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ANNE BOROEGHE, OF CLERKENWELL AND DINGLEY

All Saints’ Church, Dingley, contains one of Northamptonshire’s most interesting and unusual monuments.

This is a brass, commemorating Anne Boroeghe, a former nun of Clerkenwell in London, and it dates from 1577. It is therefore the latest brass of a nun now existing in Great Britain, and it is situated on the right-hand side of the chancel, about head-high, on the central pillar.¹

The brass shows a female figure kneeling in prayer. The dress is not specifically that of a nun and is indeed of a type often used to depict widows of the period. The shield of the Boroeghe

¹ The Revd. A. Russell Twyford, Vicar of St. Giles, Desborough, who now has the care of All Saints’, Dingley, stated (Feb. 1975) that weekday access to All Saints’ can be obtained by applying for the key from Mr. and Mrs. Sanderson, 27 Harborough Road, Dingley.
(variant spellings include Borough, Burroughes, Brough and Burgh) family\(^a\) is prominently displayed on one side of the brass. The kneeling woman is shown as uttering the words: “Jesu, Jesu, mercie”, which have Catholic implications, but the inscription itself would have offended no Protestant of the period. It reads: “Here resteth the bodye of Anne Boroeghe, second daughter of Nycolas Boroeghe of Stanmer in the countye of Mydlesexe. Sometyme professed in Clerkenwell nere London who died the ix of Aprill in the yere of our Lorde God 1577 after she had lyved lxxv yeares, to the great losse of ye poore who in dyverse wayes were by her relieved”.

Why was a former Clerkenwell nun buried in Northamptonshire? Her family crest suggests East Anglian origins,\(^3\) but her father was a London merchant, Nicholas Boroeghe, of some wealth

\(^a\) Argent a chevron ermine fimbriated Sable between three chaplets Gules—as identified to the author by Windsor Herald of Arms, 2nd November 1973.

\(^3\) Confirmed by Windsor Herald of Arms, 2nd November 1973: “These (arms) resemble that of a Norfolk family of similar name, Burroughes . . . .”
ANNE BOROEHE, OF CLERKENWELL AND DINGLEY

and standing. His will, very piously couched, was witnessed by the prior of St. Bartholomew's, Smithfield, and he was buried in the priory church there (1527). After bequests to his wife and elder daughter, Alys, he left a sum of money "for Anne my daughter now being a nonne in Clerkenwell." Nicholas—now an outer London suburb—was Nicholas Boroeghe's country residence.

Nicholas's elder daughter, Alys, married a Geoffrey Chambers of Stanmore. A daughter of this marriage, Elizabeth, married Edward Griffin of Dingley Hall, Attorney-General to both Edward VI and Mary Tudor (though he was not, significantly, employed by Elizabeth I). She was his third wife, and the connection she brought him was clearly considered important, as both the Chambers and Boroeghe arms are impaled on the arms of his funeral certificate.

Elizabeth Chambers had previously been married to Sir Walter Stonor, who had died in 1550, and who belonged to a family that was to become noted for its recusancy, though Sir Walter himself seems to have conformed throughout his life. However, it is quoted by the Stonor family's historian that Elizabeth's own brother, "a priest, would one day be imprisoned for his faith". The circumstantial evidence suggests that the sister may have possessed similar leanings.

For it was this Elizabeth, née Chambers, who gave refuge to the aunt who was evicted from Clerkenwell at the Dissolution in 1539. Whether she had any part in her husband's decision to inscribe the cryptic "God Save the King, 1560" on the archway of Dingley Hall—implying, presumably, a belief in an eventual succession to the English throne of Philip II of Spain—is not known. But her background and what little is known of her actions suggest that this could have been the case.

The memorial to her aunt is particularly interesting in that it shows that here at least was one Augustinian canoness who carried on, in secular life, (presumably with financial assistance from her relations) the precepts of the original Augustinian code of charity, since her death was "to the great losse of ye poore, who in
diverse ways were by her relieved".

4 His will (Porch 1527) can be seen at the Public Record Office, London.
5 Preserved at the College of Arms, London E.C.4.
St. Mary's, Clerkenwell, had been one of the most important London religious houses for women. It was wealthy and fashionable, and attracted wealthy inmates—the daughters of rich London merchants and of the lesser aristocracy. Its last prioress, Isobel Sackville, who died in

7. Isobel Sackville was buried in the priory church, which was already parochial before the Dissolution. Most unfortunately, a brass depicting her in her nun's robes was destroyed during the rebuilding of the church (now known as St. James') at the end of the eighteenth century, though before its loss, sketches of it were published in the "Gentleman's Magazine". There is evidence that Isobel Sackville continued to reside near the convent after the Dissolution, with a number of other ex-nuns. However, her will (Lyons 29) which is in the Public Record Office gives little impression of either affluence—she had a pension of £50 p.a.—or religious enthusiasm. The remains of Clerkenwell Priory were quite extensive until the end of the eighteenth century, when the industrial expansion of the area caused their destruction. 12 eighteenth-century pen and wash drawings of the Nunnery Church and buildings, 11 done by John Carter, draughtsman to the Society of Antiquaries, can be seen in Finsbury Public Library. The only significant archaeological remnant of Clerkenwell today is the "Clerk's Well", just below present ground-level, near Farringdon Station. Its waters remain pure, and it can be inspected on prior personal application to the Librarian, Finsbury Public Library, 245 St. John Street, London, E.C.1. A portion of the priory wall has been excavated recently (1975: for this information the author is indebted to Mrs. E. V. Lewis, formerly of Finsbury Public Library).
1570, was the aunt of the Thomas Sackville who was created earl of Dorset by James I. Clerkenwell had enjoyed special privileges of independence from episcopal jurisdiction; Urban III took the convent under papal protection in 1186, a position confirmed by Celestine III in 1194, and it was only under an act of Henry VIII that the Bishop of London acquired jurisdiction over Clerkenwell and the parish. The convent's account rolls show that considerable sums were spent on the guest house, and also on its boarders, who were often relatives of the prioress. In its last years there is little positive evidence to suggest that the nuns in general showed any outstanding impulse to help the poor.

It is interesting, therefore, that Anne Boroeghe, with her meagre pension of £4 p.a., residing far away in Northamptonshire on the charity of her relations, should be the only recorded nun of Dissolution Clerkenwell to carry out so fully the original Augustinian role. Perhaps there were others like her, who have gone unnoticed, and perhaps Clerkenwell in its last days was something more than the wealthy retreat that the existing priory documents imply.

What precise charitable deeds Anne Boroeghe did we do not, unfortunately, know. But their mention, on the Dingley memorial, is important in that it does something to counter the still too common impression that by the time of the Dissolution the convents of sixteenth century England had outlived their usefulness, and were inhabited by women with little spirituality or true sense of dedication.

Audrey Butler.
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Some of the Trades and Trader Members of
THE NORTHAMPTON CHAMBER OF TRADE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOKSELLERS &amp; STATIONERS</th>
<th>'Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. Mark &amp; Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Established 1745)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 The Drapery 39400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING SOCIETIES</th>
<th>'Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglia Building Society</td>
<td>85 Abington Street 34800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONFECTIONERS</th>
<th>'Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. Lawrence &amp; Co.</td>
<td>35 St. Giles Street 37939</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENTAL STORES</th>
<th>'Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northampton Co-operative Society Ltd.</td>
<td>64 Abington Street 34866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FABRICS</th>
<th>'Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phillips's Fabrics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtain Fabrics</td>
<td>20-22 Abington Sq. 37446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress Fabrics</td>
<td>27 York Road 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIREPLACE SHOWROOMS AND TILE CENTRE</th>
<th>'Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Bell &amp; Co. Ltd.</td>
<td>Kingsthorpe Works 712505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLORISTS</th>
<th>'Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jack Haddon Ltd.</td>
<td>51 St. Giles Street 31368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSE FURNISHERS</th>
<th>'Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeffery Sons &amp; Co. Ltd.</td>
<td>33-39 Gold Street 39351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Watts &amp; Sons Ltd.</td>
<td>80 Abington Street 38212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINTERS</th>
<th>'Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guildhall Press (Northampton) Ltd.</td>
<td>1 Quarry Park Close, Moulton Park 491225/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Stevenson Holt Ltd.</td>
<td>152 Balmoral Road 71424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xpres Printers Ltd.</td>
<td>Norman-D-Gate 38703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bell's Yard)</td>
<td>Bedford Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RADIO &amp; TELEVISION</th>
<th>'Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Radio Co.</td>
<td>22-24 St. Leonards Rd. 61946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. A. Goode Ltd.</td>
<td>5 Towcester Road 61201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73b Harborough Rd. 714895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service Department 62591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHOE RETAILERS</th>
<th>'Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. H. Bonham (Established 1856)</td>
<td>33 St. Giles Street 36147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOLID FUEL MERCHANTS</th>
<th>'Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wiggins &amp; Co. Ltd.</td>
<td>6 Abington Street 36258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WATCHMAKERS &amp; JEWELLERS</th>
<th>'Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. Brugger</td>
<td>8 Abington Square 34367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. E. Prouse &amp; Son</td>
<td>64 St. Giles Street 39484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|            |          |
|            |          |
Kettering Inclosure 1804-5

The Kettering Inclosure in 1804/5 was in the hey-day of Parliamentary Inclosure; it is situated in Northamptonshire where the incidence of such Inclosure was greatest; it is directly based on the General Inclosure Act of 1801. Thus it can claim to be considered a type-example of Parliamentary Inclosure. The documentary evidence is good, for it includes resolutions of the original meetings of Proprietors, the Consent Bill and the State of Property, the Inclosure Act of 1804, the Minutes of the Commissioners' Meetings, the books of Claims and Requests, the Calculations of the Commissioners, the Inclosure Map and the Award 1805, the Inclosure Rate List and the Commissioners' Account with the Proprietors. In addition there is, for comparison, a first-rate pre-Inclosure Map of Kettering surveyed by William Brasier in 1727 and an accompanying Terrier with an 'Explanation'.

Inclosure by Act of Parliament usually began with a measure of agreement between landowners, leading to the drawing up of a petition. In Kettering the initiative came from the ordinary proprietors and seems to have been broadly based for the original meetings in June and July 1802 were attended by five proprietors holding over 100 acres each, six holding about sixty acres, ten smallholders and five who were only cottagers. This was very representative of the Parish. These meetings were called 'for the purpose of taking into consideration the propriety of enclosing and enfranchising' the Lordship of Kettering, and 'to settle proposals to be offered to the Lords and Rector'. The resolutions at these meetings agreed on certain conditions. First, that 1/5 part of tithable arable land and 1/9 part of tithable grass in the open field should be made to the Rector in lieu of tithes; and second, that 2/11 parts of land should be paid to the Lords in compensation for enfranchisement. The minutes of the second meeting were to be transmitted to the Lords and the Rector.

These local negotiations went on for over a year and when the petition was ready for presentation to Parliament on 23rd November 1803, the Bill had been signed by the joint Lords and Lady of the Manor (Lord Sondes, 6/10 of the Manor, and the Duke and Duchess of Buccleuch, 4/10 of the Manor), and the Rector, Joseph Knight, 45 proprietors of land, and the trustees of the Church and Town Land, the Poors Estates and the Free Grammar School. Twelve proprietors did not sign, indicating instead that they would be 'neuter', leaving only seven, holding between them just over ten acres of the land to be inclosed, who did not signify their views. Of those who later claimed only cottage rights—about 65—eighteen signed the Bill and three said they would be 'neuter'.

Thus the inclosure proposal met with widespread approval. Even among those officially 'neuter' many merely 'didn't like to sign' but 'wouldn't oppose'. Among these were two major proprietors, George Whirlark (108 acres) and Thomas Wright (107 acres) who had attended the second meeting in 1802. John Warner, as a Quaker, would not sign the Bill but had 'no objection to Inclosures, further than in respect of giving compensation for tythes. Think it will be of general benefit'. Only two expressed any opposition. Samuel Munn (28 acres) said 'I do not like inclosures. Won't oppose it. Will remain neuter', and Thomas Mee (42 acres) wrote 'No friend to inclosure. Will take no trouble in the business. Sha'n't interfere'.

On 15th December 1803 William Cartwright Esq., one of the Shire members for the County of Northampton, presented in the Commons 'a Bill for inclosing lands within the Manor

1 NRO X6108 XII/5 & XII/2 Resolutions.  
2 NRO X6108 XII/6a and 6c State of Property.
Fig. 1  Pre-Enclosure Map of Kettering  
based on Will Brasier's map of 1727
KETTERING INCLOSURE 1804-5

and Parish of Kettering'. It was given a first and second reading and before the Committee the Clerk, Mr. Marshall, declared the 'State of Property' to be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Agst.</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old enclosures</td>
<td>439.2.6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>71.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Field</td>
<td>1640.1.4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>532.0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage Commons on the Links</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard-land Common on Open Field</td>
<td>34(\frac{3}{4})</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>12(\frac{3}{4})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Bill received the Royal Assent on 9th March 1804.

The Act followed the pattern set by the General Inclosure Act of 41 Geo. III (1801). It proposed the inclosing of ‘open and common Fields, common Meadows, common Pastures and other common lands and waste grounds within the Manor and Parish of Kettering in the County of Northampton, consisting of 48 yardlands and diverse parcels of Acrement land and other comonnable lands and containing altogether by estimation 2,300 acres or thereabouts’. It made the standard claim that because the several lands ‘lie intermixed and are inconveniently situated, and are, in their present state, incapable of any considerable improvement; . . . it would be advantageous . . . if the same were divided and inclosed’. However, the preamble goes on to detail the tithe entitlement of Joseph Knight as Rector and later clauses lay down the precise terms of compensation to him in lieu of that entitlement. Thus an important motive was the desire to settle, finally, the vexatious issue of tithes. The General Inclosure Act made no provision for this commutation—it was first made statutory in 1836—but many private Inclosure Acts at this time did take the opportunity of so doing.

The Act named the three Commissioners. Thomas Eagle of Baginton, Warwicks. was nominated by the joint Lords and Lady of the Manor; James Waltden Roberts of Thornby Grange, Northants. was nominated by the Rector; and William Burdett of Mowsley, Leics. was nominated by the Proprietors.

The Commissioners held seventeen meetings of up to 5 or 6 days duration at about monthly intervals between April 1804 and December 1806 with a final three-day winding-up meeting in February 1809. They were held alternately at the George and White Hart Inns in Kettering. Throughout, notices of all decisions affecting the public and provisions for hearing objections were published well in advance on the outer doors of the Church and in the columns of the Northampton Mercury. Their work was carried out in the orderly manner one would expect from experienced Commissioners of Inclosure. Claims for land were invited at the beginning and evidence and objections were heard up to the sixth meeting, as were requests for desired locations of particular allotments. Boundaries of the land to be inclosed were viewed and valuations were made. Then the major roads were decided and, after detailed calculations of individual entitlements, the scheming of allotments and the allocation of fencing responsibilities were made. Then the rating levy was worked out. The arrangement of private roads and bridges followed and determination of subsequent requests and objections spread over several meetings. The complete Award was engrossed and legally proclaimed and finally the accounts were audited and settled.

At the first meeting, held 11th April 1804, only a month after the Act was passed, the necessary officers were appointed—bankers, solicitors and clerk, surveyor— and all persons concerned were invited to deliver their claims. These were received and printed in two booklets for inspection by all. There were in total 128 claims. Of these, 123 were made by individuals ranging from the Lord of the Manor to the humble cottager and the remainder were from five ‘bodies, corporate or politic’—the Fieldsmen of Kettering, the Poor Inhabitants, Kettering Church Lands, Kettering Parish, and the Cottagers.

---

3 J. of House of Commons, lxxv.7 p.55.
4 NRO X6108 XII/6b.
5 Kettering Inclosure Act 44 Geo. III.
6 These appointments minutes were signed by ‘a majority in value of the Proprietors of Kettering.’
7 Kettering Borough Lib. Local Collection Kett. 35 Enc. 6693 and 6694 Claims Books.
The Inclosure was to take in not only the field land but also the common and some old enclosures and the claims are all based either on the holding of parcels of land affected or on rights of common attached to holding yardland or cottages, together with a few other customary rights. Of the 123 claims by individuals, 103 claimed on cottages. 42 of these also had land, leaving 61, half of the total, claiming only cottage rights of common. As many as 52 claimed only on one cottage. There were 60 claims based on landholding, 18 of which made no mention of cottage or house. These were not the ‘absentee’ landlords, for seven are known to have lived in the Parish, occupying cottages belonging to another. Of the 13 landholders known to have lived outside, nine, including the Duke and Duchess of Buccleuch, lived in nearby villages and two, who sold their holdings very early on, lived in Wellingborough. The remaining two were Bryan Mitton (1.3 acres) of London and Edward Martin Esq. (73 acres) who may have lived in Godmanchester but was associated with Mrs. Martha Wallis in the Parish. Thus there was no ‘absentee’ landlord problem in Kettering.

Those who held land expected to receive an appropriate share in the re-allotment of the inclosed land and so their claims are generally expressed in acreage terms. Should their holding include yardland, they were additionally entitled to, and claimed, certain rights of putting stock on the open field land during the fallow year and between harvesting the wheat and ploughing for barley. Yardland was an ancient measure of land in the tenurial system of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. It was synonymous with a virgate or a quarter of a hide. It is doubtful whether it ever had a definite acreage but in any case it quickly became a conventional administrative unit and in 1804 it was important because it still carried the ancient privilege of stocking which other, more recent, land did not. In the claims this privilege is often un informatively expressed as ‘rights of common’ or just ‘common’, but in nine instances the claim is for specific numbers of horses, cows (or beeves) and sheep. In five the ratio is 1 horse, 1 cow and 8 sheep per quarter yardland and in the other four the ratio is 1 horse, 1 cow and 10 sheep. When the Commissioners do their calculations it is the former ratio that they use.

Normally, no claim for customary rights was made for land which was not yardland. Six claimants tried it, but the Commissioners did not recognise any of them.

Ownership of a cottage also carried with it a customary right, namely that of using the common land for pasturage. Out of the 103 such claims, 59 merely ask for ‘commons’ or ‘cottage rights’ and do not give any information, but 3 say ‘cow commons’ and 13 ‘a cow and a follower’. Two others are more helpful for they specify ‘a cow and a heifer’ and ‘one milch and one barren cow’. The main area of common land was 101 acres or thereabouts called the Links and lying in the north of the Parish. 31 claims specify common on the Links and one refers to Wadcroft, a partly enclosed area near the town centre.

In addition to the individual claims of cottage rights there was a joint claim made on behalf of ‘the Cottagers’. In this they claimed exclusive right to the use of the Links, admitting only three small exceptions. They also claimed exclusive rights of common on all the Lammas land in the Parish—i.e. the grassland which was open from Lammas (Aug. 1st) after hay harvest, until Candlemas (Feb. 2nd). As an alternative they claimed joint common with the husbandmen on the open field, which practice they said had been exercised by them for many years. The 27 signatures to this claim included six yardland holders so that it was no ‘poor man’s appeal’. The Commissioners were not influenced by these demands but treated each cottage right claim on an individual basis.

Thomas Gotch, a yardland holder, registered a claim on behalf of the genuine Poor Inhabitants of the Parish. These possessed no land nor had any right of common but desired to record their customary right to collect all brakes, furze, ling and heath from the Links, for use mainly as fuel. Inclosure would deprive them of access and they were hopeful of compensation. The Commissioners accepted this and when they came to divide up the Common set aside a 9½-acre plot as a Poor allotment. Nevertheless, the Poor did not get their brakes, etc. as before, for the

---

8 Ibid. Claim No. 127. 9 Ibid. Claim No. 67.
plot was let and they received the rents instead. It is not certain how far the recipients judged the money fair compensation for their lost customary pickings.

Cottage rights were often doubtful and the importance of substantiating them was occasionally recognised by the claimant. Nathaniel Collis said he had 'copy of Court Roll 1756' for one of his cottages and William Satchell said he was 'admitted tenant at Court in 1794'. Eight others used a formula such as 'as it has been enjoyed by me and my predecessors for time immemorial'. The minutes of the fourth Commissioners' meeting, in July 1804, record the request from several ancient cottagers for application to the Steward of the Manor for Court Rolls as evidence (practically all the land in the Parish was copyhold of the Lord of the Manor) and a letter was written to Messrs. Farrer & Atkinson asking them to send the Court Rolls to the care of Mr. Marshall as Deputy Steward. For any cottage in question the Court Rolls recorded the successive surrenders and admissions of tenants. In the case of the cottage claimed by Ralph Pickering, for example, the Rolls showed him to have been admitted on the surrender of Jno. Richards on 1st Oct. 1798. His title was thus confirmed. But many who had come to exercise a cottage right of common seem to have been unable to justify it in legal opinion. A total of 60 cottage claims, from 36 persons, were rejected, so that not all cottages carried common rights. The Duke and Duchess with three cottages as well as the Hall House were only granted one cottage common. Nathaniel Collis claimed for a second cottage which had been taken down ‘and the Great Meeting House erected thereon’ but it was not accepted. James Kempston who purchased his cottage in the Market Place in 1747, got commons, but John Davey who purchased his in Parkstile Lane ‘lately’ did not. John Jenkinson, writing in 1845 about the ‘Schedules of Claims 1804’10 says that the rights applied ‘only to ancient cottage estates, not to additional dwellings erected on these estates’.

Among the evidences are some relating to ‘stocking’. One relates to two cottages in Goose Pasture Lane held by James Chater but the subject of objection. Title was confirmed by Court Rolls from 1736 to 1788 and from 1739 to 1788 but evidence was given that James Chater had always kept on the Common five beasts, which was one more than normal. He was allowed 2½ cottage commons! It seems to have been important that stocking should have been maintained. There are several records of verbal evidence given on this question. One, taken from Mary Cave, aged 78, reads:11 ‘Remembers Mary, widow of Thomas Richards, afterwards Mary Deare, keeping a Cow which she has seen in an evening go in the entry at the side of her house in Cock Lane into the yard. Can’t say whether the Cow was depastured on the Links in the daytime or not, but has heard her mother say it was a Cottage. Can’t tell how long she kept a Cow. Was widowed after her marrying with Deare and kept none then’. Mary Deare did not get cottage commons.

Land holding was not so open to question and only two claims were turned down. The rest are recorded in the Calculations though there is some disagreement between the acreages claimed and those which the Surveyor measured.

As soon as claims had been put in many proprietors sent to the Commissioners requests that their allotments should be in certain preferred situations.12 The Commissioners met most of these. Thomas Mee, a farmer, wanted his land to reach the Beck Gutter because ‘being destitute of that privilege will be attended with very great expense to me to get water’. Ephraim Buswell wanted to retain the close next to his wool-warehouse because it had been in his family for 102 years. Robert Smith, surveyor, had an eye to the future. He said ‘It is certain we shall lose considerable of our employment among the farmers, namely marking lands, making terriers, laying out the grass, etc.’ so he thought a bit of land near the town might help him to a little ‘honest employment’. In 1826 he is listed as a gardener on the same premises near Mount Pleasant which he was allotted. Thomas Dash, bookseller, and Nathaniel Collis, stationer, were more reticent. They wanted their allotments to be adjoining because it would ‘better accord with our affairs at a future time’.

11 NRO X6108 VII Sundry papers of Evidences.  
12 NRO X6108 XII/3 Book of Requests.
Naturally land close to the town was in greatest demand and it is worth noting that the Duke and Duchess asked only a proportion of their land to adjoin the town. Their agent said that the rest ‘could be in remote parts which would be inconvenient for other proprietors but which could be let by their Graces to tenants on their lands in Weekley’. Nearly 80 acres was taken next to Weekley and 25 acres next to Barton.

This accommodating attitude was in marked contrast to the scheming of at least one who, knowing that inclosure was due, bought some land in the open field in order to claim and perhaps choose a favourable allotment. Mr. Marshall, the solicitor, originally claimed only cottage rights but then purchased about 20 acres of land and put in a request for the Hospital Close and Cow Lane Close, lammas-lands formerly held by the Duke and Duchess and close to their Hall in the town. The scheme came to light when their Graces’ lawyer objected. Since Mr. Marshall was Clerk to the Commissioners, the latter felt it necessary to record in their Minutes a declaration of their complete impartiality in accord with the oath they had taken. Mr. Marshall withdrew his request. Later, in a list dated 20th March 1805\textsuperscript{13} he is recorded as tenant, under the Duke and Duchess, of Hospital Close and Cow Close!

The sheets of calculations by which the Commissioners worked out their assessments, compensations and allotments are preserved in Kettering Borough Library’s Local Collection.\textsuperscript{14} The detail and accuracy are faultless and fascinating, a monument to their impartiality and a remarkable example of the arithmetic of Inclosure. There are listed 112 proprietors. Compared with the Claims Books, the list shows 20 whose claims were not accepted and 4 who, though they did not put in a claim, were recognised as claimants.

For the calculations all rights, lands, tithes, etc. are reckoned at their estimated annual value in terms of shillings. Rather surprisingly, all values and acreages are expressed in decimal notation corrected to the third place, i.e. to the nearest thousandth of a shilling or an acre! This in 1804 makes our 1971 decimalisation not such a new thing.

The grouping of the sixty columns shows the order of working. First the cottage and yardland common rights are valued—a cottage common at 8/- and a quarter yardland at 26/-. Then all individual holdings of land to be inclosed are valued and totalled. Next, individual deductions are calculated for tithe compensation on the scale of value equal to 1/5 of tithable arable and 1/9 of tithable grassland. These are totalled and the balances remaining are entered. Then land has to be provided in compensation for the value of lost stock common rights and for part of this contributions are deducted from all land-holders on a given scale. The other part comes, naturally, from the Links and other common land but first, 1/8 of the Links and 1/9 of other common is deducted for tithe, 1/16 is taken for Manorial rights compensation and some is set aside for the Poors’ allotment. What is left is added to the contributions from land-holders and the whole apportioned according to the rights of common valued at the beginning. Contributions are deducted and apportionments added to each individual balance.

Next a deduction of 14\% is made to provide land for roads and the plot for materials for road making.

Finally, all ancient enclosures held by the proprietors are listed and, in order to extinguish the tithes on these, 1/9 of their value is deducted and added to the tithe allocation.

This should have left the final individual ‘values to allot’, but a few complications arose over four ‘late-accepted’ cottage claims and the need to compensate the Rector for tithes lost from ‘diverse small proprietors’ who did not have claims on the inclosed land. These amendments are completed in the last column, Column 60.

The Act said that ‘Joseph Knight, clerk, as Rector, . . . is seized of certain Glebe lands . . . and in respect of them is entitled to certain common rights’. In this matter he is treated by

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid. Kett. 35 Enc.
the Commissioners as one of the Proprietors. However, he is also, as Rector, entitled to all the Great and Small Tithes. These tithe rights are to be extinguished by the allotment of land to the Rector in compensation, such land to be deducted from the various tithe-payers in accord with the specified rates. The Commissioners follow these instructions and so, at almost every step in the calculations, amounts are transferred from individual totals to the tithe allotment—except of course from the Glebe, which is tithe-free. The proprietors even have to forfeit some fraction to compensate the Rector for the tithes he will no longer get from those ‘diverse small proprietors’ who are not getting any divided land—though the Act does say that these are to pay money towards the Inclosure expenses.

The tithe allotment finally amounted to 9,465/- worth which was 13\(\frac{1}{2}\)% of the total annual value of the land being inclosed. It meant that the Proprietors, apart from the Rector, gave up between 1/8 and 1/7 of their holdings to the Rector in order to be free of tithe. Such was their judgement of that burden. The allotment approached twice the value of the largest other allotment, that to the Duke and Duchess. The figures were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tithe allotment</td>
<td>9,465/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Duke &amp; Duchess</td>
<td>5,622/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Duchess’s own holding</td>
<td>3,877/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Glebe—also held by the Rector</td>
<td>3,147/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The next eight major landholders</td>
<td>2,935/- to 2,533/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this context the Proprietors specially noted the detail in the following clause in the Act.

“These allotments to the Rector shall be in lieu of full satisfaction and compensation for all his Glebe lands, rights of common, all manner of Great and Small tithes, Moduses or Compositions, Dues or other payments whatsoever in respect of all and every the Messuages, Homesteads, Gardens, Orchards, ancient enclosures, Common, Common Fields, meadows, pastures, Common Grounds, Waste Grounds and all other Lands, Tenements and Hereditaments whatsoever in the Parish of Kettering aforesaid and the boundaries, limits and precincts thereof”.

The only payments still to be made to the Rector were the mortuaries, surplice fees and the Easter offerings. However, he was to be ‘for ever exonerated and exempt from providing and keeping a Bull and Boar for the use of the inhabitants of Kettering’.

The Inclosure was without doubt the greatest change ever to have taken place on the land of Kettering. 15 2,262 acres, being 82% of the land of the Manor, were affected and of the remaining 487 acres, 407 were the anciently enclosed land of the Hall Fields.

After April 1804 the Surveyor and the Commissioners went everywhere, measuring and valuing. Then, from 26th Nov. all rights of common on lands to be inclosed, field-land, lamas-land and common, were ordered to ‘cease, determine and be utterly and for ever extinguished’, and on or before that date all lands were to be cleared of ‘all manner of Meat, Cattle, Horses and Swine’. This was the point at which the old agricultural system finished. November was as convenient a time as any to interrupt the farming cycle, but there was still clover in the Middle Field and the Fieldsmen requested the Commissioners to set a value per acre on the crop so that such persons whose allotments might be awarded in that Field could take the clover at that valuation. As for animals, in theory the 48 yardlands permitted 192 horses, 192 cows and 2,536 sheep to be turned on the fields, plus about 250 or so cows permitted on the Common. It is unlikely that this maximum number were in fact there, but it is interesting to speculate where they were all kept, at a time when animal fodder was at a premium, until the allotments were made.

However, on 15th Dec. the Surveyor started staking out and delivered ‘tickets with the account of the fencing’ to each proprietor. As soon as an allotment was staked the proprietor was given possession and presumably that winter and spring witnessed a crescendo of feverish activity on the fields. The fencing had to be hedges of quickset, otherwise known as whitethorn and

\[15\] Compare Figs. 1 and 3.
hawthorn, with ditches or 'proper' mounds. There were to be post and rail guard fences along each side and convenient gaps were to be left for cart gates; and the new farm roads had to be formed. Thus appeared the chequer-board field pattern and, gradually, the ubiquitous hawthorn hedgerows so characteristic of the East Midlands countryside.

The pattern of landholding in 1804, before the Inclosure, was as follows. There was one very large landowner, the Duke and Duchess of Buccleuch holding jointly. Their 537 acres comprised 407 acres of the anciently enclosed Hall Fields and 130 acres of land in Open Field and was almost unchanged from the 'Domanes' delineated on Richard Treswell's map of 1587 drawn for Sir Christopher Hatton. The Duchess herself has separately a copyhold tenure of 155 acres making her a second very large proprietor. Then there were nineteen main proprietors, holding between 40 and 120 acres. These, with the Duke and Duchess, held 85\% of the Manor. The rest was spread among 64 smallholders, of whom 40 had less than 5 acres each.

After the Inclosure Award this pattern was very little changed. The joint holding of the Duke and Duchess was still the largest, but the Duchess joined the main body of landholders, with only 112 acres. Her place was taken by the Rector, for the tithe compensation award was 365 acres which, added to the Glebe, gave him 448 acres and lifted him from the main body to the status of second landowner. The main group remained nineteen in number, now ranging from 25 to 120 acres. The smallholders increased from 64 to 69 with 50 having less than 5 acres.

Expressed in cold statistics the change is thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very large Landowners</th>
<th>Main group</th>
<th>Smallholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before: 27% (2)</td>
<td>58% (19)</td>
<td>14% (64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After: 37% (2)</td>
<td>50% (19)</td>
<td>12% (69)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It would appear from these figures that the large landowners had grabbed the 'lion's share' at the expense of the others; but this was not the truth. As we have seen, the villain in the piece is the Rector with his massive tithe compensation award.

Although the Inclosure Award made no major upset in the pattern of landholding it certainly did for the individual farmer. Principally it put an end to the fragmented holding, characteristic of the open-field system. The Terrier which accompanies Brasier’s fine pre-Inclosure map of 1727 gives sufficient detail to enable the distribution of selions making up an individual’s holding to be mapped. This has been done in Fig. 2 for John Green who at that time held about 36 acres in 69 separate parcels of land spread over the whole of the open fields. 44 of these were less than a half-acre each. Though this was 77 years earlier there is no evidence to suppose that the situation had changed much down to the Inclosure.

After 1804, out of the 40 proprietors having more than a few acres, 24 had their land in one piece and 12 had one piece plus a close or meadow elsewhere, and only 4 had a split holding. This must have been a great practical advantage.

The costs of the Inclosure had to be paid by the Parish. The Act listed the expenses to be met by a Rate on all Proprietors and owners, except the Rector—which exception is italicised in the text of the Act. The Commissioners were each allowed £2 12s. 6d. for each day spent on the work of the Inclosure or in travelling to and from their homes for that purpose. Other

---

16 An estimate sent by John Lowick to the Commissioners gives details and costs. NRO X6108 Sundry papers.
18 The Award: NRO Y2 4232 & 4233.
19 The Map: Westfield Museum, Kettering; on loan from His Grace the Duke of Buccleuch. 'A Mapp of the Mannor of Kettering in the County of Northampton belonging to the most Noble John, Duke of Montagu & the Right Hon. the Earl of Rockingham as surveyed by Wm. Brasier anno 1727 and by the same hand mapped anno 1734.' The Terrier: NRO Kettering Terriers Box 4 No. 37 (Buccleuch).
20 The Committee of Inclosures of 1800 said the fee was usually 2 gns. a day, exclusive of travelling.
Fig. 2
The Yardland Holding of John Green in 1727

About 36 acres in 69 parcels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of parcels:</th>
<th>less than 1 rd</th>
<th>1-2 rd</th>
<th>2-3 rd</th>
<th>3-4 rd</th>
<th>1-2 ac</th>
<th>2-3 ac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
allowable expenses were those incurred in 'preparing and passing the Act'; in 'surveying, planning, valuing, dividing and allotting lands'; in 'surveying, admeasuring and planning old enclosures'; in 'enrolling the Award'; in erecting ring fences and mounds for the Rector; and in 'forming the roads in sufficient and good repair'. An auditor was appointed, John Bramston, barrister-at-Law, and only on his certification could any item of expense be charged to the Rate.

At their seventh meeting on 14th Nov. 1804, the Commissioners ordered a Rate of 30/- in the £ on the several proprietors to be made on the annual value of their open-field land and grounds. This was prepared by the Surveyor, John Eagle, and a Rate List was published in December. The total amount of the Rate was £4,391. In the final account only £6 10s. 6d. was still in arrears. This is marked 'desperate'!

Of the 209 Inclosure Rate-payers the largest landowner, the Duke and Duchess, paid the largest amount, namely £456. The next largest proprietor, the Rector, is not in the list. He paid the smallest amount—nothing. Between these extremes, 15 paid between £100 and £300; 53 paid between £10 and £100; 53 paid between £1 and £10; and 109, just over half, paid sums of less than £1. The commonest amounts were about £1 and about 2/-.

These rate payments should be judged against the average incomes for that time. According to P. Colquhoun's estimates for 1803, country-wide averages for farmers were about £120 annually and for tradesmen and shopkeepers, about £150 annually. For ordinary labourers, including farmworkers, it was about £30 which is about 12/- a week. In general the Rate demand took a considerable chunk out of a year's income.

The Commissioners' final Account was audited on 14th July 1809. The expenses therein were just about equally divided between administrative and practical costs. Of the first, the Commissioners' fees took a total of £730 or 17½%, and the Solicitor's and Clerk's fees took £1,183 14s. 3d. which was 28%. The only allowed expenses of meetings were the items of £10. 11s. 7d. and £7 3s. 6d. made as 'entitlement for labours, fire and candles' to Griffith Roberts and Christopher Jenkinson who were innkeepers at the White Hart and the George Inns respectively.

On the practical costs side the major items were understandably for surveying (20%) and public fencing (20½%). £812 15s. 9d. went to the Surveyor but that included his payments to his labourers. The only fencing expenses allowable were those for the Rector's allotments. The bill for this was specially checked by the Commissioners at their meeting in Dec. 1805—perhaps an indication of their concern that this expenditure should be justified to the Proprietors. After all, though the ring-fencing of the Rector's allotment seems to have been usual and was agreed to at the original meeting in 1802, this expenditure of £862, or one-fifth of the total expenses, for the benefit of a landowner who paid nothing towards Inclosure Rate, yet was getting an extra 365 acres of land, seems exceptionally preferential treatment.

The Account showed a balance remaining at the Bankers which was to be returned to the Proprietors in proportion to the sums first levied. It was £182 3s. 3d. and would refund to the land and cottage proprietors 1/- out of every 24/-.

Mathematically, the cost of Inclosure, or to be more accurate, the cost of executing the Act, averaged £1.86 per acre. However, since 491 acres—the waste and roads and the Rector's allotment—had to be paid for by the owners of the remaining lands, the monetary cost to the Rate-payers averaged £2.34 per acre for land of average annual value £1.55.

Comparing the 102 claimants on houses in 1804 with the 1801 Census figure of 641 houses in Kettering suggests that only about 16% of families in the town were directly concerned with the effects of inclosing the fields. It is a small percentage and reflects the great growth and importance of trade and commerce in the town in relation to agriculture.

21 The List is recorded in the Minute Book. NRO X6108 V.
22 P. Colquhoun Treatise on Indigence 1806.
23 See Minutes of Commissioners' Meetings.
Fig. 3  Post-Enclosure Map of Kettering  
From the Award Map 1805
In 1811, six years after the Inclosure, the Census gives a total of 713 families of which 126 are 'chiefly employed in agriculture'. This is 17½% and implies that despite the transformation in the appearance of the farmland the Inclosure had had little or no impact on the status of farming in the town’s economy, and certainly had not impaired it.

If one looks for actual farmers, the information of 1804 shows 13 known farmers and 7 or 8 probable farmers, together with two who are called 'gardeners'. The next comparable information is in Robert Smith’s list of owners and occupiers in Kettering in 1826. He records 15 farmers and 6 gardeners. Nine of the farmers and two of the gardeners can be positively linked with those of 1804, and two farmers and two gardeners are persons in the 1804 lists but not then in that occupation. The prosperity of farmers may have declined in the post-war period of depression, but their numbers have not declined.

The difficult problems were faced by those who had small plots allotted to them. There were about 48 in this position and about 26 sold their allotments and 22 kept them. Generally those who sold had not previously held any land at all, while those who kept already had small plots of old enclosure. Clearly experience in looking after land was an important factor in the decision. It means that those who sold had never in fact been ‘farm workers’. Many had other businesses such as draper or builder and were not being forced to give up their livelihood, but were getting rid of an unwanted, additional responsibility.

What they and other cottagers did lose was the free pasture on the ‘common’ for cow, pig, geese or hens and the occasional meat, milk, eggs, etc. this brought. Not all ‘cottagers’ were poor, but those who were did suffer from the inclosure. They were in any case the first to be hit by rising prices and falling employment and no doubt the loss of ‘commons’ caused them to join the ranks of paupers earlier than they might have done otherwise.

The Inclosure took place, however, against a background of industrial distress and poverty. Kettering Vestry Minutes for the period 1790 to 1820 are dominated by the burden of coping with the relief of the poor. The situation was aggravated by chronic unemployment following the collapse of the town’s major woollen industry which had been at its height as late as 1780. With the outbreak of the French Revolutionary War it became disorganised and earnings fell. There was never any recovery and the leather industry was not then sufficiently developed to take over. Poor Rate rose from £1,455 in 1793 to over £4,275 in 1817. The 1821 Census said that 1805 of a population of 3,668 were paupers. But Inclosure was not a contributory factor to this disastrous period. The first and only direct reference in the Vestry Minutes to unemployment in agriculture is in 1819 when a list of unemployed includes 18 ‘farmers’ labourers’. Almost certainly these lost their work because of the general depression and not because of the effects of Inclosure.

R. A. Martin.
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DENINGTON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE WELLINGBOROUGH
FACTORS INFLUENCING THE GROWTH OF PETERBOROUGH, 1850-1900

It was debated at the time whether Peterborough owed its growth and economic viability to its position as a regional marketing town and to the support that was received from agriculture, or whether the growth and development of the city from 1850 to 1900 was due primarily to the money spent by the railways and their workers. The *Victoria County History* states that the most salient feature of the economic history of Northamptonshire during this period was Peterborough’s evolution into a big railway centre. But while there is much truth in the observation that Peterborough would practically “collapse” by the end of the century if the “mass of railway signals, railway engines, railway carriages, railway workshops, and railway workers” were removed from the city, the contribution still being made by the agricultural interests and the growing importance of the developing brick works were also essential elements to the city’s economic well-being during the last half of the 19th century.

The controversy as to whom—agriculture or the railways—was due more homage was conducted at times during the half-century with great vigour by the respective supporters of the two interests in the city. It appears that, after the railways came to Peterborough, the supporters of agriculture felt duty bound, as they went increasingly on the defensive, to exalt the contribution that the farmers and the agricultural workers had made and were still making to the city’s prosperity. Some agricultural spokesmen conveniently chose to overlook the huge capital investment that the railways had made in the city and the numbers employed in the workshops, etc.; they saw the railway simply going “through” the town and maintained that it was not an industry of a “character that advanced it (the city) from a monetary point of view (sic)”. However, it became increasingly more difficult during the half-century for even the most fervent advocate of the agriculturalists to ignore the railways’ contribution to the growth of the city. They begrudgingly admitted, eventually, that the two were “intimately associated” and both were necessary in supporting the life of Peterborough.

The area around Peterborough, containing some of the finest farming land in England, suffered heavily in the agricultural depression after 1875, and particularly during the 1880s. The area depended a great deal on the production of grain and on pasture lands and was severely effected by the decrease in the price of staple crops, such as wheat, during this period. A Royal Commission report on agricultural distress in 1881 noted that the Peterborough area was the most severely hit in the district, and in the first six months of 1880 more farmers in the area went bankrupt than in all of the previous twenty years.

A very gradual improvement took place by the end of the decade, and those who survived and stayed on the land were those who diversified from the rigid syllabus of corn growing, the traditional type of production in south Lincolnshire and the fenlands. Some of the farmers now

---

2 *Peterborough Advertiser* (hereafter referred to as P.A.), 1 April 1893.
3 P.A., 13 December 1873.
4 This phrase was used in 1893 (P.A., 18 November 1893), by J. Nichols, one of the city’s leading land developers. Nichols had come full circle in his appraisal regarding the contributions of the two industries.
FACTORS INFLUENCING THE GROWTH OF PETERBOROUGH, 1850-1900

c. 1875

ROADS CONSTRUCTED SINCE 1865

c. 1885

ROADS CONSTRUCTED SINCE 1875
grew fruit and vegetables, and others bred and sold animals. In point of fact, the area had, by 1885, achieved a degree of notoriety as the centre for the breeding and sale of cart horses. These were highlighted at the annual Peterborough Agricultural Show, one of the most important and successful in the Kingdom, as well as at a number of agriculture shows and exhibitions held annually in the city. The profusion and success of these shows helped to ease the effects of the depression on the farmers, together with helping the life and trade of the town.

The railway was instrumental in helping to ensure the success of these shows by running numerous excursion trains into the city. Its help to agriculture in this way underlined how important was the role of the railway in ensuring that Peterborough maintained her claim as an important regional marketing area. But there was little that the railway could do to overcome the lack of foresight shown by city officials and agriculturalists as to the location and management of the cattle market in the city. The market proved to be an unsuccessful financial venture for its private investors and was sold to the Corporation in 1891. By the end of the century, this "white elephant", as some now called it, proved no greater a success for the Corporation than it had been for its original

---

7 Farmers in the eastern part of England were slower to change their farming habits and types of production than most of the farming areas in the country. T. W. Fletcher, "The Great Depression", Economic History Review, second series, XIII, 1, 2 and 3. 1960-1. p.431. Royal Commission on Agriculture, Final Report of Agricultural Depression, XV, 1897, p.21.

8 The first Agricultural Show, in 1837, was located in the yard of the "Waggon and Horses" off Bridge Street. It moved several times up to 1889, at which time the Peterborough Agricultural Society signed a twenty-four year lease with the Church Commissioners. P.A., 11 October 1862, 13 July 1867, 1 July 1876, 11 May 1890. Church Commissioners' Files, 78383, 25 July 1899.

9 The cattle market promoters agreed to purchase, in 1861, six acres of land north of Midgate from the Earl Fitzwilliam, who was known to oppose further northward expansion of the city. (P.A., 27 March, 29 May, 5 June, 31 July 1858, 9 March 1861). Peterborough should have followed the example of Crewe. Here the cattle market "died" in the centre of the city but regained life after a permanent shift to the neighbourhood of the railway station by 1883. See, W. H. Chaloner, The Social and Economic Change in a Midlands Town, London 1966, pp.101-02.
owners. Thus, the real potential for a regional cattle market operation was never realized, and the impetus never materialized for other, associated pursuits, such as a dead meat market and the use of skins for a much bigger boot and shoe industry.

Undeniably, Peterborough prospered most when agriculture in the area prospered, and the depression in agriculture was a contributing factor to the slowed rate of the city's growth during the 1880s and early 1890s. But by this time, the city's dependence on the farmers had waned: far fewer people lived in the farming areas round Peterborough, and less than three per cent of the male work-force living in the city in 1900 worked on the land, compared with twenty-one per cent in 1850. The slack was taken up by the railway. Whereas only one in nine of the employable male work force in the city worked for the railway in 1850, one in four did so in 1900. And the thousands of pounds earned and spent weekly by the railway workers was now the single most important source of income for the tradesmen of the city.

The railway in Peterborough was a many faceted operation, not the least important of which were facilities for handling extensive passenger and goods traffic. The city, by mid-century, had established itself as one of the important links in east-west rail traffic, but after the completion of the Great Northern's London to York line in August of 1850 and the extension of the Great Northern's line to Nottingham and Yorkshire in 1852, the "cross-country lines—Peterborough to Syston, to Rugby, to Northampton—were never able to rise above the status of feeder", because the "pull of London and the towns to the north was so strong".

Most of the goods trains to the city during the half-century carried coal. The Peterborough yards became a depository and clearing house for much of the coal coming from Yorkshire and the north of England via the Great Northern railway, and from the west via the Midland railway. It was usually despatched directly from the colliery to Peterborough, where it was sorted out and put on trains for London and the east of England. By the end of the century, three million tons of coal were arriving yearly from Derbyshire alone, and 2,500 loaded coal wagons were passing daily through the city.

The Great Northern made the most of Peterborough's advantageous position to establish in the city one of their most important railway and workshop centres. None of the other railway companies matched the scale of the Great Northern's operation in the city, and the community of New England, in the northern part of the city, owed its existence almost solely to the Great Northern. Peterborough was to become known as a "Great Northern town".

The railway made its first 150 appointments in July of 1850, shortly before the opening of

---

10 Those taking up shares, for example, saw them drop from a high of £12 in 1877, to a low of £7.10 in 1886 (Stamford Mercury, 6 April 1886. P.A., 3 February 1877; 26 June 1886). By the end of the century the Corporation was losing money on the market operation. See, also, Peterborough Cattle Market Minutes Book, various dates.

11 There was only one shoe factory built in the city. This was in 1871, and it expanded twice between 1887 and 1898. There were many independent shoemakers. Peterborough City Directory, Peterborough 1871, p.13; 1896, pp.168, 172; F.A., 7 February 1863; 16 September 1865, and other dates.

12 The city's population increase, from 1881 to 1891, was 18.6 per cent, compared, for example, to a 48.3 per cent gain between 1851 and 1861. See, T. M. Cunningham, "The Growth of Peterborough, 1850-1900", unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge University 1972, Table 9, p.107.

13 Cunningham, Ibid., Table 15, p.130.


15 Grantham and Doncaster were the other cities on the York-London line of the Great Northern where coal was "divided" (Royal Commission on Railways, 1867, XXXVIII, pt. 1, evidence of S. Clarke). Some of the coal was burned in coke ovens; before 1850 the London and North Western had fifty ovens, almost all of them on the south bank of the river at Fletton. F. Head, Stokers and Pokers, London 1849, p.65.

16 1,000 of these waggons passed over the Midland and Great Eastern (P.A., 16 September 1893) systems, and there were 1,500 Great Northern coal waggons daily, Nock. op. cit. p.130.
their “North” station and the completion of their line from London in August. The workshops in New England, which opened in 1852, were the centre of heavy repairs and engine overhauls, and the outlay for 226 “barrack” workers’ houses built here was only part of the Great Northern’s continuous heavy outlay of capital. For example, more than £100,000 was spent in the decade of the 1860s; nearly half of this in 1865 alone. The amount spent during the quarter-century of their greatest expansion in the city, 1859-1884, was in excess of £200,000.

The fact that the company was spending over £2,000 a week in wages by the mid-1880s, helped to ensure that the city’s growth rate would not be checked entirely owing to the depressed state of agriculture in the area. More workers, in point of fact, were added to the payroll in 1887, when the company extended their factory which made tarpaulins used to cover their wagons. Their expansion continued through the 1890s, and by the end of the century the Great Northern was taking on a “good many more hands”, and their position as the city’s single most important company was unchallenged.

Starting before the Great Northern, the city’s first major railway was the Eastern Counties, later re-organized and re-named the Great Eastern. Their station, the few houses that they built for their employees, and their “diminutive” yards served also, in the first few years, for both the London and North Western and Midland railways. The Great Eastern’s operations into the east of England expanded continuously from mid-century, and by the 1870s they had a large network of shops in Peterborough. Although some of the traffic in agriculture was hit by the depression in the 1880s, the Great Eastern had, by this time, taken up the slack by an increased business in coal and commerce between the east of England and new markets in Lancashire and Yorkshire. By the end of the century, renewed business in agricultural goods, increased activity in coal, and the growing trade in bricks had led to further expansion in their Peterborough operations.

The Midland railway had, as early as the 1860s, through their operation of the Peterborough, Wisbech and Sutton line, control of some important coastal rail traffic in the east of England. Largely owing to their stake in the newly opened Wisbech line, the Midland’s operation in the city was considerably expanded by the building of new workshops and sheds in the Crescent and Spital Bridge areas in 1871, which were enlarged in the 1880s to include their own foundry and carriage departments. Similar to the Great Eastern’s operation, the Midland increased their east coast port traffic in coal in the 1880s and 1890s, and much of the resultant build-up in plant

18 This information was found in the various accounts and minutes of the railway companies in the British Transport Commission Archives. From 1859 to 1868 the Great Northern accounts were listed separately in a Reports and Accounts book (GN RAC 1/155), and the printed minutes and accounts of the general meeting of shareholders from 1869 to 1884 were included in the *General Minutes Books* for these years (GN 1/7). See, also, Grinling, *op. cit.*, pp.262, 297, for brief references to the capital expenditures by the Great Northern in Peterborough during some of these years.
19 P.A., 7 April 1883.
22 P.A., 15 August 1874; 6 February 1875. Information regarding the Eastern Counties’ initial outlay in Peterborough can be found in S. Salt, *Railway Commercial Information*, London 1850, p.93.
23 The Great Eastern was also being pressed for more passenger accommodations, which meant a bigger station. Additions to the “East” station were made in 1887, and again in 1896 (P.A., 1 October 1887; 25 July 1896). In December, 1896, the Great Eastern began carrying coal from North Derbyshire and by 1900, from Sheffield. Allen, *op. cit.*, p.52.
24 The Wisbech and Sutton line opened for passenger traffic on 1 August 1866. The line formed a junction with the Midland line near New England. Clinker and Dane, *op. cit.*, p.225.
25 The Midland had their own “box” of a station at the Crescent from 1858 to 1866. It held a “few pieces of luggage, a booking clerk, and a half-a-dozen passengers” (*Stamford Mercury*, 9 March, 28 September 1860). The Midland’s foundry cast between 200 and 250 tons weekly during the mid-1860s, and it was reported that, at any one time, it was possible to see as many as 100 new carriages standing outside their shops. P.A., 12 January, 5 July 1884, and other dates.
facilities took place in Peterborough. In point of fact, their links with the east coast ports enhanced Peterborough’s prospects of becoming a major terminus for foreign trade, but efforts to increase commerce between the city and east coast ports, largely through increased rail traffic and greater use of the Nene, were never to be realized.

The most serious effort undertaken by the railways in their attempts to “marry Peterborough with the sea” was the building of the Sutton docks, largely paid for by the Great Northern, which invested heavily in a private stock venture for this purpose. The idea was to build berths for North Sea ships and the Great Northern would build tracks to the docks. Goods would then have been sent to Peterborough for sorting and shipment elsewhere. The Great Northern and all who had invested in the scheme lost everything when the docks collapsed in May, 1881, after being in operation for only one day. Efforts to rebuild and make use of the port were tried at various times during the rest of the century but without success.

The Nene, which once played an important part in the economic life of the city before the arrival of the railway, had been deteriorating for some time up to 1850, and continued to do so for the remainder of the century. Below the city to the sea, the river was subjected to periodic “silting up”, and at times during the 1870s, the depth of the water at Peterborough bridge measured only six inches. Obstacles preventing the free flow of water from the sea were the cause of the silting, and one of the major ones was a shoal three miles below Peterborough called Northey Gravel. All attempts to remove it were stiffly opposed by the Duke of Bedford, whose Thorney estate, he claimed, would be deprived of fresh water since it was the shoal that kept out the salt seawater.

Some interests in Peterborough were not unaware of the commercial possibilities of the river and tried to make use of it. The steamship navigation companies, whose boats drew the barges, saw the advantage of the river passing through a major railway centre such as Peterborough. By 1888, 9,000 tons of straw annually was passing through the city, and with traffic in grain and hay increasing, the Eastern Counties Steam Navigation and Transport Company saw the possibilities of eventually carrying between 300,000 and 500,000 tons of produce to and from Peterborough every year. But this amount of business was never to be realized, and the Navigation Company stopped their operation in 1891, when the river’s silting became so bad that a journey of thirty-four miles on the river took as long as three days.

The trade in grain, timber and bricks would have justified some more serious attention being paid to the river’s condition, and the general inattention of the Nene Valley Commissioners, whose job it was to preserve the river as a navigable channel, was partly responsible for the Nene’s dismal state in 1900. But it was the Bedfords, more than anyone else, who were responsible for stifling any river improvement proposals, and their behaviour in this matter throughout the century was obdurate and selfish. Their insistence that the maintenance of the Thorney Estate take precedence over all other interests, plus the threat of an injunction and a fine of £25,000 if any attempt to improve the river was made, meant that the chance to exploit the Nene for the greater welfare of Peterborough was lost.

56 There were complaints initially—like those levelled against the Great Eastern when they assumed control of additional lines—that the Midland was diverting away from the city a great deal of coal traffic from the east coast ports, notably King’s Lynn, which formerly “reached in” at Peterborough. P.A., 19 January 1884.
27 P.A., 3 June 1876. A good description of the Nene, the area it covered and the amount of land it drained, was included in the Report from the Commissioners on the Sewerage of Towns, Accounts and Papers, 1861, XXXIII.
28 The Town Council finally sent, in 1886, a deputation to talk with the Duke of Bedford about the state of the river. They had no success. Peterborough Council Minutes, 2 June 1886.
29 This company was the largest and most important of the shipping companies using the Nene. P.A., 5 July, 12 July, 6 December 1890; 21 March 1891.
30 P.A., 6 February 1892.
31 A feeble defence of his position was offered by the Duke of Bedford in A Great Agricultural Estate: Being the Story of the Origin and Administration of Woburn and Thorney, London 1897.
The remark was made in 1879 that Peterborough was becoming famous for "extinct companies". It is difficult to know what this meant because records show that not all that many companies had, in the first instance, been located in Peterborough. Indeed, the claim was often made that there was a lack of industries to augment the railway and take care of the surplus labour in the city. For example, at the time of the incorporation of Peterborough in 1874, it was claimed that one of the great disadvantages of trying to live and work in the city was its lack of industry, and that this was the reason why so many people signed the petition for incorporation. The Improvement Commissioners and private entrepreneurs had failed adequately to exploit the railway facilities in order to bring new industry, and it was also claimed that the facilities for trade were no greater in 1870 than they had been in 1850.

There were those who saw the need to attract new industry to the city; they were aware of the city's "disadvantage as compared with Leicester, Loughborough and other towns from the want of any trade or factory... and were desirous of erecting works and furnishing employment like that afforded in other Midland towns". But those who had attempted to promote manufacturing were faced with the difficulty of finding suitably placed and priced land for building their factories. In particular, it was the high price of land which scared off prospective industrialists because landowners, as the Advertiser remarked, "opened their mouths too wide". In most parts of the city throughout the half-century, those who wanted land for industrial development had to compete with building speculators, and landowners were aware that speculators were usually prepared to pay more. The end result was that "Poor, Pottering, Potential Peterborough" had little standing in the nineteenth century as either a commercial or industrial city.

The industrial development that did take place in Peterborough was directly connected with the railway's expansion. For example, independent railway coach-making companies were solely dependent on the railways for their success, and by the end of the century there were at least nine companies located along the Great Northern's sidings and six along the Great Eastern ones. As the railway attracted numerous skilled artisans and mechanics to the city, a surplus of this type of worker made it possible for light engineering firms to expand during the half-century. Cycle manufacturers, ironmongers, and farming implement makers were natural off-shoots and beneficiaries of the railway industry's excess of technically skilled personnel.

How much the railway helped in the development of a firm such as the Queen Street Ironworks, which was one of the largest makers of farm machinery in the east of England, is difficult to say. The Queen Street firm preceded the railways, and its growth was due as much to its technical achievements and adaptability as to the fortunes of agriculture and industry, not only in the area, but in the rest of the country as well. The firm produced a variety of products, from institutional cooking and heating units to steam ploughs. And when the depression in agriculture hit sales of the latter, the Ironworks turned to the manufacture of brickmaking machinery. It was during the 1880s that the first of the brickmaking machines were made for the Fletton yards, and, eventually, the sales of these were to depend, in large measure, on the viability of the brick industry in and around the city.

Much of the growth of Peterborough south of the Nene after 1880, and of the city itself after 1890, is closely connected with the development of the brick industry. The exploitation of

---

33 P.A., 15 February 1879.
34 Enquiry on the Incorporation of Peterborough, from the shorthand notes of G. Stedham, Peterborough 1873, p.57, et. seq.
35 Church Commissioners' Files, 51560 letter of Smiths-Gore, Commissioners' land agents, 9 July 1875.
36 21 November 1882. See, also, P.A., 14 December 1898.
37 P.A., 23 November 1898.
39 This was true of other cities where engineering works were to be found. For example, Church notes this about Nottingham. Roy Church, Economic and Social Change in a Midlands Town, London 1966, pp.245-7.
40 At the height of their operations, they employed about two hundred men. Ancestors of the present Perkins Diesel Manufacturers were associated with the firm. See E. J. Barford, "A Short History of the Queen Street Ironworks" (a memoir of J. D. Barford, J.P.), Peterborough, January 1924.
the rich deposits of Oxford clay was eventually to make Peterborough the centre of one of the most extensive brickyards in the country. The best of the clay and, therefore, the area of the greatest development of the industry was found immediately to the east near the village of Whittlesey, and in and to the south of the city in the parishes of Fletton, Woodston, Yaxley and Farce. One of the earliest yards making bricks, however, was located near the Great Northern railway line in New England.  

As it had done for other industrial and agricultural pursuits in the area, the railway made the growth of the brick industry here possible. All of the brickyards were within easy reach of rail lines, and the railway was to quickly replace barges on the Nene as the cheapest and most convenient means of transporting bricks out of the area. The railway also made it possible to bring in the enormous quantities of coal needed for the firing of the kilns, and the speed with which bricks were dispatched to market areas—particularly one as good as London—undoubtedly provided the necessary impetus for the greater exploitation and development of the brick industry.  

Profits were small and production was still only "several thousands" a week up to the end of the 1870s. But by 1882, Fletton was "beginning to assume the proportions of a populous place", and the need for new houses was much felt in the area. However, house building and development here throughout the 1880s was to reflect the unsteady and unprofitable state of the industry itself. In point of fact, by 1888, several of the brickyards were at a standstill, and as late as 1891, the 13 local brickyards were producing, roughly, only half of their capacity.  

A busier and more prosperous brick industry by 1892 was the result of a revival of the building trade in the area and the rest of the country. At this time the London Brick Company, for example, opened more yards, and the annual production capacity of the Fletton-type brick-makers now stood at one hundred millions, and the number in their employ had reached 1,000. And although there were fluctuations in the fortunes of the industry during the remainder of the decade, growth was experienced, particularly in the years 1898 to 1900, when five new yards were opened in Fletton, four in Whittlesey and one north of Peterborough at Eye.  

By 1900, the land in and to the south of the city had been given over almost exclusively to brick production. Sixteen-hundred acres had now been acquired here by brick producers, and the annual capacity of the thirty-one brick works stood at approximately four hundred millions. This represented at least a five hundred per cent increase in production in the past decade. It also meant that land values here skyrocketed; the greatest rise was experienced in parishes such as Yaxley and Farce. A few years previous, agricultural land fetched £30 per acre. This same land exploited for brick making purposes now sold for as much as £600 per acre.  

It is clear that the brick and railway industries had now assumed from agriculture the task of providing the impetus to the growth and development of the city. It was the railway which bore the brunt of this task and the importance of the railway to Peterborough's growth was not simply its presence as a prosperous industry, but that, in various ways, it complemented and

---

41 Victoria County History, op. cit., 1, p.166. See also, Henry Porter, Geology of Peterborough and its Vicinity, Peterborough 1861, p.61. Peterborough itself did not rest on Oxford clay but on hard limestone rock called Cornbash or Forest Marble.

42 The Nene Navigation Company tried for a time to compete with the railways, but without success. A barge holding 12,000 bricks could sometimes take weeks to get to London. Nevertheless, barges continued to be used up to the end of the century. P.A., 2 October 1897.

43 P.A., 8 April 1882.


45 By 1894 at least 115 more acres had been bought in the Fletton area for future brickmaking use. P.A., 4 November 1891; 14 May, 15 October 1892; 8 September 1894. Stamford Mercury, 20 November 1891; 12 February 1892. The British Clayworker, April, November 1892, quoted in Collier, op. cit., p.135.

46 Collier, op. cit., p.142. Approximately seventy acres at Eye was to be owned by a syndicate of Peterborough residents. P.A., 10 April 1897.

47 Some reports gave five hundred millions as the annual figure (Collier, op. cit., pp.143-4), but based on the 60,000 tons of coal used by the industry in 1900 (ibid., p.152), and the fact that 325 pounds were used to make 1,000 bricks, four hundred million may be closer to the mark.

48 P.A., 7 April 1898; 6 September 1899.
strengthened other aspects of the city's economy. Its viability and general economic momentum, built up by the late 1870s, mitigated the possible adverse effects on the city's growth caused by the precarious state of agriculture. In the long run, it was the railway which helped to restore some of the prosperity to agriculture, and to provide, as it did for the brick industry, avenues for expansion beyond the frontiers of the local area.

That the brick industry now shared with the railway the job of maintaining Peterborough's trade and commerce was reassuring. Peterborough could now boast of a second major industry to ensure that its prospects for growth continued, and that this new industry would help to relieve the erratic fortunes that a city so heavily dependent upon a single industry invites.

T. M. Cunningham.