dumping of hardcore for the levelling of the site in 1911. Archaeology cut into the subsoil below may well be preserved.

Welsampton and Lyneal; SJ 433 349. In March 2003 a watching brief was carried out on excavations for a water pipeline at the church of St Michael and all Angels, Welsampton (PRN 08597). No evidence for burials was found, but at the extreme south east end of the trench there was a high concentration of bricks and mortar. This may have been associated with the 1840s boundary wall, but is more likely to have come from the demolished 1788 church.

(Maxfield, C., 2003: Churchyard of St Michael and all Angels, Welsampton, Shropshire, ESA 5883)

Westbury; SJ 353 094. An evaluation trench was excavated in advance of a proposed residential development in Westbury in 2003. The site was in close proximity to the postulated line of a Roman Road. The evaluation results showed that a pebble surface survived below 18th century garden soil which could be associated with a field boundary that survived as a stony bank. Partial excavation of the surface produced no datable evidence except for a single undated fragment of ceramic building material.


West Felton; SJ 341 252. A watching brief at the beginning of 2003 in West Felton by Marches Archaeology revealed a number of ditches probably relating to medieval cultivation together with a comparatively detailed plan of part of the Old Rectory (PRN 08106). No evidence of medieval occupation was located, despite the groundworks being widely distributed over the development site. The results of the watching brief strongly suggest that the medieval town did not extend along this part of Threadneedle Street.

(Kenney, J., 2003: The Old Rectory, West Felton, Shropshire: report on an archaeological watching brief, Marches Archaeology Report: 279, ESA 5112)

Whitchurch; SJ 541 412. In November 2003, a desk-based assessment was undertaken on a proposed development site at Bark Hill, Whitchurch. The site included the former Plume of Feathers Inn at 18 Bark Hill together with a car parking area on its north side, the former Builders Offices, 26 Bark Hill and the land to the rear of these properties, the gardens of Nos. 20 to 24 Bark Hill and the cobbled builders yard and workshop behind No. 26. An evaluation of the site in 2004 (ESA 5592) revealed that the area to the rear of the Inn had been severely disturbed. Several pits were revealed and archaeological deposits recovered were entirely post medieval in date.


Whitchurch; SJ 532 431. A building survey was carried out at Fields Farm, near Hinton, in 2003. The farm includes several brick built agricultural buildings and a substantial timber framed farmhouse. The north west range of the farmhouse was probably built in 1774 utilising a recycled timber frame. During restoration of this timber frame it was discovered that the dimensions of the timber framed section of the house had been reduced at some point during its history. Despite this, a brick extension had been added in 1782 and in the 19th century, a substantial house added to the south. The timber frame portion was partially demolished again in 1928.

(Meeson, B., 2003: The Fields Farm, Hinton: an Archaeological Assessment: Meeson Report number 03/26, ESA 5227)

Whixall; SJ 491 346. In February 2003, an archaeological survey was carried out at Stark’s Bridge (PRN 01009) to record the canal walls and any other features that may have been revealed when a section of the canal around the bridge was drained to enable repairs. Stark’s Bridge is a timber canal lifting bridge of late 18th-century date and carries Maltkiln Lane across the Prees Branch of the Shropshire Union Canal (originally the Ellesmere Canal) near Whixall. A series of colour and black and white photographs was taken of the bridge after the canal had been drained and prior to repair work commencing.


Wroxeter and Uppington; SJ 565 089. During June 2003, a watching brief was carried out within the confines of the Roman city of Viroconium, in connection with the repair of a burst watermain. The trench was excavated by hand and spoil was monitored for finds. The excavation did not impact on in situ archaeology; the layers investigated were found to be from previous work to the watermain. Despite waterlogging, a possible stratigraphic horizon was recorded at a depth of 0.35m and several sherds of Roman pottery, including one piece of Samian ware were found.

(Hewson, M., 2003: Wroxeter watermain: an archaeological watching brief, Birmingham University Field Archaeology Unit, Report number: 1084, ESA 5225)
ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS IN SHROPSHIRE IN 2004

By SALLY THOMPSON

A summary of the work undertaken in 2004 in the County of Shropshire and the Unitary Authority of Telford and Wrekin that was subsequently reported to the Sites and Monuments Record, Shropshire County Council.

The references in brackets beginning PRN are the County Sites and Monuments Record numbers for individual sites and the references beginning ESA are the County Sites and Monuments Record numbers for individual events or activities such as archaeological excavations. I would like to thank the contributors who provided summaries for some of the reports included in this review.

**Acton Burnell; SJ 534 019.** Two trenches were excavated at Concord College, Acton Burnell, in connection with a proposed development within the designated area of the scheduled monument of Acton Burnell Castle (PRN 05050). Features and deposits dating to the 13th-14th century (probably indicating the construction of a short lived timber building associated with the castle complex) were found to survive on the site, and there was also evidence of medieval smelting. There was little evidence of occupation in the early post medieval period, but signs of 18th-century terracing probably associated with the construction of Acton Burnell Hall (PRN 13182) were seen in one of the trenches.


**Acton Scott; SO 457 898.** A geophysical survey was carried out as part of an evaluation of a proposed visitor centre site at Acton Scott Historic Farm. Area 1 of the geophysical survey identified a magnetic anomaly intersecting the known cropmark enclosure (PRN 04419). Excavation later showed this to be a telephone cable trench. The resistivity survey picked up a number of anomalies which were at first interpreted as representing traces of former ridge and furrow. However, all three excavation trenches found layers of geotextile membrane covering the site, whilst no physical traces of ridge and furrow were seen; it was therefore suggested at the end of the evaluation that the linear anomalies might have been produced by rows of pegs holding down the membrane.


**Acton Scott; SO 457 898.** In 2004 a proposal was put forward to construct a new visitor facility and an associated car parking area at Acton Scott Historic Farm, near Church Stretton. An evaluation was carried out of the proposed site, which abutted the Scheduled area of Acton Scott Roman villa (PRN 00168), and was known to contain the western part of a cropmark enclosure (PRN 04419) centred in the Scheduled area. A geophysical survey of the study area was carried out by Stratascan and three trial trenches were excavated by the Shropshire County Council Archaeology Service. The trenches were intended to locate and identify rather than fully excavate any archaeological deposits. The evaluation confirmed the existence of significant archaeological remains associated with the cropmark enclosure and the villa in the eastern part of the site. The western arm of the enclosure ditch was located running along the eastern edge of the study area. The fill of the enclosure ditch included Roman brick and tile, including identifiable pieces of tegula and hypocauste brick. It was recommended that the area of the enclosure should be excluded from development.

(Hannaford, H. R., 2004: An archaeological evaluation at Acton Scott historic working farm, Shropshire, Shropshire County Council Archaeology Service: Report 230, ESA 5775)
Barrow; SO 691 999. In August 2004 a systematic fieldwalking exercise was carried out at Caughley Quarry in advance of further quarrying. Part of the area was under pasture and so could not be covered, but the remainder had been freshly ploughed. Much of the fieldwalking area lay within the area which was open caste mined in the 1960s, but there was a potential to recover material redeposited during ground restoration. The quantity of material recovered was disappointing. The finds recovered produced no evidence of occupation in the area prior to the mid 17th century. The fine ceramic material which was recovered was directly related to Caughley Chinaworks (PRN 00664), dating from the 1770s onwards. It included 11 sherds of blue and white underglazed ceramics typical of 18th-century Caughley ware, together with over 200 sherds of biscuit ware. All the sherds were small and abraded and probably originated from the dispersal of rubbish tips. Other material recovered included 56 pieces of saggars and tile fragments some of which date to the mid 18th century.

(Frost, P., 2004: Caughley Quarry, Broseley, Shropshire: fieldwalking for finds report – Phase 5 quarry extension, Castlering Archaeology Report 185, ESA 5842)

Bishop’s Castle; SO 321 879. In February 2004 the Lydbury Field Group carried out a measured survey of ridge and furrow at The Novers (PRN 08592) in Bishop’s Castle. Subsequently, map analysis was carried out which showed the development of the landscape to the south of Bishop’s Castle between the mid 18th century and the present day. Nine ridges were recorded running down slope, south to north. They varied considerably in height and depth. The distance between ridge tops varied from a maximum of 12 metres to a minimum of 7 metres. The greatest present depth is 0.5 metres. This area of ridge and furrow is part of a larger system of ridge and furrow to the south of Bishop’s Castle. By the time the Tithe Map of 1843 was created, this land had been divided up into regular fields much as it is today.

(Lydbury Field Group, 2004: Ridge and furrow at the Novers, Bishop’s Castle, Shropshire: a report on research and survey, ESA 5899)

Bromfield; SO 481 768. In September 2004 a watching brief was carried out on remedial drainage works at the Church of St Mary the Virgin, Bromfield (PRN 10736). No features or deposits relating to an earlier church or the monastic complex were uncovered, but the foundation of a buttress was encountered, as were two-lined brick burial vaults. Numerous skeletons were excavated, but there was an unusual find of a pewter chalice indicating a priest’s burial (more normally found on the south side of a church). All the human remains disturbed during these works were retained for reburial elsewhere in the churchyard.

(Wainwright, J., 2004: The Church of St Mary the Virgin, Bromfield, Shropshire: a report on an archaeological watching brief, Marches Archaeology Report: 359, ESA 5920)

Chirbury with Brompton; SO 244 974. An emergency recording was undertaken at East Dudston motte (PRN 01216) due to damage caused to its north face during road widening works. The face was cleaned, illustrated and photographed. Two sherds of unstratified post medieval pottery were recovered as well as one 19th-century tile fragment from the top of the motte.

(Sears, V., 2004: Motte at East Dudston Farm, Chirbury, Shropshire: a report on emergency archaeological recording, Marches Archaeology Report: 339, ESA 5871)

Church Stretton; SO 449 938. In December 2004, Shropshire County Council Archaeology Service undertook a survey of Rectory Wood and Field Countryside Heritage Park, Church Stretton. The survey recorded a number of features associated with the landscaping and development of the site as a landscape park in the 18th and 19th centuries. Most of these features survive in a poor condition and are not of great significance in themselves. However, they are important collectively as surviving elements of an important Shropshire Park.


Craven Arms; SO 430 833. An archaeological watching brief was undertaken by Birmingham Archaeology in May 2004 on groundworks prior to the construction of a Highways Maintenance Depot at land off Long Lane, Craven Arms. Previous work had revealed Roman occupation in the area (PRN 02046). However, no archaeological features were observed and groundworks revealed nothing of archaeological significance.

(Krawiec, K., 2004: Land off Long Lane, Craven Arms, Shropshire: an archaeological watching brief, BUFAU Report: 1137, ESA 5808)

Great Ness; SJ 397 190. In November 2004 an archaeological watching brief took place on the excavation of a water pipe trench through the churchyard and around the west and north sides of St Andrew’s Church, Great Ness (PRN 13277). Outcrops of the natural sandstone bedrock, cut by graves, were recorded to the south-west
of the church. A wall, possibly the footing of a post-medieval buttress, was recorded to the south of the tower. To the north of the nave a cobbled wall footing was recorded running the length of the nave and parallel to it. It was tentatively interpreted as the footing for a medieval north aisle that was abandoned as a result of a design change during construction, mirroring evidence in the standing building for an abandoned south aisle. Stratified under this wall, cuts into the sandstone bedrock on an alignment diagonal to that of the present building were interpreted as features belonging to the pre-Conquest archaeology of the site (PRN 08094).

(Baker, N. J., 2004: An archaeological watching brief at St Andrew’s Church, Great Ness, ESA 5881)

**Kinlet; SO 710 810.** Alterations to drainage at the Church of St John the Baptist, Kinlet (PRN 11871) in 2004 created the need for a programme of archaeological works. A burial soil, a series of drain runs and a levelling deposit were excavated. Two brick vaults were recorded, as was a grave slab. In places the offset footings of the church were exposed. These were built of rough hewn sandstone.

(Wainwright, J., 2004: The Church of St John the Baptist, Kinlet: a report on a programme of archaeological works, Marches Archaeology Report: 347, ESA 5874)

**Leebotwood; SO 470 986.** In September 2004 a watching brief was carried out on the installation of a new footpath and gate at St Mary’s Church, Leebotwood (PRN 13311). This involved the creation of a gap in the churchyard wall and the excavation of a sloping cutting to carry the path from the raised ground of the churchyard to the ground outside, some 0.7m lower. It was observed that the churchyard wall had been terraced into a disturbed loamy layer; the fill behind it produced finds of 19th- and 20th-century date. No significant archaeological features or deposits were encountered.

(Hannaford, H. R., 2004: A watching brief at St Mary’s Church, Leebotwood, Shropshire, Shropshire County Council Archaeology Service: Report 234, ESA 5829)

**Longnor; SJ 493 002.** One trench was excavated on the site of a proposed garage at the Moat House (PRN 00743), Longnor, by Marches Archaeology in 2004. A gully of probable medieval date was excavated. A series of undated stakeholes to the west of the gully could be associated with it. Post holes in the west end of the trench are possibly medieval and are probably part of a structure with the posts removed in the 18th century. Soil horizons excavated in the east end of the trench probably represent garden soils of an early post medieval date. Several 19th-century features were sealed by a 19th-century cobbled yard surface after which the area became a garden.


**Ludlow; SO 516 745.** Excavations were carried out at Lower Galdeford Garage, Ludlow, by Marches Archaeology in early 2004. Two trenches were excavated and two walls associated with the Augustinian Friary of Ludlow (PRN 01770) were uncovered. Post medieval demolition layers and dumps of material overlay these features to a depth of 1.3 metres which are possibly backfill of 19th-century excavations on the site. No occupation levels associated with the walls were reached.


**Ludlow; SO 513 746.** A boundary wall on the line of the medieval town wall was inspected and recorded prior to partial demolition, repair and consolidation works during the conversion of the old Museum Store building. The wall consisted of an upper part of 19th- and 20th-century brickwork, and a lower part of sandstone. The sandstone wall was clearly of at least two phases. The upper part was very narrow and of poor quality, probably a later post medieval rebuild. The lower portion (not affected by the demolition and rebuilding) was thicker, but it was not possible to establish whether it was part of the medieval town wall (PRN 01177) or an early post medieval (possibly post Civil War) rebuild.


**Ludlow; SO 513 746.** An evaluation was carried out at Lower Galdeford in August 2004 in connection with the proposed construction of a Youth Service Building in close proximity to the scheduled ancient monument, the Augustinian Friary of Ludlow (PRN 01770). The evaluation located what appeared to be the eastern wall of an aisled structure and a contemporary cobbled stone floor along with a hearth feature. Three fragments of 14th-century impressed stone tile were identified and are thought to be associated with the demolition layer of the aisled structure.
Ludlow; SO 512 747. Two evaluation trenches were excavated at 9–10 King Street, Ludlow, in January 2004 to assess the site of a proposed development within the medieval core of the town. A sequence of building phases was revealed dating from the 15th century through to the 20th century. The earliest wall found in the first trench may have formed an earlier wall to the churchyard of St Lawrence’s Church (PRN 06186). In the second trench, the plastered internal floor and flagged exterior courtyard of a house dating to the 14th century were found (PRN 06302). It is possible that medieval burials survive at the western end of the site, but none was located in this evaluation.

(Kenney, J., 2004: Land to the rear of 9–10 King Street, Ludlow: a report on an archaeological evaluation, Marches Archaeology Report: 321, ESA 5747)

Ludlow; SO 509 746. A watching brief was carried out in March 2004 on the digging of a trench for the provision of a gate into the garden of Castle House (PRN 01176), Ludlow. The small scale features observed were interpreted as late 19th- or early 20th-century garden features and of little archaeological interest.


Montford; SJ 400 153. A watching brief was carried out in October 2004 on the excavation of footings for an extension and a detached garage at Castle Croft, Montford. Traces of fragmented and eroded sandstone together with lime mortar were located in both areas of excavation (PRN 00052). In the trenches excavated for the house extension, the sandstone appeared to be the remains of walls which had enclosed areas with compacted pebble floors. Fragments of animal bone were compacted into the floor surface. In the excavations for the garage, similar walls appeared to have enclosed a cobbled floor. A ditch or pit with a wet, heavy gravel fill including a minimal amount of sandstone fragments, charcoal and animal bone, was also encountered in the garage excavations. Although no direct dating evidence was recovered from the features, the depth at which they were found (c0.8m to 0.9m below ground surface), together with the fact that there was no documentary evidence for post medieval structures on the site suggests a medieval date.

(Frost, P., 2004: Castle Croft, Shrawardine, Shropshire, Castlering Archaeology Report 189, ESA 5932)

Oswestry; SJ 256 305. A watching brief was undertaken during the excavation of footings for a building extension to Craig Forda, a cottage partly built into the east side of Offa’s Dyke (PRN 01000). The works included the partial demolition of an existing lime-mortared stone retaining wall projecting into the probable alignment of Offa’s Dyke. When this wall was partially removed, extensive stone footings were revealed. The original foundation cut extended across the dyke line. Sections of other parts of the foundations showed that prior to the construction of the cottage in the mid 19th century, the area had been re-landscaped and backfilled with large deposits of varying materials, including clays probably from a cutting south east of the cottage. The remains of wall footings from a building, perhaps an outbuilding, pre-dating the cottage, were found in association with fragments of 18th-century slipware. They showed that the ground surface used to be some 1.4m lower on the cottage site. Documentary research suggested that the footpath approaching the site from the south west used to run in a holloway through a gap in the dyke and into the cottage yard; it too probably predated the cottage, perhaps being a byway up onto Craig Forda, and was buried in later earth moving operations.

(Grant, I., 2004: Offa’s Dyke, Craig Forda, Oswestry: archaeological watching brief, Clwyd-Powys Archaeological Trust Report number: 652, ESA 5869)

Oswestry; SJ 290 297. In August 2004 an evaluation was carried out on the site of a proposed extension to a development site to the rear of 23–27 Bailey Street (PRN 05787), Oswestry. The work consisted of two trenches, one of which (Trench 1) found successive levels of dumping and burning dating back to the medieval period. It was not possible to establish what activity had given rise to the burning other than disposal of waste material of some sort. Where medieval layers survived, they were some 0.4m below the present ground surface.

(Edwards, I., 2004: 23–27 Bailey Street, Oswestry: archaeological evaluation, Cambrian Archaeological Projects; Report 331, ESA 5889)

Pimhill, Shrewsbury, Bicton; SJ 497 166 to SJ 447 135. In 2004 a further assessment was prompted by new proposals for the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road. In this case, six route options were considered, the assessment being carried out through documentary research and a walk over survey of the entire area. The survey had to take place in high summer due to the constraints of the project, so conditions on arable sections of
land were not ideal, with abundant crops and other vegetation. The report recommended a further programme of evaluation for the Berwick cropmark complex (PRN 00010, PRN 00012, PRN 00013), but only a programme of strip recording and watching briefs for the other archaeological features identified.

(Hannaford, H. R., 2004: An archaeological assessment of The Shrewsbury North West Relief Road: Report 233.2, ESA 5846)

**Pontesbury; SJ 399 061.** In July 2004 Shropshire County Council Archaeology Service undertook a site visit on Main Road, Pontesbury to inspect groundworks being undertaken for a small housing development. At the time of the visit, the topsoil had been removed to a depth of about 0.3m over the area of the development. Trenches for the footings of the development had been excavated and filled with concrete. No archaeological features were visible at the time of the visit.

(Hannaford, H. R., 2004: 9 & 10 Main Road, Pontesbury Shropshire: Notes on a site visit, ESA 5833)

**Shrewsbury; SJ 490 122.** An archaeological watching brief was carried out during ground disturbance associated with the construction of a new dwelling on the street frontage of Belmont, Shrewsbury, in March 2004. Reductions in ground levels and the excavation of footings were monitored. No archaeological features were revealed and the few finds recovered were entirely post medieval in date.

(Frost, P., 2004: 16 Belmont, Shrewsbury: archaeological watching brief, Castlering Archaeology Report 174, ESA 5730)

**Shrewsbury; SJ 490 126.** Three trenches were excavated in a further evaluation at Mardol Gardens in 2004 following on from a desk-based assessment in 2002 (ESA 4781). Stratified archaeology dating to the 17th century was reached at a depth of approximately two metres, and archaeological features and deposits including the town ditch (PRN 62406) may exist at deeper levels. A sandstone wall seen in the base of trench one could be part of a post-medieval or medieval building or part of a boundary wall running back from the Mardol frontage. The base of this wall was not reached. Layers abutting this wall probably represent early post-medieval build up of soil but could represent dumping to raise the ground level. In the 17th century the sandstone wall had been re-used as part of the foundation for a brick wall which was on a similar alignment. A later foundation for a building situated in the south of the trench also reused part of the sandstone wall. In the 19th century the ground in the area was built up by about 1.5 metres. The excavators concluded that significant features and deposits were unlikely to survive above the level of the top of the wall.


**Shrewsbury; SJ 493 125.** Through the last part of 2004 three evaluation trenches were excavated to investigate the car park to the north and part of the gardens to the east of the Guildhall, Shrewsbury. In the western part of the site the excavations revealed levelling activity pre-dating the 17th century (PRN 08367). In the eastern part of the site, under the soil of the late 17th-century gardens, was evidence of 14th-century industrial activity. This was on top of made up ground built up during the 13th and early 14th centuries. A small trench through this made up ground revealed activity pre-dating it, which may be of Saxon date. This date was supported by the existence of a residual late Saxon sherd in a later layer.


**Shrewsbury; SJ 493 124.** In June 2004 a watching brief was carried out on the removal of the existing brick floor and bedding in a cellar under the frontage of 3 St Alkmund’s Square (PRN 10486), Shrewsbury. A photographic record was also made of the cellar before and during the work. The cellar was of brick and the earliest constructional features observed were of mid to late 17th-century date. No significant archaeological features were observed when the floor was taken up.

(Hannaford, H. R., 2004: A watching brief at St Alkmund’s Square, Shrewsbury, Shropshire County Council Archaeology Service: Report 232, ESA 5807)

**Shrewsbury; SJ 490 125.** An archaeological watching brief took place at Mardol Head, Shrewsbury, on contractors’ excavations for a slab footing for a public art feature. Within the maximum excavated depth of 1.2m, most of the ground was found to have been previously disturbed in the 19th century, probably by the construction of the nearby Market Hall of 1866–9 (PRN 08377). The north east section lay just outside this disturbance and revealed a sequence of road metalling and make up horizons commencing probably in the 12th-13th century (PRN 62417) and extending the full depth of the excavation.

(Baker, N. J., 2004: An archaeological watching brief at Mardol Head, Shrewsbury, ESA 5867)
Shrewsbury; SJ 492 132. An assessment was carried out at Furrows Garage, Coton Hill, Shrewsbury, prior to proposed redevelopment. The work consisted of a desk-based assessment of the site and a surrounding 200 metre buffer zone, together with a visual assessment of the buildings. Structural remains of historical significance were identified within the buildings (PRN 01530) on the site.


Shrewsbury; SJ 489 099. An evaluation was carried out at Meole Brace, Shrewsbury, on the site of a proposed B&Q development. A series of isolated pits and gullies was found across the proposed development area. None contained any dating evidence of identifiable origin. Some may have been of agricultural origin, as the proposed development area is believed to have been in agricultural use throughout the medieval and post medieval periods but many have been predominantly identified as tree-throws of a periglacial origin. A tree that has been uprooted will also carry a plug of soil with its roots, leaving a hole called a tree throw. This is quite common, particularly on shallow soils such as chalk and gravel. Trench one was excavated to establish the location of a possible second ring ditch feature approximately 50 metres north west of the known double ring ditch (PRN 00014). The geophysical survey had not found any evidence for this second ring ditch. A trench of modern date was located running across the site in a broadly east west direction and is thought to have been part of a trench formation created and used by the Territorial Army in the 1920s and 30s. Following on from the excavations, a desk based assessment was carried out on all existing investigations carried out on the site of a proposed B&Q development at Meole Brace, Shrewsbury in 2004.

(Josephs, A., 2004: B&Q Meole Brace; Assessment of archaeological significance, Andrew Josephs Ltd, ESAs 5891 & 5893)

Shrewsbury; SJ 495 103. A series of features identified as post medieval field boundaries from aerial photographs and geophysical survey was targeted with eight evaluation trenches at New Meadow, Meole Brace in September 2004. The remains were identified together with several pits associated with known coal working in the area. A single ditch produced evidence of possible Romano-British activity (PRN 00015).

(McAree, D., 2004: An archaeological evaluation at New Meadow, Meole Brace, Shrewsbury, Northamptonshire Archaeology, ESA 5931)

Shrewsbury; SJ 494 128. A dendrochronology survey was carried out in 2004 on timbers from the Hall Range (PRN 62506) of Shrewsbury Castle (PRN 01097). Shrewsbury castle was founded shortly after the Norman Conquest. Construction of the Hall was thought to have begun in AD 1164, although it is commonly accepted that it was rebuilt circa 1280 by Edward I as part of his campaign to fortify the Welsh Border. It was enlarged in 1596 and it was not clear as to whether any of the 12th-century timbers remain. Thirty-two timbers were sampled. The earliest felling date identified was for a reset timber over a doorway between the east tower and the balcony which forms part of the current roof structure over the Hall. This was most likely felled in the period AD 1184 – 1214. Nine timbers were dated from the stairways at either end of the Hall and these were most likely felled in the period AD 1234 – 49. Five floor beams from the Hall and three timbers from the screen form a single group of timbers with similar date ranges, one of which retained complete sapwood and was felled in the winter of AD 1647/8.

(Bridge, M. & Miles, D., 2004: Tree-Ring Analysis of timbers from Shrewsbury Castle, Shrewsbury, English Heritage Centre for Archaeology Report 57/2005, ESA 5986)

Welshampton and Lyneal; SJ 437 329. In November 2004 a watching brief was undertaken on the excavation of trenches to carry a water supply pipe and soil pipe to new church facilities at Colemere Church, Ellesmere (PRN 12220). The church was seen to have footings of mortared but undressed masonry rubble, but no finds of archaeological significance were made and no unmarked graves were encountered.

(Baker, N. J., 2004: An archaeological watching brief at Colemere Church, Ellesmere, Shropshire, ESA 5882)

Wem; SJ 514 291. In December 2004 an architectural appraisal of 17 New Street, Wem (PRN 20684) was carried out in advance of demolition. Documentary research indicated that the property comprised two conjoined buildings, one of late 18th- or early 19th-century date and the other of mid 19th-century date. The appraisal of the standing buildings revealed that most of the 19th-century features had been lost in 20th-century conversions for use as offices and shops. The study also noted that the buildings did not have cellars and much of the land to the rear was undeveloped, with the result that the site as a whole has the potential to contain significant archaeological remains of the medieval suburb (PRN 05538) and, possibly, Wem’s Civil War defences (PRN 01637).
Whitchurch; SJ 542 412. Following a desk-based assessment in 2003 (ESA 5572) an evaluation was carried out in February 2004 in connection with the proposed development of the former site of the Plume of Feathers Inn, No. 18 Bark Hill, along with the car park on its north side, the former builder’s offices at No. 26 Bark Hill and the builder’s yard, workshop and gardens to the rear of the houses between No. 18 and No. 26. Three trenches were excavated on the site. The area to the rear of the Inn had been severely disturbed. Several pits were uncovered, all of which were dated to an 18th- and 19th-century date. The area to the rear of the builder’s yard had been cut through to lay services to the workshop and the trench excavated on the car parking area north of the former Inn revealed demolition layers of the properties removed in the 1960s (PRN 05939). Finds recovered from all three trenches were post medieval in date.

Whitchurch; SJ 543 413. An archaeological evaluation and subsequent watching brief of land extending from the street frontage of 14 and 16 Dodington, and including the back plots of 6–12, 14 and 16 Dodington. Four trenches were excavated which were positioned to investigate the survival of any 18th-century or earlier properties along this frontage section of Dodington and also to intercept the edge of a Roman road (PRN 00066). The fourth trench was positioned to investigate the survival of any wooden structures and associated deposits on the edge of the former mere, Deer Moss (PRN 05885). Archaeological evidence revealed a background noise of Roman activity including residual pottery and some possible human cremations (PRN 08475), a significant series of 13th-14th-century deposits including surfaces, possibly metallised paths leading down to Deer Moss and direct evidence for the medieval development of Dodington as part of the expansion of Whitchurch in the High Middle Ages. Also identified was the decline of activity over a long period perhaps related to the sacking of Whitchurch in 1404 and its gradual regrowth in the 15th-16th centuries. 18th-century ground surfaces, yard areas and rubbish pits reflecting domestic occupation of the area from before the 18th century and probably relating to properties along the street frontage shown on a town map of 1761; and 19th-century brick foundations and cellaring for various buildings including an iron foundry and smithy (PRN 05887) noted on the 1st edition OS map of 1880 were also uncovered. Organic silts and artefacts recorded at the east end of the site probably indicate domestic rubbish and discarded animal bone from industrial use dumped into the edge of Deer Moss.

Whittington; SJ 325 311. A conservation plan was commissioned in April 2004 for Whittington Castle (PRN 01003), in order to provide a detailed understanding of the significance of the site, to assess its value and importance as a heritage and community asset, to define any vulnerability issues that might threaten it and to recommend appropriate development opportunities for the future. Whittington Castle comprises the well preserved remains of an enclosed castle and its historic landscape which is well documented for much of its history. The buildings are Grade I listed and the entire site, including earthworks, is a scheduled ancient monument. During its history it has been amongst others a frontier fortress, the residence of a powerful Baron, a convenient source of building stone and a tourist attraction. The standing structures of the visible ruins of the castle fall naturally into two separate sections, the inner bailey, and the better preserved barbican or outer gatehouse.

Worfield; SO 758 958. In the first half of 2004 an archaeological watching brief was carried out at St Peter’s Church (PRN 12136), Worfield on ground level reductions in the western part of the nave, the north aisle and also in the graveyard (PRN 08556) adjacent to the northwest corner of the church. Within the church an archaeological deposit containing large quantities of disarticulated human remains was identified. This has been interpreted as a clearance deposit, probably formed during the Victorian restoration of the interior of the church. Externally a number of probable grave fills were observed, but only one grave was excavated down to the skeleton. This was retained by the contractors on behalf of the PCC for re-interment in the church grounds.

(Frost, P., 2004: Nos 18 and 26 Bark Hill, Whitchurch (the Plume of Feathers & Builders Yard): Archaeological evaluation, Castlering Archaeology Report 172, ESA 5592)

(Whittington; SJ 325 311. A conservation plan was commissioned in April 2004 for Whittington Castle (PRN 01003), in order to provide a detailed understanding of the significance of the site, to assess its value and importance as a heritage and community asset, to define any vulnerability issues that might threaten it and to recommend appropriate development opportunities for the future. Whittington Castle comprises the well preserved remains of an enclosed castle and its historic landscape which is well documented for much of its history. The buildings are Grade I listed and the entire site, including earthworks, is a scheduled ancient monument. During its history it has been amongst others a frontier fortress, the residence of a powerful Baron, a convenient source of building stone and a tourist attraction. The standing structures of the visible ruins of the castle fall naturally into two separate sections, the inner bailey, and the better preserved barbican or outer gatehouse.)

(Worfield; SO 758 958. In the first half of 2004 an archaeological watching brief was carried out at St Peter’s Church (PRN 12136), Worfield on ground level reductions in the western part of the nave, the north aisle and also in the graveyard (PRN 08556) adjacent to the northwest corner of the church. Within the church an archaeological deposit containing large quantities of disarticulated human remains was identified. This has been interpreted as a clearance deposit, probably formed during the Victorian restoration of the interior of the church. Externally a number of probable grave fills were observed, but only one grave was excavated down to the skeleton. This was retained by the contractors on behalf of the PCC for re-interment in the church grounds.)

(Frost, P., 2004: Nos 18 and 26 Bark Hill, Whitchurch (the Plume of Feathers & Builders Yard): Archaeological evaluation, Castlering Archaeology Report 172, ESA 5592)

(Frost, P., 2004: Nos 18 and 26 Bark Hill, Whitchurch (the Plume of Feathers & Builders Yard): Archaeological evaluation, Castlering Archaeology Report 172, ESA 5592)
BOOK REVIEWS


This latest contribution to the series of volumes cataloguing the sculpture of Roman Britain is divided into two parts. The first deals with Chester and Cheshire, the second with Wroxeter and Wall (Staffs.) and the few other pieces from the rest of Shropshire and Staffordshire. My review will discuss the second part because of its direct interest to readers of these *Transactions*.

The catalogue is preceded by a discursive introduction. Firstly, the main type of stone used at Wroxeter is identified as Hoar Edge Grit from between Harnage and Cardington; although superficially similar this is not to be confused with oolitic limestone, characteristic of the Cotswold region.

With regard to style Henig considers the most accomplished piece from Wroxeter to be a Venus statue, part of a fountain, belonging to the military period (No. 141 in the catalogue). The army tombstone he rates as competent with the exception of the memorial of a cavalryman of a Thracian cohort which he condemns as poorly designed with a naïve representation of a horse (No. 146). Henig speculates that the monuments in the cemeteries that would have lined the roads into Wroxeter in the civilian period may have been of higher quality workmanship if the tombstone of Placida and Deuccus is representative of the lost material (No. 150).

There are several good quality pieces of religious sculpture from Wroxeter. Among these are: fragments of two Jupiter columns, one with a modelled horse head (No. 165a), the other with Bacchus and Cupid reliefs (No. 138); a female head which Henig identifies as probably representing a *mater* (No. 145); a relief of Venus and Cupid (No. 142); and a Corinthian pilaster capital (No. 166).

In considering both the Wroxeter and Chester material Henig is unable to make a case for the existence of a North-West Midlands school of sculpture. He characterises the region as being at the ‘very edge of the empire’ (p. xxiv), with too few wealthy patrons to encourage the development of a significant school of locally-based sculptors or to attract many itinerant workers. What we know archaeologically of the region supports his opinion.

The paucity of the remains only allows Henig to make a few disconnected observations about various subject areas. Discussing religion, he notes the similarity of the Jupiter columns at Wroxeter to those in the Rhine-Moselle region, where the cult originated. The continued survival of native beliefs may be exemplified in the head carvings found in the forum (Nos. 157, 158), the head being regarded as a site of immanent power. Wroxeter must have had its share of imperial sculpture, though all that probably remains are the finger and eye of a bronze statue (Nos. 184, 185).

The architectural sculpture at Wroxeter, particularly the types of Corinthians capitals employed, are evidence for architects from Trier working there. Two of the foliate capitals were made by a sculptor familiar with a style found in second-century Italy; he was probably in the civitas capital for only a specific, limited commission.

The second part of the catalogue is devoted to Shropshire and Staffordshire. Henig pays due respect to the contribution made towards this by the late Graham Webster. The corpus is subdivided into sections: Graeco-Roman Deities; Oriental Deities (only an uncertain identification with Attis); Portraiture; Funerary Monuments; Altars to Unknown Deities; Unidentified Anthropomorphic Figures; Animals and Plants; Phalli; Architectural Carvings (incorporating work by the late T. F. C. Blagg); Bronze Statuary; *Incerta, Falsa et Aliena*.

The individual numbered entries consist of: a brief description and plate reference; provenance (curiously without a National Grid Reference, although this would not be possible in many cases); location (present location of the piece, if known, with accession numbers); full bibliographic references; description; discussion, parallels and interpretation; chronology. These scholarly accounts are exemplary.
The volume is a comprehensive and well-illustrated corpus, valuable both to specialists in Roman Britain and to readers with a more general interest in this period of Shropshire’s history.

David M. Browne
Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Wales


This is an exceptional book, for it sets out to do something that has been attempted for no other English county: to write its entire architectural history from the Middle Ages to the end of the nineteenth century: from Anglo-Saxon churches to nonconformist chapels, from castles to country houses, from peasants’ cottages to semi-detached suburban houses. Its author, Eric Mercer, who died in 2001, wrote with the authority of a senior member of the staff of the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments and with the personal knowledge of someone who had himself lived in the county for the last twenty years of his life. Intellectually he was a Marxist, who was as interested in the ‘social function’ of buildings as he was in their structure or their aesthetic pretensions. Originally conceived as a part of the now defunct Victoria County History of Shropshire, this volume now appears on its own as a personal contribution to the architectural history of Mercer’s adopted county.

The book begins with a discussion of the late Anglo-Saxon and early Norman churches which are Shropshire’s earliest recognizable architecture: which are Norman and which are pre-Conquest in date is debatable. Mercer argues that the herring-bone masonry that is a feature of several of these churches was more often than not commissioned by Norman, not Saxon, lords recruiting native masons for an extensive rural church-building programme. That Shropshire did not subsequently play an important part in the development of Romanesque architecture in England he attributes to that fact that there was no ‘richly endowed Cathedral or minster ready to take part in the architectural competition between sees that was beginning in the late twelfth century’. The lack of a cathedral church can indeed be felt throughout the county’s history. Henry VIII did at one time contemplate converting Shrewsbury Abbey into the seat of a bishop, but his failure to do so deprived Shropshire of an ecclesiastical capital, and left it divided between three neighbouring dioceses. On the churches built between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries Mercer writes with evident expertise, but there is probably more that is innovative in his chapter on church-building from 1550 to 1800, a period of greater activity than has often been recognised owing to the determined efforts of the nineteenth-century ecclesiologists to efface the work of previous generations of Anglicans. As he points out, some of the finest church roofs in the county are of post-Reformation date, notably the hammer-beam structures at Shifnal, Donington and Ford. What he writes about the county’s (or rather the dioceses’?) response to the Laudian church-building campaign of the 1630s also deserves attention.

In a county where, before the end of the seventeenth century, much of the architecture was timber-framed, the advent of dendrochronology has given a new precision to its architectural history of which Mercer has made systematic use. Though a few cricket houses can now be reliably dated to the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries, most of the surviving ones have proved to be fifteenth century and crucks were still being reared well into the Tudor period. The paucity of stone domestic building in late medieval Shropshire Mercer attributes to ‘the decline in the political importance of the Border counties’ once Wales was conquered and the Marches had ceased to be of military importance. However this may be, the presence from the reign of Henry VII onwards of the Council in the Marches of Wales with its seat at Ludlow Castle is likely to have been an effective deterrent to any great magnates seeking to dominate the county, and this may be the reason why, as Mercer observes, there were no ‘prodigy houses’ in Shropshire.

In the course of a well-informed review of the houses of the Stuart and Georgian gentry Mercer observes that ‘After the Restoration all the rich turned to stone or brick. Timber became poor men’s material’. This draws attention to one of the few weaknesses of this book: there is no discussion of the history of the building trades, nor of the stone-quarries which elsewhere were so often the making of local dynasties of mason-architects. Turning to ‘Grinshill’ (the source of some of Shropshire’s best freestone) in the index, the only references one finds are to the church, a house and some cottages. It may be significant that the local building craft association, the names of whose wardens are known from 1585 onwards, was of Carpenters and Bricklayers, but did not formally include Masons, though some masons were members of it by the eighteenth century.

A lively chapter on secular architecture from 1740 to 1830, with sub-headings such as ‘An architecture common to Men of Property: the elimination of vernacular architecture’ and ‘Shropshire architecture and the Industrial Revolution’ is followed by an innovative one on ‘Domestic Architecture 1830–1900, The Classes and the Masses’, where the author’s interest in middle- and working-class housing in places like Shrewsbury and Oswestry breaks new ground. Commercial and public architecture, including factories, shops, schools and
The twentieth century largely ignored nineteenth-century Ludlow, or – where obliged to address its achievements – disparaged these (vide Pevsner and Clifton-Taylor). Ludlow was medieval and Georgian, and the Victorian years were perceived, as the preface aptly puts it, as a ‘dowdy postscript to a glorious past’. Such collective amnesia is common in local history, and is fundamental to the operation of the heritage industry. So the determination of the Ludlow Historical Research Group to swim against the tide and to apply their formidable resources of enthusiasm and research skills to the Victorian era is particularly welcome. The outcome is a valuable and original volume of essays which recover the town’s forgotten past, and will encourage the present inhabitants to rethink Ludlow’s historic (and perhaps contemporary) identity.

The eleven essays fall into two main groups. The first tackles the issue of how people made a living in Victorian Ludlow. Exploiting in particular the riches of the decennial censuses David Lloyd provides an overview of the town’s economy and patterns of employment, emphasizing change rather than decline, as there was a shift away from manufacturing businesses and jobs to those (such as dealing and transport) which supported Ludlow’s role as a service centre for its rural region. Lloyd’s specialist chapter on shops and shopkeepers reinforces the notion of a service-based economy, as does the chapter by Jean Brown on domestic servants, an occupation of growing importance for much of the Victorian era for women classified in the censuses as in employment.

The second major group of essays revolves around institutions. Martin Speight’s two contributions explore Parliamentary elections in the town between 1832 and 1867, and local government, in the latter case focusing upon the provision of public services such as gas, water and sewerage. Without underplaying the Victorian achievement in developing the urban infrastructure, Speight highlights the extent to which the improvement agenda has its roots in the eighteenth century, and the acute problems (not least the high levels of politicking) involved in implementing that agenda. Derek Williams and Ivan Hall explore the impact of the new poor law, which contributed substantially to the harsh regime operating in the workhouse (only relieved a little towards the end of the century), and led to a systematic and sustained erosion of the level of outdoor relief. Two further elements in the urban institutional structure that attract the attention of the Ludlow team are education (David Lloyd) and the established church (Christopher Train), the latter enjoying an apparent revival during the forty-year incumbency (1867–1907) of the severe and autocratic (as some saw it) rector, Edward ffarington Clayton. To the above essays are added a revealing study (Christopher Train) of the expansion of the eastern suburbs, so that while the population of the historic core dropped that of the town as a whole grew, and a multi-authored miscellany based on diary evidence that touches on matters such as the arrival of the railways and ‘entertainments’.

All the essays contain original research based in the archives, and the sources are well referenced. There is plenty of meaty information (much conveyed through well laid out tables and charts), and the authors generally address important and well articulated questions. The volume is handsomely put together with an outstanding array of illustrations that add to, rather than simply ornament, the arguments. In many respects this is a model local history, and one which both lay people and professional historians will undoubtedly want to consult.
There are, of course, many ways of organizing a local study. An alternative approach might raise three questions of the volume. First, how comprehensive and integrated is the view that we are given of the Victorian town? There is, for example, a chapter on the Anglican church but very little on nonconformity despite its importance in the town’s religious make up. Most of the chapters contain valuable and telling comments about social structure and class, but there is no one point where the issue is treated in a concerted fashion. Structures of power are alluded to (the formidable alliance between the late Victorian rector and the Windsor Clive family is well demonstrated), but there is no sustained attempt to unravel these. On occasions there is the feeling that the study is being driven by the sources and the institutions which produced them, rather than presenting an integrated vision of the community. Second, what was distinctive about Ludlow? This is, of course, a difficult task since it requires systematic comparison with other places. However, it is only through such comparison than the ‘local’ in local history really takes on meaning. Third, how does Ludlow relate to the world beyond it – its rural hinterland (Lloyd rightly emphasizes the town’s regional service role as the key to its economic success), the urban system, and to the regional and national states? The essays on poverty demonstrate the way that the new poor law unions cut across traditional parish and urban communities, threatening their autonomy, and many of the contributions point to the growing interaction – often the source of considerable friction – between the local and national state, with the latter slowly but surely extending its influence.

The approaches outlined above represent alternative, but not necessarily more effective, ways of tackling a local history. This volume should be judged by what it is: a pioneering and revealing piece of teamwork, which recovers a neglected era of Ludlow’s history, and which maintains impressive scholarly standards at the same time as being highly enjoyable to read.

Peter Borsay
University of Wales, Lampeter


It is fitting that these two books should be published in 2005 and mark in some way forty years of dedicated research by Dr. Trinder on the social and economic history of the East Shropshire coalfield. The first edition of the valuable anthology The Most Extraordinary District was published in 1977 and now appears in its third edition. The first edition contained thirty-three entries and the present fifty-three and amongst them three valuable new accounts of the district by foreign travellers: Reinhold Rucker Angerstein, a Swedish industrial spy (1754); Jabez Maude Fisher, a Pennsylvania Quaker (1776) and two aristocratic French brothers, Francois and Alexandre de La Roche Foucauld (1785). Of these, that of Angerstein is of particular interest for the history of lead mining and smelting in Shropshire. His account was probably garbled in the first place and has certainly been muddled by the English translator and requires further explanation. He says that there was a lead smelter on the site of Joshua Gee’s short-lived nail making enterprise at the lower end of Coalbrookdale. (This smelter is known.) Angerstein says that the smelter was supplied from the mines of ‘Lord Pauvres’ (presumably the Marquess of Powis) and from ‘Pannels’. This is correctly identified as Pennerley. The Marquess of Powis had never had a smelter in the gorge as his lead from Llangynog had been smelted at Llandrinio. However, Thomas Powys of the Abbey, Shrewsbury, and Berwick and his partners were mining at Pennerley from 1727 and possibly retained the smelter until the 1760s when they moved to Pulley. The production figures of the smelter are sadly garbled, the writer saying that good ore yielded eight tons of lead a week and hardly credibly that production was a mere sixty tons a year. His other comments are more illuminating.

The book is handsomely and generously illustrated with a wide range of prints, drawings and photographs. There is a new introduction and an up-to-date reading list. It is a most valuable companion for any visitor to the area and a marvellous resource for industrial and local historians. The editor is confident that further significant accounts of the area will emerge in course of time.

Barges and Bargemen, for good archival reasons, starts in 1660 by which time the Upper Severn was already an old Navigation. The coal mines and river wharves of Broseley had been busy for a century and the trade in pig and bar iron between the Upper, Middle and Lower Severn had been active since the 1630s, feeding the iron-working trades of the West Midlands. Worcester had probably been dependent on Broseley and Madeley coal since the late 1570s. Madeley stone had been shipped to Bewdley for the building of Kyre Park in the 1590s and stone slates had been carried from Bristol to Shrewsbury in the 1580s. Delabole slates had probably followed the same route to Moreton Corbet castle in the 1580s. Floats of timber and firing had been passing down river under Montford Bridge to Shrewsbury since at least the later 13th century and by the early 15th
century goods whether passing over or under the bridge by barge were tolled. Henry II dispatched lead from the Stiperstones region to Wiltshire by barge and Henry III used the river to move wine from the lower river to Bridgnorth castle and beyond. A Tewkesbury boat was used to ferry stone for the town walls of Shrewsbury in the mid 13th century. In the mid 15th century a Bridgnorth merchant imported barrels of salted herrings from Bristol and at much the same time a Ludlow merchant was exporting his cloth to Portugal via Bristol and returning with a cargo of wine and fruit. Ludlow’s ties with Bristol from the Middle Ages onwards via Bewdley, however, are part of the trade of the Middle Severn and regrettably outside the limits of this book.

Understandably Dr. Trinder starts his book, as mentioned above, in 1660 when both the probate inventories, on which he and others have worked so profitably, and the Gloucester Port Books become plentiful. There is no single magical source which can unlock the history of the navigation and what he has done is to use his encyclopedic knowledge of the sources for the economic and social history of East Shropshire and distill all that relates to the river. The result is a fascinating description of the trade and the bargemen who plied the river down to the late 19th century, taking full advantage of the 19th-century census returns to reveal relationships between bargemen from Shrewsbury down to Worcester. The Port Books reveal only such trades as passed through Gloucester and regrettably these are unrevealing after about 1725 and say nothing of the massive trades in iron which circulated on the Upper and Middle Severn in the period. For these reference is made to such records that survive for the industrial concerns of the area, and these are skilfully used to demonstrate the navigation at its height and how canals, railways and improved roads led to the decline of the navigation in the 19th century. There are inevitably some omissions. Estate and institutional records reveal a trade in Westmorland slate to Shrewsbury between 1760 and 1800 for quality works. The archives of Lord Powis in the early 18th century reveal a trade in thousands of tons of lead down river to Bristol from his Llangynog enterprise. The lack of information after about the 1720s conceals a continuous trade in Shropshire lead to Bristol. This is regrettably impossible to gauge but, as mining and smelting activity in the Ironbridge Gorge was continuous, what evidence there is suggests trade to towns down river and ultimately to Bristol. This is apparent from the sparse records of the Bog mine in the 1760s and the White Grit company from the 1780s which, as the author states, used a wharf and storehouse at the Boat-house Inn, Shrewsbury until in the early 19th century traffic was transferred to the canals. The difficulties of the navigation both in drought, flood and frost are stressed but curiously no mention is made of the detailed record of daily water levels made by William Reynolds at Coalport from 1789 to 1800. It is probable that the fluctuating quarterly sales records of the Snailbeach lead mine in the late 18th century reflect the vagaries of the navigation. To the list of great frosts should be added that of 1766, when a printing press was set up on the ice at Shrewsbury, as in 1739.

The book is generously illustrated, but there are one or two minor errors. The prospect of Shrewsbury by John Bowen (p. 34) dated to c.1730 must be before 1719 and would usually be dated c. 1700. The Buck view of Shrewsbury of 1732 is not used in preference to the Great Frost engraving of 1739, but the former shows quays extending all along the edge of Raven Meadow above the Welsh bridge. The two prospects of Bridgnorth of 1791, by Thomas Sanders of Shrewsbury (noted on p. 35), are aquatints not paintings, and ‘the late 18th-century engraving’ of Bridgnorth Bridge (p. 50) is an aquatint by Paul Sandby of about 1770. It, like all Sandby’s later Shropshire paintings, aquatints and engravings, was the product of two tours in the early 1770s made under the patronage of Sir Watkins Williams Wyn of Much Wenlock and Wynnstay.

James Lawson

Barbara Ross (ed.), Accounts of the Stewards of the Talbot Household at Blakemere, 1392–1425, Centre for Local History, University of Keele: Shropshire Record Series, vol. 7, 2003. ISBN 0 9536020 4 4. £15, post free, obtainable from Dr. D. C. Cox, 12 Oakfield Road, Shrewsbury SY3 8AA.

On a personal level, I am delighted to welcome the publication of Barbara Ross’s Accounts of the Stewards of the Talbot Household at Blakemere, 1392–1425. I well recall making a special journey to Shrewsbury, some years ago, for the specific purpose of studying this (then unpublished) work in connection with my own research on the Talbot family. My particular interest related to the next generation of Talbots: the children of John, Lord Talbot and Furnival (later first Earl of Shrewsbury) and his second wife, Lady Margaret Beauchamp. In particular, I was researching their two daughters, Lady Eleanor (who, in slightly different circumstances, might have become Edward IV’s queen) and Lady Elizabeth (wife of the last Mowbray Duke of Norfolk).

I found Barbara Ross’ work both fascinating and invaluable to me then, when I first read it. I feel certain that it will now prove equally fascinating and invaluable to a much wider circle of readers and researchers in its new, published format.

A walk across the field by the ‘Black Mere’ nowadays is a rather sad experience. An area of slightly raised ground is discernible. There are one or two worked stones lying about on the surface. Otherwise the house has
gone, leaving no visible trace. In her introduction, however, and through the translated words of the stewards’ accounts which she presents to us, Barbara Ross evokes the ghost of the vanished Talbot home at Blakemere.

Inherited by the Talbots from their Le Strange forebears, the house was a *mansum*, not a *castellum* (though no doubt defensible, should the need arise). Interesting, then, that in December 1460 it was forcibly reoccupied by Margaret Beauchamp (who appears in these accounts as Lady Talbot, but who, by the time of her repossession of Blakemere, was the dowager Countess of Shrewsbury). Margaret Beauchamp was, however, a lady of strong and forthright character, who had cracked tougher nuts than Blakemere. Moreover, the people at Blakemere knew her well. Maybe they thought twice about crossing the old lady, or perhaps they actually welcomed her return to her former home, and took her part against those descendants of her late husband’s previous marriage, with whom she was by then feuding. Either way, it is a story that post-dates the stewards’ accounts translated and published by Barbara Ross.

From these accounts a huge quantity of invaluable information about the Talbot household emerges. We learn, for example, that the members of the Talbot affinity wore green livery. We discover that the roof of the main house at Blakemere was of wooden shingles, though the gatehouse had a lead roof, and the kitchen had a tiled roof (minimising the fire risk), while the outbuildings were thatched, using reeds from the mere. Some, at least, of the windows at Blakemere had glass in them. Lady Talbot’s room was panelled, and had its own chapel, or oratory. The outbuildings included stables, kennels (which perhaps housed the now extinct white Talbot hounds, which bore the family name, and constituted their livery badge), a wardrobe, a malthouse and a dovecote. The household seems to have eaten quantities of fish and seafood, some of the fish being caught in the mere by fishermen who were brought in annually for this purpose. Salt and poultry came from Wyck. Moreover, most impressively, the Talbot diet also, on rare and special occasions, included imported luxuries such as oranges (not to mention such spices as cloves, mace and ginger). Olive oil was in use. Ale (751 gallons a year) was brewed at Blakemere, while wine was imported from both France and Germany.

The accounts also reveal touching personal details, such as the death, in 1424/5, of Lord Talbot’s little daughter. (The child’s funeral cost 11s. 10d.) They likewise reveal long forgotten patterns of loyalty. Members of the Wenlock family, for instance, who were still in the service of the Talbots at the end of the fifteenth century, were already serving them in 1401. Richard Cholmely, a member of the household in the 1420s, was the son of Thomas Cholmely, who had served at Blakemere in the previous century.

Twenty years ago, in his introduction to Muriel St. Clare Byrne’s edition of the Lisle letters, Hugh Trevor-Roper commented that ‘fifteenth-century England seems to us infinitely remote, its anarchy almost unimaginable, until we read the Paston Letters and see the daily problems of a Norfolk family during the Wars of the Roses’. In their own way, and in relation to a different county and a slightly earlier epoch, the stewards’ accounts from Blakemere equally shed light upon, and permit us to enter into, a vanished way of life. We owe a debt of gratitude to Barbara Ross for her work in translating this archive and supplementing it with intelligent and informative notes, and to the Centre for Local History, University of Keele, for finally bringing this work to publication.

John Ashdown-Hill
University of Essex

---

1 In 1451 Margaret had invaded her late mother’s ancestral home of Berkeley Castle with a small army, capturing and holding to ransom her cousin, Lord Berkeley, and his family. She had also occupied several other Berkeley manors by force of arms.


Those interested in the Anglican churches of Shropshire have several useful reference books – the Little Guide and the Shell Guide, Pevsner, Salter, and, of course, D. H. S. Cranage’s 1133 pages on the subject. Dr. John Leonard’s splendid volume must now be added to the list as an indispensable *vade-mecum*. It is based on a thorough personal knowledge of the buildings, with a very full and up-to-date bibliography. Indeed the descriptions of the churches are also up-to-date. I was delighted to see, for example, the striking Millennium tympanum at Acton Round discussed.

The work is in three parts. The first is a very sound historical introduction from Wroxeter to Emmanuel Church, Harlescott, consecrated in 2001. There follows a detailed account of the ‘treasures’, ranging from
towers and spires, through porches, roofs, and furnishings to stained glass. The largest section of the book is the gazetteer of churches, arranged by areas. There is such a wealth of information in this book that it is impossible to exaggerate its value.

To me the greatest blessing of this delightful work is the huge number of illustrations – 537 in all. Many of the external views of churches are from unusual perspectives. The internal views will become very useful sources as changes are made in church interiors. I am particularly impressed by Dr. Leonard’s perseverance in apparently managing to see inside every church. I have been visiting Anglican churches in Shropshire for well over fifty years, and there are still some which I have not succeeded in entering. Pevsner commented in the final (Staffordshire, 1974) volume of the Buildings of England that if he were beginning afresh he would not be able to complete his vast enterprise because of the great increase in the number of locked churches.

There are a few errors in the captions to some of the illustrations, especially to those of pulpits. That in figure 189 is at Cressage and that in figure 190 at Bourton, and not as stated. Figure 191 is the astonishing pulpit at Petton, not the less flamboyant one at Clun. The same pulpit is shown in figures 192 and 193, the first being described as at Petton, the second at Albrighton, near Shrewsbury. It is the latter. Figure 403 is the interior of Cound, not Church Stretton, and figure 406 is the interior of Church Stretton, not Cound.

This is no dry-as-dust catalogue. Dr. Leonard makes many telling observations, of which the following are typical. We learn that the activities of the small corrugated iron church at Maesbury ‘would put to shame many a grander building’. The setting of Hope is like Devon, while near-by Shelve is like Yorkshire. Donnington Wood church ‘undoubtedly imparts much-needed grace to its environment’. The pretty village of Little Wenlock ‘perhaps...deserves a finer church’. He muses on what the inhabitants of Minsterley felt when their new Baroque church was built in 1689. Broadstone chapel is a delight for those ‘who love the remote and obscure’. Tuckhill church ‘evidently does not wish to advertise its presence’, being hidden in a wood, without any sign pointing to its location. He rejoices that Cold Weston church has been saved from dereliction and is now a delightful private house. Hope Bagot is ‘an enchanting spot’. Holy Spirit, Harlescott, is ‘probably the best church of the 20th century in Shropshire’. St. Alkmund’s, Shrewsbury, ‘is not as appreciated as much as it deserves’. It is ‘sad, perverse, [and] astonishing’ that St. Mary’s, Shrewsbury, is no longer used for regular worship. It is ‘too great a building to remain indefinitely a museum of art’. Telford needs a first-class modern church, preferably ecumenical.

It is clear that Dr. Leonard includes daughter or mission churches as well as parish churches. I think that he has omitted five mission churches still used for worship – Ackleton mission church in the parish of Worfield, The Knowle in Coreley parish, Tyrley in Market Drayton, St. James’s Hall in Bridgnorth, and St. Anne’s in Burlton (built as a Sunday School room in 1891), in which I preside at Sung Eucharist twice a month. There may be other mission churches. The list of churches closed in the last 100 years (p. 292) includes St. Luke’s at Snailbeach, although there are in fact services there on three Sundays of the month.

Dr. Leonard, a retired consultant physician, now living in Hopesay, has published accounts of churches in many counties, and always he tackles his subject with great knowledge and much enthusiasm. His aim here is ‘to describe the current state of the churches and to help people who love parish churches to visit those buildings which are most rewarding’. This he certainly achieves in this lovely book, produced by Logaston Press (where would we be without it?) at an astonishingly reasonable price.

The author is pessimistic about the future of many churches. Royalties from the book are devoted to the Shropshire Historic Churches Trust, which seeks to help parishioners to maintain their churches. Five years ago I would have thought Dr. Leonard too pessimistic, but now I tend to agree with his prophesy. Ever-increasing financial demands (paying clergy through the Parish Share, insuring buildings, maintaining churchyards, heating and lighting – the last becoming severely at the time of writing) combined with ageing and declining congregations in many churches, urban as well as rural, add up to what might soon become a crisis. The usual Sunday attendance in many churches is frighteningly low, and churches are slowly being closed for regular worship, most recently, to my knowledge, at Woodcote and Sibdon Carwood. I believe that Linley, one service a month, and Benthall, two services a month, are both at risk of closure, and there are many more in a similar position.

In about 2001 I visited an exhibition in Wem of Methodist chapels in Shropshire. As I remember, most of those featured in the exhibition had closed and many had been demolished. I cannot imagine what Shropshire will be like in 2101, but I am sure that if there were in that year an exhibition of Anglican churches in the county most would be closed and many demolished. Enjoy them while there is time! Dr. Leonard’s book is the perfect guide.

William Price

P.S. Dean Cranage’s Churches of Shropshire was published in ten parts. I have in my possession parts 2–10. I lent part 1 (Brimstree Hundred) to someone almost 40 years ago, and it was never returned to me. I doubt whether the person in question, whoever he or she is, will read this, but I would be grateful to hear from anyone who has a copy of part 1 of Cranage for sale.
In 1851 the decennial census in Britain included an enquiry into religious practice. There was no question on religion on the form to be completed by householders, but those in charge of places of worship were asked to provide details of attendance on Sunday 30 March. Making a return was not compulsory. In this model and magisterial study Dr. Field provides a very full introduction (of 63 pages), covering the mechanics of the whole exercise and the consequential contemporary and historical debates. The author indicates with great clarity the methodological and interpretative problems involved in using the returns. These include how to deal with people who attended church or chapel more than once on the day, how to take into account the facts that 30 March was Mothering Sunday, when many people missed church because they were visiting family and friends at a distance and also that it was a wet day, making it difficult for many people to walk to their own church. Some people attended churches nearer to their homes than their parish church. Some attended church less frequently than once a week, and so might have been absent on 30 March. Dr. Field brings an immense knowledge of the historical industry which has developed in relation to this religious census.

The details of each return are printed in full in 152 pages. There were, according to the returns, 664 places of worship in Shropshire, although this was certainly an under-estimate, since many nonconformist, especially Primitive Methodist, preaching stations and cottage meetings were overlooked. The estimated combined adult and Sunday School attendance – a figure reached by a complicated series of calculations- was about 122,303, 53.33% of the population of the county. It is generally assumed that attendance on the census Sunday in Shropshire was 14% below the average Sunday attendance – because of its being Mothering Sunday and wet and stormy – and so the usual Sunday attendance in the 1850s was just over 60% of the population. (In 1998 attendance was 29,100, less than 7% of the total population, in 548 places of worship.) Useful tables in Dr. Field’s book provide fascinating details of the number of places of worship and the number of general and Sunday School attendances.

Dr. Field also includes a list, inevitably probably incomplete, of churches, chapels, and meeting houses not included in the census. He provides illustrations of the Anglican and Nonconformist questionnaires. The third questionnaire related to Quaker meeting houses. These were two in number in Shropshire. At Ironbridge 25 attended the morning meeting on 30 March and 16 the afternoon meeting; at Shrewsbury just two Friends were present at the meeting, in the morning, on the census Sunday. Dr. Field provides a very full bibliography, as befits the author of The 1851 Religious Census of Great Britain: A Bibliographical Guide for Local and Regional Historians (Salisbury, British Association for Local History, 1999.). The book finishes with an index of churches, chapels, and meeting houses by denominations, and indices of places and the signatories of returns.

I was particularly interested in some of the more ‘marginal’ Christian denominations. The Catholic Apostolic Church (sometimes wrongly called the Irvingites), which has held a fascination for me ever since I attended Eucharists in the church at Paddington in the 1960s, before the death of the last priest ended Eucharistic worship, no longer had a congregation in Wem, but in West Castle Street in Bridgnorth (later a dance hall) 103 people in the morning, 63 in the afternoon, and 124 in the evening enjoyed ever more complex worship – with vestments, incense, and holy water – under the leadership of John Henry Cooper, angel (i.e. bishop) of the Catholic and Apostolic Church. No doubt the worship of the 50 Southcottians meeting that morning at Cockshutford in the parish of Clee St. Margaret was much simpler. The Latter Day Saints (Mormons) met at Asterley in the parish of Pontesbury and at Shrewsbury; perhaps some of the Saints were later to move to Utah, as Janice Capewell suggested in her chapter on the religious census of 1851 in Shrewsbury in Barrie Trinder (ed.), Victorian Shrewsbury (Shropshire Libraries, 1984).

It was in January 1998 that Dr. David Cox invited Dr. Field to prepare this edition of the census. He could not have found a more capable person to undertake the work. It joins editions for 17 other English counties and the whole of Wales, and it sets the highest possible standard for future editors in other counties.

William Price


John Pryce-Jones has brought together in this book 18 articles written for the Parish Magazine of St. Oswald’s Church in Oswestry between February 2003 and August 2004. The chapters present short, delightfully illustrated, and very readable accounts of parish life in Oswestry from medieval times to the nineteenth century.
There is a useful bibliography. Local historians in other parishes will find much to help and encourage them in their own studies from this volume. Parish magazines tend to be rather ephemeral publications, read and then thrown away, in spite of sometimes containing important accounts of aspects of local history. Gathering articles into a single publication, as in this case, seems an excellent way of safeguarding material. Further studies on Oswestry by John Pryce-Jones will be published in a forthcoming issue of these Transactions.

William Price

Other books received, for future review:
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2. The Society’s objects shall be the advancement of the education of the public in archaeological and historical investigation in Shropshire and the preservation of the county’s antiquities. In furtherance of those objects, but not otherwise, the Society shall have the power (i) to publish the results of historical research and archaeological excavation and editions of documentary material of local importance including parish registers, and (ii) to record archaeological discoveries.
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