

## 8. THE POST-MEDIEVAL PERIOD (1485-1750) – UPDATED RESEARCH AGENDA

### 8.1. *Urbanism: morphology, functions and buildings*

1. Can we elucidate the role of towns as social, administrative, industrial and commercial centres, their integration within regional marketing systems and their relationship to communication routes?
2. How were towns organised and planned, and how did population growth impact upon their internal spatial organisation?
3. What was the impact of religion, urban government, civic pride and class structures upon town planning and architecture (e.g. public buildings such as town halls or prisons and water management structures)?
4. What can studies of environmental data, artefacts and structural remains tell us about variations in diet, living conditions and status?
5. Can we recognise the emergence of the poorer classes in the developing suburbs?
6. How can we advance studies of building plans and standing remains, especially where hidden inside later buildings, and of caves and cellars?

### 8.2 *Landscapes of display: country houses and garden;*

1. Can we elucidate further the use of social space in buildings and across the landscape, the manipulation of vistas and the integration of gardens with the wider landscape?
2. How were garden designs influenced by changing fashions and by a familiarity with Continental garden styles?
3. What horticultural methods, planting schemes and water management methods were employed by garden planners?
4. How are tenants and servants reflected in the surviving material culture?
5. Can we establish regional typologies of parklands and parkland structures and of estate villages and cottages?

### 8.3 *Agricultural landscapes and the food-producing economy*

1. How can we improve our understanding of the early landscapes of enclosure and improvement and the interrelationship between arable, pasture, woodland, commons and waste?
2. How did water management and land drainage change the landscape during this period?
3. What changes and improvements occurred in animal husbandry and the use of animals (e.g. new breeds, traction and traded animal products)?
4. What garden plants and crops were grown in the countryside and urban market gardens, and what new types were introduced, particularly from the New World?

### 8.4 *Rural settlement patterns and building traditions*

1. Can we enhance our understanding of the houses of the rural poor?
2. Can we develop as an aid to academic study and conservation management a regional typology of farmhouses, barns and other rural vernacular buildings?
3. Can we discern intra-regional or temporal variations in the pattern of rural vernacular architecture?

4. What was the impact of industrialisation upon established settlement patterns and the rural landscape, and how did this vary regionally?
5. How did the diet, living conditions and status of rural and urban communities compare?

### 8.5 *Industry and communications*

1. Can we elucidate the organisation of the workplace, gender differences at work and the development of industrial processes (especially the nationally important lead, coal and tanning industries)?
2. Can we shed further light upon the developing technology of the regionally important early stoneware potteries?
3. Can we identify domestic buildings adapted for the textile industry?
4. How were transport infrastructures improved and how was this related to the developing urban and market hierarchy?
5. What may be learned of the material culture of industrial workers?
6. What can we deduce from factory/non-factory production data about the changing economy (especially patterns of marketing and consumption)?

### 8.6 *Ecclesiastical structures, estates and burials*

1. What was the impact of the Reformation upon ecclesiastical buildings and monastic estates?
2. Can a typology of church-related and non-Anglican buildings be devised?
3. How can we ensure appropriate recording of churches and chapels, graveyards, artefacts of burial and remembrance and human remains (with their major potential for elucidating diet, health and demography)?
4. Can we devise a typology to record and classify more effectively the interiors of ecclesiastical buildings, their decoration and monuments?

### 8.7 *Battlefields and fortifications*

1. How best can we record and study battlefield sites, particularly of the Civil War period (e.g. Naseby)?
2. How can we refine our knowledge of Civil War defences and siege works?
3. What was the impact of the Civil War upon urban development (notably the demolition of suburbs, as at Leicester, and post-siege development)?

### 8.8 *Material culture*

1. How was pottery distributed across the region and can we identify competition between regional potteries?
2. Can we establish a dated type series for ceramics (building in particular upon unpublished urban pit and well groups)?
3. Can we identify the changing material culture of the urban and rural poor, the emerging middle classes and the aristocracy?
4. Were there different patterns of consumption between town and countryside and between different agricultural regions?
5. What may be deduced about the symbolic use of material culture (e.g. in social competition)?

### 8. THE POST-MEDIEVAL PERIOD (1485-1750): RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Updated Research Agenda Research Objectives	8.1 Urbanism						8.2 Country houses and gardens					8.3 Agricultural landscapes				8.4 Rural settlement patterns					8.5 Industry and communications						8.6 Churches, chapels and burials				8.7 Battle-fields			8.8 Material culture				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
<b>8A</b> Identify and research the landless urban and rural poor		•			•											•				•																		
<b>8B</b> Further research the morphology and use of caves		•				•															•																	
<b>8C</b> Establish a typology of regional building traditions					•						•					•	•	•					•															
<b>8D</b> Investigate developments in estate and garden design and their landscape contexts							•	•	•	•	•																											
<b>8E</b> Identify agricultural improvements of the 16 <sup>th</sup> to 18 <sup>th</sup> centuries												•	•	•	•		•			•																		
<b>8F</b> Research further the development of East Midlands industry																			•		•	•	•	•	•	•												
<b>8G</b> Study post-Dissolution re-use of monastic structures and continuity of monastic estates																											•											
<b>8H</b> Investigate graveyards and other burial sites																													•		•							
<b>8I</b> Investigate Civil War defences, siege works and battlefields																															•	•	•					
<b>8J</b> Develop further the study of ceramic assemblages										•																								•	•	•	•	•

## Research Objective 8A

### Identify and research the landless urban and rural poor

#### Summary:

The landless poor, characterised by comparatively few possessions and often inhabiting very insubstantial structures, have left few traces in the archaeological or documentary record, and identification of this largely invisible social class may be highlighted as a key priority for research. Even for a period as recent as the nineteenth century, the rural poor are hard to see<sup>1</sup>, and for the post-medieval period they are most clearly visible by inference - as carriers, for example, of nightsoil to the fields, or as protagonists in the 1607 Midlands Revolt<sup>2</sup> and other civil unrest reflecting antagonism to enclosure of the Open Fields. Some of these communities are potentially identifiable in the countryside by small, irregular enclosures on the edges of pasture, wood or road<sup>3</sup>, depicted but not remarked upon by the surveyors of tithe or enclosure maps and worth surveying for insubstantial earthworks or particular colonies of plants that might betray flimsy dwellings and other structures<sup>4</sup>. Wastes and commons, identifiable from documentary and cartographic sources, also provide possible locations for squatter settlements that could potentially be revealed by detailed field investigations<sup>4</sup>. In urban areas, the investigation of vacant plots and open areas on the edges of settlement may also reveal insubstantial structures associated with the poor<sup>5</sup>. Related groups include gypsies and travellers, whose temporary encampments are sometimes known through tradition, and itinerant charcoal burners, shepherds and herdsfolk. These settlement locations have seldom formed the focus of archaeological inquiry, and all are under pressure from intensifying agriculture, forestry and urban development.

**Agenda topics addressed:** 8.1.2, 8.1.5, 8.4.1 and 8.4.4

**East Midlands Resource Assessment and Research Agenda:** 232-233

**English Heritage SHAPE sub-programme:** 11111:170

#### References:

<sup>1</sup> Reay, B. 2004. *Rural England: Labouring Lives in the Nineteenth Century*, Polgrave Macmillan.

<sup>2</sup> Blomley, N. 2007. Making private property: enclosure, common right and the work of hedges, *Rural History, Economy and Society* 18, 10-14.

<sup>3</sup> Stocker, D. 2006. *England's Landscapes: The East Midlands*, 59

<sup>4</sup> Courtney, P. 2006 The Post-Medieval period, in Cooper, N.J. (ed) *The Archaeology of the East Midlands*, 233.

<sup>5</sup> e.g. possible squatter settlement identified at Cloud Hill, Leicestershire: Clay, P. and Courtney, P. 1995 *An Archaeological Desk-based Assessment of Cloud Hill Quarry Extension, Breedon-on-the-Hill and Worthington, Leicestershire*, University of Leicester Archaeological Services Report.

## Research Objective 8B

### Further research the morphology and use of caves

#### Summary:

The soft sandstone outcropping as a cliff at Nottingham preserves a remarkable collection of over 500 artificially created caves<sup>1</sup>, many of which were utilised in the post-medieval period for purposes such as habitation, storage, malting and tanning<sup>2</sup>. Their chronology extends at least from medieval to modern times, when some caves were utilised as Second World War air-raid shelters<sup>3</sup>, and this unique resource has been highlighted as a key priority for cross-period research. A detailed laser survey of the caves is currently being conducted alongside an assessment of the documentary resource<sup>4</sup>, and will provide a secure foundation for future management of the resource and further research (including analyses of finds obtained during unpublished excavations and integration of the evidence for subterranean and standing structures). Comparable surveys may usefully be extended to other caves in the region whose period of use may have spanned the post-medieval period. Artificial caves are a distinctive feature of sandstone outcrops elsewhere in the region, including Rock Cottages and other locations in Mansfield, Nottinghamshire, the Anchor Church<sup>5</sup> near Foremark, Derbyshire, and the Hermit's Cave near Dale Abbey<sup>6</sup>, also in Derbyshire. In addition, natural caves with evidence for human activity spanning many millennia are abundantly distributed across the Carboniferous limestones of the Derbyshire Peak and the Magnesian Limestone escarpment that straddles the Derbyshire-Nottinghamshire boundary. A review of post-medieval use of the above sites would complement well the on-going work at Nottingham and would provide a useful basis for further survey work and assessments of caves used in the medieval and other periods.

**Agenda topics addressed:** 8.1.2, 8.1.6 and 8.5.1

**English Heritage SHAPE sub-programmes:** 11111:130 and 11111:170

#### References:

<sup>1</sup>Waltham. T. 2008. *The Sandstone Caves of Nottingham*, East Midlands Geological Society, Nottingham.

<sup>2</sup>Waltham, T. and MacCormick, A.G. 1993. The caves, malt kiln and tannery at the Black's Head site, Nottingham, *Transactions of the Thoroton Society* 97, 64-73.

<sup>3</sup>Waltham 2008, 39.

<sup>4</sup><http://nottinghamcavessurvey.org.uk/index.htm>.

<sup>5</sup> Pevsner, N. and Williamson, E, 1978. *The Buildings of England: Derbyshire*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 217.

<sup>6</sup> Pevsner and Williamson 1978, 162.

## **Research Objective 8C**

### **Establish a typology of regional building traditions**

#### **Summary:**

Further research is recommended to establish a typology of regional vernacular buildings and to investigate temporal and spatial variations in building styles and materials (as indicated, for example, by the distinctive Lincolnshire tradition of mud or cob built structures with timber studs<sup>1</sup>). Dating is particularly problematic for many building types, and it is recommended that particular emphasis be placed upon the use of dendrochronological data where appropriate. Further information on the antecedents of post-medieval vernacular buildings could be obtained from the investigation of early structural remains concealed within gentrified urban buildings<sup>2</sup> and by the excavation of deserted or shrunken rural settlements. Reviews of vernacular architectural traditions tend to focus on extant higher status buildings<sup>3</sup>, and survey could usefully extend to the broad range of lower status structures that survive. For the East Midlands, a number of more detailed unpublished sub-regional studies<sup>1</sup> are complemented by the *Buildings of England* volumes, which include reviews of building styles and the range of building materials used<sup>4</sup>, and in north Northamptonshire by a systematic RCHME survey of architectural monuments<sup>5</sup>. Themes which deserve greater consideration include the transformation of individual wealth as reflected in buildings, the impact of local economic and social structure on the chronology of the 'Great Rebuilding'<sup>6</sup>, and the study of local landscape settings<sup>7</sup>.

**Agenda topics addressed:** 8.1.6, 8.2.5, 8.4.1, 8.4.2, 8.4.3 and 8.5.3

**East Midlands Resource Assessment and Research Agenda:** 232-233

**English Heritage SHAPE sub-programmes:** 11111:170, 11111:310 and 11111:230

#### **References:**

<sup>1</sup> Courtney, P. 2006. The Post-Medieval period, in Cooper, N.J. (ed) *The Archaeology of the East Midlands*, 225-226.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid*, 220.

<sup>3</sup> e.g. Quiney, A. 1990. *The Traditional Buildings of England*.

<sup>4</sup> e.g. Clifton-Taylor, A. and Barley, M. 1979. Building materials, in Williamson, E. *The Buildings of England: Nottinghamshire*, by N. Pevsner, 46-50; also Roberts, D. 1989 Lesser rural building, in Antram, N. *The Buildings of England: Lincolnshire*, by N. Pevsner and J. Harris, 33-41.

<sup>5</sup> Royal Commission on Historical Monuments England 1984. *An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in the County of Northampton, Vol. 6: Architectural Monuments in North Northamptonshire*, London:HMSO.

<sup>6</sup> Courtney 2006, 226.

<sup>7</sup> Longcroft, A. 2007. The importance of place: placing vernacular buildings into a landscape context, in Barnwell, P.S. and Palmer, M. (eds) *Post-Medieval Landscapes: Landscape History After Hoskins*.

## Research Objective 8D

### Investigate developments in estate and garden design and their landscape context

**Summary:** The East Midlands preserves numerous estates where a grand mansion sits at the centre of a tract of private land<sup>1</sup>, as for example at Chatsworth in Derbyshire.<sup>2-3</sup> The examination of estates has often polarised between social and art historic evaluation of the mansion house and agricultural and horticultural assessment of the estate. There has often been little attempt to link these approaches or to consider relationships with the wider landscape and with more distant but closely intertwined interests of the estate owner<sup>4</sup>. Williamson has identified three phases of estate development embracing the Post-Medieval and Modern periods<sup>5</sup>, and hence this Objective spans both the Post-Medieval and Modern periods (see also Objective 9F). The first spanned the mid-seventeenth to mid-eighteenth centuries, during which period some of the larger estates developed, sometimes on post-Dissolution sites. The second part of the eighteenth century saw the development of Neo-Classical mansions associated with private parklands from which public roads and settlements had been diverted. A third phase may be identified in the first part of the nineteenth century, and was based on the landscaping ideas of Humphrey Repton<sup>6</sup>. Estate design owed much to local topographic and landscape factors, as well as to local tenorial and social traditions. Regional and sub-regional characteristics should be identifiable<sup>7</sup> and study of intra-regional variability should be encouraged. Particular attention should be paid to the impact of other landholdings and economic interests such as mining and industrial development upon the design and management of estates, and to the influence of large estates upon the more numerous and less commonly researched small estates of both the Post-Medieval and Modern periods<sup>8</sup>.

**Agenda topics addressed:** 8.2.1-8.2.5

**East Midlands Resource Assessment and Research Agenda:** 232-233

**English Heritage SHAPE sub-programme:** 11111.170

C:\data\EMRS\EMRSFinalReport\Post-MedievalSynthesis\_11-11-10

#### References:

- <sup>1</sup> Courtney, P. 2006. The Post-Medieval period, in Cooper, N.J. (ed) *The Archaeology of the East Midlands*, 221-222; Beckett, J.V. 1988. *The East Midlands from AD1000*. London: Longman, 108-111, 195-200.
- <sup>2</sup> Barnatt, J. and Williamson, T. 2005. *Chatsworth: A Landscape History*, Macclesfield: Windgather Press Ltd.
- <sup>3</sup> Barnatt, J. and Bannister, N. 2009. *The Archaeology of a Great Estate. Chatsworth and Beyond*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- <sup>4</sup> Williamson, T. 2007. Archaeological perspectives on landed estates: research agendas, in J. Finch and K. Giles (eds) *Estate Landscapes: Design, Improvement and Power in the Post-Medieval Landscape*, Boydell and Brewer, 8.
- <sup>5</sup> Williamson 2007, 9-12.
- <sup>6</sup> Repton, H. 1816. *Fragments on the Theory and Practice of Gardening*, London.
- <sup>7</sup> Williamson, T. 2004. Designed landscapes: the regional dimension, *Landscapes* 5, 20-24.
- <sup>8</sup> Spooner, S. 2009 'A prospect two fields distance': rural landscapes and urban mentalities in the eighteenth century, *Landscapes* 10, 101-22.

## Research Objective 8E

### Identify agricultural improvements of the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries

#### Summary:

Enclosure of the open fields, waste and commons took place increasingly from the sixteenth century, along with reclamation of the Lincolnshire Fens<sup>1</sup> and other marshy areas and the development of water meadows, although physical evidence of these changes is not always clearly visible until the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries<sup>2</sup>. Additional investigations are required to shed further light upon the development of early enclosures, water meadows, fenland drainage schemes and other landscape evidence of the agricultural improvements that characterised this period<sup>3</sup> – and the extent of intra-regional variability. Environmental analyses of palaeobotanical and faunal assemblages should be encouraged as means of enhancing our knowledge of changes in crop and animal husbandry<sup>4</sup>, including identification of the famously large sheep of the region that have so far eluded detection in archaeological excavations<sup>5</sup>. A variety of other direct and indirect evidence for agricultural improvement may also be expected, and should be sought for. The success of the Ticknall pottery in Derbyshire, for example, which produced substantial quantities of dairy ceramics throughout the seventeenth century in the face of Staffordshire competition<sup>6</sup>, may reflect in part the growing importance and success of dairy farming in the region. Research should also be focused upon the identification of specialist agricultural buildings that may provide indirect evidence for agricultural change, such as beast houses which may reflect the growing importance of dairying and beef cattle production.

**Agenda topics addressed:** 8.3.1, 8.3.2, 8.3.3, 8.3.4, 8.4.2 and 8.4.5

**East Midlands Resource Assessment and Research Agenda:** 233

**English Heritage SHAPE sub-programme:** 11111:420

#### References:

<sup>1</sup> Darby, H.C. 1982. *The Changing Fenland*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

<sup>2</sup> Courtney, P. 2006. The Post-Medieval period, in Cooper, N.J. (ed) *The Archaeology of the East Midlands*, 2006, 223.

<sup>3</sup> Beckett, J.V. 1988. *The East Midlands from AD1000*. London: Longman, 121-130

<sup>4</sup> Albarella, U. 1997. Size, power, wool and veal: zooarchaeological evidence for late medieval innovations, in de Boe, G. and Verhaghe, F. (ed) *Environment and Subsistence in Medieval Europe: Papers of the Medieval Europe Brugge 1997 Conference*, 19-30.

<sup>5</sup> Gidney, L. 1999. The animal bones, in Connor, A. and Buckley, R. *Roman and Medieval Occupation at Causeway Lane, Leicester*, Leicester Archaeology Monograph 5, 310-329.

<sup>6</sup> Brears, P.C.D. 1971. *The English Country Pottery*, 175.

## Research Objective 8F

### Research further the development of East Midlands industry and its impact upon settlement morphology

#### Summary:

Coal, lead, iron, leather-working and textile production were foremost among a number of industries which in the post-medieval period came to characterise the East Midlands<sup>1</sup>, and in the case particularly of coal and lead may be regarded as of national importance. A key area of required research is the transition of industry from an adjunct of the agricultural economy to the economic driver of the rural economy and the stimulus for urbanisation<sup>2</sup>. Rural sources of industry require further assessment of their locations, as well as the recording of detail. Particular interest attaches to the extensive coal-mining remains in Derbyshire, Leicestershire<sup>3</sup> and Nottinghamshire<sup>4</sup>, the landscape evidence for which has yet to be fully recorded. Linkage to efficient communications networks and labour resources played a key role on the development of the coal industry, but the scale and chronology of the extraction of coal and other materials also depended on tenurial arrangements and the availability of labour. Processing frequently took place within settlements, including cloth-making and framework-knitting in rural settlements and leather tanning in urban locations. All of these activities, which required open space and separation from domestic settlement, influenced settlement morphology and would have spurred population growth and hence settlement expansion.<sup>5-6</sup>

**Agenda topics addressed:** 8.4.4 and 8.5.1-8.5.6

**East Midlands Resource Assessment and Research Agenda:** 233-234

**English Heritage SHAPE sub-programme:** 11111:170

#### References:

<sup>1</sup> Courtney, P. 2006. The Post-Medieval period, in Cooper, N.J. (ed) *The Archaeology of the East Midlands*, 2006, 227-228; Beckett, J.V. 1988. *The East Midlands from AD1000*. London: Longman, 131-164.

<sup>2</sup> Courtney 2006, 227.

<sup>3</sup> Hartley, R.F. 2000. An Archaeological resource Assessment of Post-Medieval Leicestershire,

[www.le.ac.uk/archaeology/east\\_midlands\\_research\\_framework.htm](http://www.le.ac.uk/archaeology/east_midlands_research_framework.htm).

<sup>4</sup> Bishop, M.W., Baddeley, V. and Mordan, J. 2000. An Archaeological resource Assessment of Post-Medieval Nottinghamshire

[www.le.ac.uk/archaeology/east\\_midlands\\_research\\_frameworks.htm](http://www.le.ac.uk/archaeology/east_midlands_research_frameworks.htm)

<sup>5</sup> Palmer, M. 2000. Housing the Leicestershire framework-knitters: history and archaeology, *Transactions Leicestershire Archaeological historical Society* 74, 59-70.

<sup>6</sup> Shaw, M. 1996. The excavation of a late 15<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> century tanning complex at The Green, Northampton, *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 30, 63-128.

## Research Objective 8G

### Study the post-Dissolution re-use of monastic structures and the continuity of monastic estates

#### Summary:

The history of use of medieval monastic buildings and their estates following Henry VIII's dissolution of the monasteries between 1536 and 1539<sup>1</sup> remains poorly known and would benefit from further investigation. Some monastic institutions were abandoned after the Dissolution<sup>2</sup>, but many other monastic buildings were converted to dwellings<sup>3</sup>. The conversion from ecclesiastical to secular use is illustrated by virtually all of over a hundred monasteries in the diocese of Lincoln<sup>4</sup>, and elsewhere in the region has been demonstrated by documentary research and fieldwork at former abbey sites such as Launde<sup>5</sup> and Leicester<sup>6</sup>, and by a study of the buildings and gardens of the former monastic grange at Langtoft Hall Farm in Lincolnshire<sup>7</sup>. The Dissolution provided important opportunities for the acquisition of high-status buildings and for the transfer to secular hands of extensive, well-managed and wealthy monastic estates<sup>8</sup>. While there may have been little change in how the land was managed, many estates will have been sub-divided or amalgamated with other holdings. Such amendments should be visible in the components of the historic landscape as well as in written records<sup>9</sup>, and merit detailed study as important evidence for the development of patterns of land ownership in the post-Reformation rural landscape.

**Agenda topics addressed:** 8.6.1

**East Midlands Resource Assessment and Research Agenda:** 232-233

**English Heritage SHAPE sub-programme:** 11111:130

#### References:

<sup>1</sup> Beckett, J.V. 1988. *The East Midlands from AD1000*. London: Longman, 105 - 107.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. Lenton Priory, Nottinghamshire: Barnes, F.A. 1987 Lenton Priory after the Dissolution: its building and fair ground, *Transactions Thoroton Society* 91, 79-95.

<sup>3</sup> Courtney, P. 2006. The Post-Medieval Period, in Cooper, N.J. (ed) *The Archaeology of the East Midlands: An Archaeological Resource Assessment and Agenda*, Leicester Archaeology Monograph 13, 221.

<sup>4</sup> Stocker, D.A. 2006. *England's Landscape: The East Midlands*, 147-148.

<sup>5</sup> Beavitt, P. 1995. Geophysical and buildings survey at Launde Abbey, *Transactions Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society* 69, 22-31.

<sup>6</sup> Buckley, R. 1997. *Abbey Park, Leicester, an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Survey*, University of Leicester Archaeological Services report 97/12.

<sup>7</sup> Field, N. and Clark, M. 1991. *Langtoft Hall Farm Archaeological Evaluation*, survey for Lincolnshire County Council.

<sup>8</sup> Stocker 2006, 147.

<sup>9</sup> Courtney 2006, 221-222.

## **Research Objective 8H**

### **Investigate graveyards and other burial sites**

#### **Summary:**

Graveyards and other burials, including the mass graves that may survive at battlefield sites<sup>1</sup> and plague burial sites such as Eyam in Derbyshire<sup>2</sup> offer a wide range of information relating to demography, personal identity, religious observance and attitudes to death<sup>3</sup>, and in the case of graveyards the production, manufacture and acquisition of memorials. Graveyards and the stones they contain are also an important ecological resource meriting conservation. Despite their importance, graveyard memorials are at significant risk, not only from erosion but also as a result of misdirected 'tidying-up' and clearance, perceived safety precautions and direct threats posed by the construction of toilets, kitchens and other amenities, and hence recording should be regarded as a priority before irreplaceable evidence is lost. Graveyards also offer a wide range of recording and interpretation opportunities which are particularly well-suited to local community groups, and there is a need both to encourage such activities and to ensure a common approach so that comparable information can be retrieved from across the region<sup>4,5</sup>.

**Agenda topics addressed:** 8.6.3, 8.7.1

**East Midlands Resource Assessment and Research Agenda:** 234

**English Heritage SHAPE sub-programme:** 11111:130

#### **References:**

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Stoke Field (1487): see Objective 7H; Foard, G. 2008. *Conflict in the Pre-Industrial Landscape of England: a Resource Assessment*, University of Leeds, 52-53, fig.14.

<sup>2</sup> Wallis, P. 2005. *A Dreadful Heritage: Interpreting Epidemic Disease at Eyam, 1666-2000*, Department of Economic History, London School of Economics (<http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/22546/1/0205Wallis.pdf>)

<sup>3</sup>Hickman, D. 1999. Reforming remembrance: funerary commemoration and religious change in Nottinghamshire, 1500-1640, *Transactions Thoroton Society* 103, 109-124; compare Mytum, H. 2004. Rural burial and remembrance: changing landscapes of commemoration, in Barker, D and Cranstone, D (eds) *The Archaeology of Industrialization*, Maney, London, 223-240.

<sup>3</sup>Courtney, P. 2006. The Post-Medieval Period, in Cooper, N.J. (ed) *The Archaeology of the East Midlands: An Archaeological Resource Assessment and Agenda*, Leicester Archaeology Monograph 13, 230-231.

<sup>4</sup>Mytum, H. 2000. *Recording and Analysing Graveyards*, CBA Practical handbooks in Archaeology 15.

## **Research Objective 8I**

### **Investigate Civil War defences, siege works and battlefields**

#### **Summary:**

The East Midlands was an important arena of conflict during the First (1642-1646) and Second (1648) Civil Wars<sup>1</sup>, and this turbulent period saw the fortification of key towns such as Leicester, Nottingham and Northampton and some of its gentry houses<sup>2</sup>. The region preserves several battlefield and siege sites of national importance, including the decisive Battle of Naseby (1645)<sup>3</sup> and the remarkable complex of siege works encircling Newark-on-Trent<sup>4</sup>, plus many other skirmish, battle and siege sites that have potential for developing understanding of this period. Many of these are vulnerable to development and require the formulation of appropriate conservation and management strategies. There is an urgent need for an assessment of the survival and condition of structural remains at siege sites, together with a separate assessment of the taphonomy of battle archaeology to determine the factors determining the survival and condition of metal artefact scatters. These could provide a foundation for subsequent investigation by a combination of metal detector survey, remote sensing, excavation, documentary and topographic work. Appropriate methodologies have been developed at Naseby<sup>5</sup> and several other sites in the region, including Leicester<sup>6</sup> and Grafton Regis<sup>7</sup> in Northamptonshire, and should be extended to other sites in the region. Newark, with its exceptional system of preserved offensive and defensive monuments, stands out as an ideal focus for further study, which could build upon the excellent survey conducted by the Royal Commission<sup>8</sup> and more recent work associated with the Monuments Protection Programme<sup>9</sup>. Building particularly upon the experience of work carried out at Bosworth (Objective 7H), there is also significant scope for community involvement.

**Agenda topics addressed:** 8.7.1-8.7.3

**East Midlands Resource Assessment and Research Agenda:** 234

**English Heritage SHAPE sub-programmes:** 11111.130 and 11111.170

C:\data\EMRS\EMRSFinalReport\Post-MedievalSynthesis\_11-11-10

#### **Other specialist period/subject research strategies:**

Foard, G. 2008. *Conflict in the Pre-Industrial Landscape of England: a Resource Assessment*, University of Leeds, 267-269: 7.8, 7.12, 7.15

#### **References:**

- <sup>1</sup> Sherwood, R.E. 1974. *Civil Strife in the Midlands 1642-1651*, London, Phillimore.
- <sup>2</sup> Courtney, P. 2006. The Post-Medieval Period, in Cooper, N.J. (ed) *The Archaeology of the East Midlands: An Archaeological Resource Assessment and Agenda*, Leicester Archaeology Monograph 13, 234.
- <sup>3</sup> Foard, G. 1995. *Naseby: The Decisive Campaign*, Whitstable, Pryor Publications.
- <sup>4</sup> Royal Commission on Historical Monuments of England 1964. *The Civil War Siegeworks of Newark on Trent*, London: HMSO.
- <sup>5</sup> Foard 1995; see also general discussion of methodology in Foard 2008, 24-59.
- <sup>6</sup> Courtney, P. and Courtney, Y.C.S. 1992. A siege examined: the Civil War archaeology of Leicester, *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 26, 47-90.
- <sup>7</sup> Foard 2008, 169-170.
- <sup>8</sup> RCHME 1964.
- <sup>9</sup> Holyoak, V. 1997. Civil War monument project, Newark-on-Trent, Nottinghamshire: rediscovery of Civil War redoubt Z, *Transactions of the Thorton Society* 101, 109-118.

## **Research Objective 8J**

### **Develop further the study of ceramic assemblages**

#### **Summary:**

The region as a whole is poorly served by synthetic assessments of post-medieval ceramics, and although a number of key groups have been published<sup>1</sup> many important assemblages await full analysis and publication<sup>2</sup>. The development of ceramic studies needs to be underpinned by stronger guidance on methodologies to be employed during excavation, fieldwalking and post-survey analysis, and by the establishment of a regional ceramic type-series that will facilitate comparison and analysis of pottery and other ceramic artefacts and refine our understanding of ceramic chronology. Particular areas of inquiry, which should be addressed in further appraisals of ceramic assemblages, include the distribution of imported and other high-status pottery as an indicator of developing communications routes and patterns of changing status, diet and fashion<sup>3</sup>. Studies of individual assemblages which offer the chance to contribute to biographies of households and individuals should be encouraged, while the retrieval and study of assemblages from rural sites should also be promoted. Ceramic analyses may also contribute to studies of agricultural improvements, as demonstrated by the proposed link between the successful marketing of Ticknall ware and an expansion of dairy farming in the region (Objective 8D).

**Agenda topics addressed:** 8.2.5 and 8.8.1-8.8.5

**East Midlands Resource Assessment and Research Agenda:** 234

**English Heritage SHAPE sub-programme:** 11111:510

#### **References:**

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Coppack, G. 1973 Two eighteenth-century pit-groups from Lincoln, *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 8, 115-25; Woodland, R. 1981 The pottery, in Mellor, J and Pearce, T. *The Austin Friars, Leicester*, London: CBA Research Report 35, 81-129 (important Dissolution group).

<sup>2</sup> e.g. eighteenth century inn assemblage from Bowling Green, Leicester, and a probable house-clearance deposit from Halifax Place, Nottingham: Courtney, P. 2006 The Post-Medieval Period, in Cooper, N.J. (ed) *The Archaeology of the East Midlands: An Archaeological Resource Assessment and Agenda*, Leicester Archaeology Monograph 13, 231.

<sup>3</sup> As has been done for Lincolnshire: Hurst, J.G. 1991 Medieval and post-medieval pottery imported into Lincolnshire, in Tyska, D, Miller, K. and Bryant, G. (ed) *Land, People and Landscapes: Essays on the History of the Lincolnshire Region Written in Honour of Rex C.*, 49-65.

<sup>4</sup>Brears P.C.D. 1971. *The English Country Pottery*, 175