

7. THE HIGH MEDIEVAL PERIOD (1066 – 1485): UPDATED RESEARCH AGENDA

7.1 *Urbanism*

1. How did the major towns and smaller market towns of the region develop after the Norman Conquest, both within the urban core and in sub-urban and extra-mural areas?
2. Can we define more closely the industrial and trading activities associated with towns and the nature and extent of urban influence upon the countryside?
3. How may we enhance our understanding of the chronology, functions and morphology of caves, and in particular the outstanding subterranean resource of medieval Nottingham?
4. Can we shed further light upon the commercial role of fairs, markets, ports and other trading centres (notably Boston)?

7.2 *Rural settlement*

1. How can we elucidate further the development of nucleated villages, and in particular the contribution of the Danelaw to changes in village morphology and the date and scope of the 'Great Replanning'?
2. How can we shed further light upon the origin and development of dispersed hamlets and farms in champion and pastoral areas?
3. How can we improve our understanding of the form, evolution and functions of buildings within rural settlements and establish the extent of surviving medieval fabrics?
4. Can we clarify further the processes of settlement desertion and shrinkage, especially within zones of dispersed settlement?

7.3 *Manors and manorial estates*

1. How can the classification of moated and non-moated manorial sites be improved?
2. How did the medieval manor and manorial estates develop from the Anglo-Saxon period, and what was the impact of the Danelaw?
3. Can we improve our knowledge and classification of moated sites in the region, and how can environmental data add to our knowledge?
4. What standing buildings are present on moated sites and what functions may associated features found during survey have performed?
5. How did manor buildings develop over time, how may architectural styles have varied, and what can we learn of traditional constructional skills and designs?

7.4 *Castles, military sites and country houses*

1. How can studies of East Midlands' buildings contribute to an understanding of castle origins, and can we identify local typologies of castles and country houses?
2. What was the date and function of currently undated minor motte and bailey castles?
3. How many castle sites have been lost within the region?
4. Was there continuity of location between castles and country houses, and are earlier structures concealed in later buildings?

5. What local resources were used for building and maintenance and what was the environmental context and economic impact of these buildings?
6. How should battlefield sites be further investigated?

7.5 *Religion*

1. Can we identify additional pre-Conquest minster and monastic sites and elucidate the development of later monastic settlement (particularly the regionally important Gilbertine and Templar orders)?
2. Can we discern significant differences in the planning, economy and landscape impact of the different monastic orders (e.g. Witham Valley)?
3. Can we elucidate further the development of hospitals and colleges?
4. Can we shed further light upon the distribution and development of early churches or chapels and the origins and growth of the parish system?
5. How can we refine our understanding of local and regional architectural styles, including sculptured stonework, decorations and monuments?
6. What may we deduce from scientific analyses of cemetery populations about changes in diet, mortality and other demographic variables, both within the region and between social groups?

7.6 *Industry and trade*

1. How and where was post-Conquest pottery manufactured and distributed, and what communication systems were employed?
2. By what means were the extractive mineral industries controlled or organised by royal, monastic or lay lords?
3. Can we identify, investigate and date sites associated with the region's key extractive industries (especially iron, coal, lead and alabaster), the production and distribution of cloth and leather-work, and freshwater or marine fishing?
4. Can we develop a typological classification of buildings associated with medieval industrial and commercial activities and can we identify sub-regional and chronological patterning?

7.7 *The agrarian landscape and food-producing economy*

1. Can we shed further light upon the origins and development of the open field system and its impact upon agricultural practices?
2. Can we establish the character and extent of the field systems of non-champion landscapes (e.g. upland Derbyshire)?
3. What can we deduce about changes in woodland management and animal or crop husbandry (including new crops, crop rotation, field systems, more intensive cultivation of clay soils and larger animals, particularly sheep)?
4. What can environmental remains teach us about diet and living conditions in urban, rural and coastal communities?
5. What may fish bones and other environmental data contribute to studies of the exploitation and distribution of freshwater and marine fish?
6. How best may we enhance study of the origins and development of early land reclamation and drainage, particularly in Lincolnshire?

7. THE HIGH MEDIEVAL PERIOD (1066 – 1485): RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Updated Research Agenda Research Objectives	7.1 Urbanism				7.2 Rural settlement				7.3 Manors and manorial estates					7.4 Castles, military sites and country houses						7.5 Religion						7.6 Industry and trade				7.7 The agrarian landscape and food-producing economy					
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6
7A Undertake syntheses of urban excavation, survey and documentary data	•	•	•	•										•			•	•				•	•	•	•	•			•	•				•	•
7B Enhance record of urban secular standing buildings and subterranean structures	•	•	•	•																										•					
7C Investigate provisioning of the medieval town	•	•		•																					•								•	•	
7D Investigate further the role of markets, fairs and ports and trading routes	•	•		•																						•			•	•				•	
7E Investigate the morphology of rural settlements					•	•	•	•															•							•	•				
7F Investigate development, structure and landholdings of manorial estate centres									•	•	•	•	•										•									•	•	•	
7G Investigate castles, great houses and their estates	•	•												•				•																	
7H Investigate location and character of medieval battlefields																			•																
7I Investigate development of the open field system and woodland management					•	•				•													•							•	•	•			
7J Research the regional communications infrastructure		•		•																						•	•							•	

Research Objective 7A

Undertake syntheses of urban excavation, survey and documentary data to develop understanding of town development

Summary: The East Midlands is particularly important as the location for the establishment in the ninth and tenth centuries of the five defended towns at Derby, Leicester, Lincoln, Nottingham and Stamford (the celebrated Five Boroughs of the Danelaw)¹, together with Northampton². These centres continued as major urban foci into the Post-Conquest period, which saw also the development of a range of smaller towns³. Archaeological excavation has been undertaken to a varying extent in these larger towns, but much less so in the smaller urban settlements, and the emerging knowledge remains fragmentary⁴. Syntheses of the results of excavation, successfully completed for Lincoln⁵, remain largely absent elsewhere, while comparative data and detail on key ceramic assemblages crucial for developing regional chronological frameworks and for elucidating trading networks are lacking. Better understanding is needed of the development of urban centres and the nature and variations of industrial and economic activity. Completion of Urban Archaeological Databases for major centres, comparable to those developed for Lincoln, Leicester and Nottingham, is an urgent requirement in order to provide a foundation for further research and to assist in understanding the existing evidence⁶.

Agenda topics addressed: 7.1.1-7.1.4, 7.4.1, 7.4.4, 7.4.5, 7.5.3-7.5.6, 7.6.1, 7.6.3, 7.6.4, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5

East Midlands Resource Assessment and Research Agenda: 7, 210-211

English Heritage SHAPE sub-programme: 11111.150

References:

¹ Hall, R.A. 1985. The Five Boroughs of the Danelaw: a review of present knowledge. *Anglo-Saxon England* 18, 149-206.

² Williams, J. 1977. The early development of the town of Northampton, in Dornier, A. (ed) *Mercian Studies*, Leicester University Press, 131-152.

³ Beckett, J.V. 1988. *The East Midlands from AD1000*. London: Longman, 53-67, 89-98.

⁴ Lewis, C. 2006. The medieval period, in Cooper, N.J. (ed) *The Archaeology of the East Midlands*, 188-189.

⁵ Jones, M.J., Stocker, D. and Vince, A. 2003 *The City by the Pool: Assessing the Archaeology of the City of Lincoln*, Oxford, Oxbow.

⁶ Cooper, N.J. and Clay, P. 2006. The national and regional context of the research framework, in Cooper, N.J. (ed) *The Archaeology of the East Midlands*, 5-7.

Research Objective 7B

Enhance the record of urban and sub-urban secular standing buildings and associated subterranean structures

Summary: Surviving medieval urban secular buildings are few in number within the region, and are perhaps best represented by a variety of well preserved buildings of twelfth century and later date surviving in Lincoln.^{1,2} Dendrochronology³ and detailed investigations of building plans can contribute significantly to our knowledge of the date and status of individual buildings, and cumulatively can contribute to greater understanding of the history and character of urban development. These techniques can usefully be combined with surveys and documentary studies of associated cellars, caves and other subterranean structures, which at Nottingham in particular have the potential for developing further our understanding of urban morphology and functions⁴. A review of urban and sub-urban standing buildings with the potential to contain medieval structural elements and of associated subterranean structures is recommended in order to enhance current Urban Archaeological Databases⁵ and Historic Environment Records⁶. This will provide the basic information that is required to inform planning decisions and to guide the application of appropriate research techniques.

Agenda topics addressed: 7.1.1-7.1.4, and 7.6.4

East Midlands Resource Assessment and Research Agenda: 211, 216

English Heritage SHAPE sub-programmes: 11111.130 and 11111.150

References:

¹ Jones, R.R., Major, K. and Varley, J. 1984. and subsequently, *Survey of Ancient Houses* 1 to 3, Lincoln Civic Trust.

² Jones, S.R., Major, K., Varley, J. and Johnson, C. 1996. *Survey of Ancient Houses* 4, Lincoln Civic Trust.

³ Arnold, A. 2002. *The Urban Development of Newark: A Dendrochronological Approach*. Nottinghamshire HER.

⁴ Waltham, T. 2008. *Sandstone Caves of Nottingham*, East Midlands Geological Society, Nottingham.

⁵ e.g. Jones, M.J., Stocker, D. and Vince, A. 2003. *The City by the Pool: Assessing the Archaeology of the City of Lincoln*. Oxford, Oxbow.

⁶ Cooper, N.J. and Clay, P. 2006. The national and regional context of the research framework, in Cooper, N.J. (ed) *The Archaeology of the East Midlands* 7.

Research Objective 7C

Investigate the provisioning of the medieval town by further detailed study of environmental data and human remains

Summary: The increasing use of cess-pits in medieval towns means that there is extensive evidence for the diet of the population in Medieval Leicester, Lincoln and other urban centres¹. At Causeway Lane in Leicester, for example, cesspits and other contexts produced the remains of apple, blackberry, damson, grape, plum and pear, while vegetables included bean, leek and pea. Domestic animals and fowl were augmented by sea fish and oysters². The evidence of diet may be used to identify the various social groups of the town and their access to food, and, together with isotope analysis, may identify elements of the population born and brought up elsewhere. There are also many other aspects of economy, trade and craft that can be illuminated by the further study of this evidence, as has been suggested for Lincoln³. For the medieval urban centres, environmental analyses may be supported by isotopic and other scientific studies of human remains obtained from cemeteries and by documentary research. This research objective has the potential to be expanded to cover Roman and Saxon urban centres, this longer time-frame allowing the use of data from rural and other sites which may be represented more sparsely in a narrower chronology⁴.

Agenda topics addressed: 7.1.1, 7.1.2, 7.1.4, 7.5.6, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5

East Midlands Resource Assessment and Research Agenda: 211, 283

English Heritage SHAPE sub-programme: 11111.420

References:

¹ Monckton, A. 2006. Environmental archaeology in the East Midlands, in Cooper, N.J. (ed.) *The Archaeology of the East Midlands: An Archaeological Resource Assessment and Research Agenda*, 281-283.

² Connor, A. and Buckley, R. 1999. Roman and Medieval occupation at Causeway Lane, Leicester, *Leicester Archaeology Monograph* 5.

³ Stocker, D. 2003. The archaeological agenda: An introduction to the Research Agenda Zone entries, in D. Stocker (ed) M.J. Jones, D. Stocker and A. Vince, *The City By The Pool: Assessing the Archaeology of the City of Lincoln*, 297-299.

⁴ Monckton 2006, 284-286.

Research Objective 7D

Investigate further the role of markets, fairs and ports and trading routes

Summary: Markets played a crucial role in the development of medieval towns¹, as emphasised by the recently completed archaeological resource assessment of Lincoln², and it has been suggested that regularised market places with their links to road networks and wharf areas may provide important evidence of early planning³. Coastal and inland ports and fairs performed broadly similar functions to markets, providing foci for communal economic and social activity on a daily or weekly basis or, in the case of fairs, at more lengthy intervals. There is a need to focus inquiry on fairs and ports, which have generally been accorded little attention⁴, and in particular upon such regionally important sites as the long-lived Lenton Fair near Nottingham⁵ and the inland port at Boston in Lincolnshire⁶. Here, and elsewhere in the region, there needs to be more targeting of deposits for the specific recovery of fish bones. Archaeological excavation and landscape assessments could usefully be carried out in conjunction with metal-detecting programmes, since ports and fair sites in particular have traditionally served as foci for metal-detecting activity. In addition, further detailed analyses of pottery and other traded commodities such as building stone from quarries at Collyweston in Northamptonshire and Ketton in Rutland⁷ or the internationally important alabaster of Nottingham and Derbyshire may shed further important light upon trading networks in Britain and beyond and assist in the identification of exchange foci⁸.

Agenda topics addressed: 7.1.1, 7.1.2, 7.1.4, 7.5.6, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5

East Midlands Resource Assessment and Research Agenda: 211

English Heritage SHAPE sub-programmes: 11111.130 and 11111.140

Other specialist period/subject research strategies:

Mellor, M. 1994. *Medieval Ceramic studies in England. A review for English Heritage on behalf of the Medieval Pottery Research Group*, English Heritage, London, Sections 2.3-2.5

References:

¹ Beckett, J.V. 1988. *The East Midlands from AD1000*. London: Longman, 53-67.

² Stocker, D. 2003. The High Medieval Era – the archaeological agenda. An introduction to the Research Agenda Zone entries, in Jones, M.J., Stocker, D. and Vince, A. *The City By The Pool: Assessing the Archaeology of the City of Lincoln*, Oxford: Oxbow Books, 297.

³ Stocker 2003, 297.

⁴ Lewis, C. 2006. The medieval period, in Cooper, N.J. (ed) *The Archaeology of the East Midlands*, 190, 211.

⁵ Beckett, J.V. ed. 2006. *A Centenary History of Nottingham*, Chichester: Phillimore, 69, 97, 133, 145; Grieg, P. 1992. The layout of Lenton fairground, 1516, *Transactions Thoroton Society of Nottinghamshire* 96, 130-134.

⁶ Lewis 2006, 211; Beckett 1988, 70-71.

⁷ Lewis 2006, 206.

⁸ Mellor 1994: Sections 2.4, 7.7.

Research Objective 7E

Investigate the morphology of rural settlements

Summary: The East Midlands preserves evidence of a complex landscape comprising zones dominated by a hierarchy of nucleated villages, hamlets and farmsteads, mainly in Northamptonshire, Lincolnshire, southern and eastern Leicestershire, southern and eastern Nottinghamshire and eastern Derbyshire¹. Outside of these zones, landscapes are characterised by dispersed farmsteads and hamlets, notably in Charnwood, Whittlewood and Sherwood Forests, north and west Derbyshire, the Coal Measures of Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire, and the coastal marshes and fenlands of Lincolnshire. This spatial complexity has yet to be fully characterised or explained, and priorities for further work include assessment of the date of establishment of nucleated settlement, the date of origin of the region's many planned villages, and the factors underlying observed variations in settlement morphology². Nucleated settlement appears to have developed, in some areas at least, no later than the ninth century³, but the date of establishment of the more obviously planned villages remains unclear. Concentrations of royal estates in eastern Leicestershire, northern Nottinghamshire and north-west Derbyshire, documented in 1086 but acquired over a period of time, are suggested to have been a springboard for the development of planned villages during the eleventh century⁴. They particularly merit further detailed investigation, for example, by large-scale test-pitting in gardens and open spaces in village cores, as has been undertaken at Kibworth, in Leicestershire⁵ and as part of the Whittlewood project⁶.

Agenda topics addressed: 7.2.1-7.2.4, 7.5.4, 7.7.1 and 7.7.2

East Midlands Resource Assessment and Research Agenda: 211-212

English Heritage SHAPE sub-programmes: 11111.150 and 11111.170

References:

¹e.g. Chapman, A. 2010. *West Cotton, Raunds. A Study of Medieval Settlement Dynamics AD 450-1450*, Oxford: Oxbow

²Lewis, C. 2006. The medieval period, in Cooper, N.J. (ed) *The Archaeology of the East Midlands*, 190-193.

³ Rippon, S. 2007 Emerging regional variation in historic landscape character: the possible significance of the 'long eighth century', in M. Gardiner and S. Rippon (eds) *Medieval landscapes: Landscape History After Hoskins*, 118; Lewis, C., Mitchell-Fox, P. and Dyer, C. 1996 *Village, Hamlet and Field: Changing Medieval Settlements in Central England*, 202-223.

⁴ Roberts, B.K. 2008 *Landscapes, Documents and Maps: Villages in Northern England and Beyond*, AD 900-1250, 280.

⁵ <http://www.arch.cam.ac.uk/aca/kibworth.html> ; Wood, M. 2010. *The Story of England*, London: Penguin.

⁶ Jones, R., Dyer, C. and Page, M. 2006. Changing settlements and landscapes: medieval Whittlewood, its predecessors and successors, *Internet Archaeology* 19 (http://intarch.ac.uk/journal/issue19/jones_index.html); Jones, R. and Page, M. 2006. *Medieval Villages in an English Landscape. Beginnings and Ends*, Macclesfield: Windgather Press.

Research Objective 7F

Investigate the development, structure and landholdings of manorial estate centres

Summary: Regional manorial centres, whether secular or lay, remain poorly investigated and merit further systematic study. The East Midlands preserves a rich resource of manorial sites, ranging in status from castles and granges to more modest establishments that relative to neighbouring regions are comparatively rarely moated¹. Moated sites have received the greatest attention from researchers, and where excavated may preserve elaborate structural remains. Saxilby, for example, was provided with a timber hall and solar², while Epworth preserved an impressive stone-constructed complex³. Non-moated sites have proved less attractive to archaeologists, with occasional exceptions such as Holyoak in Leicestershire, which preserved a two-storey main building of the thirteenth century⁴. The landholdings associated with these establishments have seldom been excavated, although earthworks often survive well and in many cases have been the subject of field survey. It is recommended that the results of survey should in selected instances be tested by excavation. It is hoped that this will confirm the identity of features and clarify the chronology of manorial development, which in some instances may have roots in the pre-Conquest period.

Agenda topics addressed: 7.3.1-7.3.5, 7.5.4, 7.7.3, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5

East Midlands Resource Assessment and Research Agenda: 212-213

English Heritage SHAPE sub-programmes: 11111.130 and 11111.140

References:

¹ Lewis, C. 2006. The medieval period, in Cooper, N.J. (ed) *The Archaeology of the East Midlands*, 193-194.

² Whitwell, J.B. 1969. Excavations of the site of a moated medieval manor house in the parish of Saxilby, Lincolnshire, *Journal British Archaeological Association* 32, 135-142.

³ Hayfield, C. 1984. Excavations of the site of the Mowbray manor house at the Vinegarth, Epworth, Lincolnshire, 1970-1976, *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 19, 5-28.

⁴ Brown, G. 1973a. Medieval manor of Holyoak, in A. McWhirr Archaeology in Leicestershire and Rutland 1970-1972, *Transactions Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society* 47, 70.

Research Objective 7G

Estates, architecture and power: investigate the relationship between castles and great houses and their estates

Summary: The architecture of many castles and great houses is relatively well known but there remains a need to investigate the relationship between these structures and the estates in which they are located. Are particular forms of building plan associated with particular magnates, such as William Peveril of Derbyshire¹, and do the similarities encompass estate components and layout? The investigation of Barnard Castle in County Durham points the way forward in castle and estate studies, emphasising the need to examine the estate core within the context of the estate lands, the wider countryside and the local community². Although there have been several recent broad-ranging studies of castles in their wider environment³, the approach has yet to be applied to castles and manorial centres in the East Midlands.

Agenda topics addressed: 7.1.1, 7.1.2, 7.4.1 and 7.4.5

English Heritage SHAPE sub-programme: 11111.130

References:

¹ Associated with the Norman castles at Bolsover and Castleton in Derbyshire and Castle Rock, Nottingham (Beckett, J.V. 1988. *The East Midlands from AD1000*. London: Longman, 25-26, 58; Hart, C. 1981. *The North Derbyshire Archaeological Survey*, Chesterfield: North Derbyshire Archaeological Trust, 145, 148).

² Austin, D. 2007. *Acts of Perception: A Study of Barnard Castle in Teesdale*, Archaeological and Architectural Society of Durham and Northumberland Research Report 6; Stocker, D. 2008. Review article, *Landscapes* 9, 82-85.

³ Liddiard, R. 2005. *Castles in Context: Power, Symbolism and Landscape, 1066-1500*, Macclesfield.

Research Objective 7H

Investigate the location and character of medieval battlefields

Summary: Medieval battlefield sites have long remained the preserve of the local historian more concerned and more familiar with documentary evidence rather than the landscape. Aside from castle sites that acted as foci for military actions, the region preserves a number of important battlefield sites that would repay further investigations. These include two key battlefields of the Wars of the Roses: a period which has been identified in a recent assessment of the battlefield resource as a key focus of archaeological interest (in particular for evidence of the introduction of gunpowder weapons in England)¹. The first is the pivotal Battle of Bosworth, Leicestershire, where Henry VII's defeat of Richard III in 1485 marks the beginning of the Tudor period.² The second is the Battle of Stoke Field in Nottinghamshire, marginally beyond this period, where in 1487 Henry VII's forces crushed a Yorkist rebellion³. At both of these sites, the evidence for the locations of battlefields would benefit from careful reviews of documentary sources and of the topographical and archaeological evidence (primarily in the form of unstratified artefact scatters and mass graves)⁴. Direct archaeological investigation of battle archaeology through metal detecting, as demonstrated at Bosworth⁵ and Towton⁶, should be undertaken. Prospecting for mass graves through geophysical survey and excavation should also be considered.

Agenda topics addressed: 7.4.6

East Midlands Resource Assessment and Research Agenda: 196, 213

English Heritage SHAPE sub-programme: 11111.130

Other specialist period/subject research strategies:

Foard, G. 2008. *Conflict in the Pre-Industrial Landscape of England: a Resource Assessment*, University of Leeds, 265-269.

References:

¹ Foard 2008, 269: Section 7.14.

² Lewis, C. 2006. The Medieval period (850-1500), in N.J. Cooper (ed) *The Archaeology of the East Midlands: An Archaeological Resource Assessment and Research Agenda*, Leicester Archaeology Monograph 13, 196; Foard 2008, 100-104; <http://www.bosworthbattlefield.com/>

³ Bishop, M. 1987. *The Battle of East Stoke 1487*, Nottinghamshire County Council.

⁴ Foard 2008, 24-59; e.g. Stoke Field mass graves: *ibid*, 52-53, fig.14.

⁵ Foard 2008, 100-104; 2010, *Discovering Bosworth*, *British Archaeology* 112, 26-31.

⁶ Sutherland, T.L. and Schmidt, A. 2003. Towton, 1461: an integrated approach to battlefield archaeology, *Landscapes* 4, 15-25.

Research Objective 7I

Investigate the development of the open field system and medieval woodland management

Summary: The origins of the open-field system have long attracted discussion, and are nowhere better addressed than in the East Midlands¹. Large areas of the lowland zone were dominated in this period by unhedged open fields rotating between arable and pasture, and particularly in Leicestershire and Northamptonshire ridge and furrow earthworks have remained important elements of the landscape character. The only English village where open-field farming is still conducted under the guidance of a court leet is to be found at Laxton in Nottinghamshire², and detailed surveys here and elsewhere have enhanced significantly our understanding of the origins of this flexible and long-lived agricultural system, developments over time, and the relationship between arable, pasture and woodland³. Fieldwalking⁴, targeted excavation, and earthwork, geophysical, air photographic and lidar surveys have significant potential for elucidating the origins and development of field systems and their relationship to earlier systems of land allotment⁵, and should be encouraged. There is also much potential for further investigation of woodland, including hunting parks, by documentary research, earthwork surveys and remote sensing. Studies have been undertaken of Rockingham Forest in Northamptonshire⁶ and woodland in Leicestershire⁷ and Lincolnshire⁸. Building upon these, further work should aim to integrate documentary and landscape evidence, with particular emphasis upon the evidence for former management and exploitation, access and changing boundaries. There is also a need to compare and contrast the information on woodland management and exploitation in the Champion lands with that in less favoured upland areas. Woodlands offer particular opportunities for a wide range of local fieldwork as well as potential partnerships with the Woodland Trust, National Trust and community groups, which are often concerned with the amenity value of woodlands.

Agenda topics addressed: 7.2.1, 7.2.2, 7.3.2, 7.5.4, 7.7.1, 7.7.2, 7.7.3.

East Midlands Resource Assessment and Research Agenda: 215, 286

English Heritage SHAPE sub-programmes: 11111.150 and 11111.170

References:

¹ Beckett, J.V. 1988. *The East Midlands from AD1000*. London: Longman, 46-51.

² Beckett, J.V. 1989. *A History of Laxton. England's last Open-Field Village*, Oxford: Blackwell.

³ e.g. Whittlewood Project (Northamptonshire and north Buckinghamshire); Jones, R., Dyer, C. and Page, M. 2006. Changing settlements and landscapes: medieval Whittlewood, its predecessors and successors, *Internet Archaeology* 19 (http://intarch.ac.uk/journal/issue19/jones_index.html); Jones, R. and Page, M. 2006. *Medieval Villages in an English Landscape. Beginnings and Ends*, Macclesfield: Windgather Press.

⁴ e.g. Jones, R. 2005. Signatures in the soil: the use of pottery in manure scatters in the identification of medieval arable farming regimes, *Archaeological Journal* 161, 159-188.

⁵ e.g. Brough, Notts. and Willington, Derbys: Elliott, L., Jones, H. and Howard, A.J. 2004. The medieval landscape, in Knight, D. and Howard, A.J. *Trent Valley Landscapes*, Kings Lynn: Heritage Marketing & Publications.

⁶ Foard, G. 2001. Settlement, landuse and industry in medieval Rockingham Forest, Northamptonshire, *Medieval Archaeology* 45, 41-96; Foard, G., Hall, D. and Partida, T. 2000. Rockingham Forest, Northamptonshire: the evolution of the landscape, *Landscapes* 6, 1-29.

⁷ Squires, A.E. 2004. Parks and woodland in medieval Leicestershire, 1086-1530, in Bowman, P. and Liddle, P. *Leicestershire Landscapes*, Leicestershire Museums Archaeological Fieldwork Group Monograph 1, 141-153.

⁸ Lane, T. 1995. *The Archaeology and Developing Landscape of Ropsley and Humby, Lincolnshire*, Lincolnshire Archaeology and Heritage Series 2.

Research Objective 7J

Research the regional communications infrastructure

Summary: The medieval period is important for the study of communication routes, which may well have varied in importance from one time to another and intra-regionally¹. The physical infrastructure, comprising roads, rivers and related appurtenances such as bridges and wharfs, and associations of these with landscape features, are under-investigated. In addition, the evidence that pottery and other artefacts can provide for the use of inland and coastal waterways such as the Trent and Nene has also not been maximised². At Castle Donington, Leicestershire, three phases of timber and stone bridge piers dated to 1090, 1215 and 1238 respectively have been recorded and fully investigated during gravel extraction in the river floodplain³, but such investigations are rare and many communications features are not listed in Historic Environment Records. Landscape features, such as hollow-ways, fords and bypassed stretches of major and minor highways, also remain little researched, while roads are seldom accorded archaeological excavation⁴.

Agenda topics addressed: 7.1.2, 7.1.4, 7.6.1, 7.6.2 and 7.7.5

East Midlands Resource Assessment and Research Agenda: 216

English Heritage SHAPE sub-programme: 11111.170

Other specialist period/subject research strategies:

Mellor, M. 1994. *Medieval Ceramic studies in England. A review for English Heritage on behalf of the Medieval Pottery Research Group*, English Heritage, London, Sections 2.3-2.5

References:

¹ Beckett, J.V. 1988. *The East Midlands from AD1000*. London: Longman, 46-51.

² Lewis, C. 2006. The medieval period, in Cooper, N.J. (ed) *The Archaeology of the East Midlands*, 209-210.

³ Ripper, S. and Cooper, L. 2009. *The Hemington Bridges: The Excavation of Three Medieval Bridges at Hemington Quarry near Castle Donington*, Leicestershire, Leicester Archaeology Monograph 16.

⁴ For Lincoln see Stocker, D. 2003, The archaeological agenda: An introduction to the Research Agenda Zone entries, in M.J. Jones, D. Stocker and A. Vince (eds) *The City By The Pool: Assessing the Archaeology of the City of Lincoln*, 267-269.