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PART 1

INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY
1. BACKGROUND, AIMS AND METHODS

The Northumberland National Park Historic Village Atlas Project is a collaborative project between the National Park Authority and local communities,¹ the main product of which is an atlas of Historic Villages in the Northumberland National Park (NNP) area.

Despite a considerable amount of historical and archaeological research within NNP, much of this work has been targeted on outlying sites and areas and there has been little targeted study of the historic villages themselves. Previous studies undertaken into the history of the villages, including those provided by the antiquarian, Hodgson (1827), those contained in the County Histories, as well as the later work of Wrathmell (1975) and Dixon (1985), cover some of the same ground as the present studies, but are now in need of revision in the light of subsequent archaeological discoveries and historical findings, as well as changes to both the built fabric and community of the villages in the National Park area. Even John Grundy’s impressive work on the buildings of the National Park completed as recently as 1988 has been rendered out of date by the conservation, renovation, adaptation and, in some cases, demolition of many buildings covered in his report.

The increased pace of modern development within the National Park has put pressure on its cultural heritage resource, specifically its historic buildings and villages. One of the aims of the Historic Village Atlas Project, therefore, is to provide additional information which NNPA can use to further inform its approach to the management of sites of cultural heritage importance.

Changes in the social fabric of the area, often linked to the development work outlined above, mean that traditional lifeways maintained over many generations are now becoming increasingly rare or extinct. In particular, many traditional farming practices and the skills, tools and buildings used to support them have been lost and are being lost, and along with these has gone a regional vocabulary of specific terms and expressions. However, within the same communities there is also a considerable interest in the history and archaeology of the villages. Part of the purpose of the Historic Village Atlas Project, therefore, is to provide information and advice to facilitate not only greater understanding, but also active participation by community members in investigating and preserving aspects of the past. Some of the ways in which this can be achieved is through the presentation of data, guided walks and oral history recordings, all of which have been built into the project brief.

The study presented here was commissioned in order to redress the lack of systematic research into the historic settlements of the Northumberland National Park area, with the intention not only to contribute to the Regional Research Agenda, but to inform the planning and heritage management process, and provide impetus and encouragement for local communities to carry out their own work.

The main aims of the project are as follows:

- To further the study, understanding and enjoyment of the historic villages, both by interested individuals and community-based groups.

¹ See the Acknowledgments section of the Synthesis volume for a list of institutions and individuals that have provided assistance in various ways.
➢ To reinforce and develop the existing sense of place and belonging of individuals within the communities of the region.

➢ To provide a springboard for future community-led initiatives by supplying information which community groups can use to develop their own proposals.

➢ To facilitate the management of the cultural heritage by the NNPA

Village settlements, traditionally recognisable as clustered assemblies of houses and farmsteads, are scarce within the Park, where most settlements are isolated farms and hamlets. However, on the basis of their current status and what was known about their historic importance, the NNPA identified seventeen historic villages for study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>OS Grid Reference</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akeld</td>
<td>NT 957 296</td>
<td>Glendale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alnham</td>
<td>NT 996 108</td>
<td>Alndale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alwinton</td>
<td>NT 923 065</td>
<td>Coquetdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrness</td>
<td>NT 764 026</td>
<td>Redesdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsdon</td>
<td>NY 937 934</td>
<td>Redesdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falstone</td>
<td>NY 724 875</td>
<td>North Tynedale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Tosson</td>
<td>NU 027 006</td>
<td>Coquetdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhaugh</td>
<td>NY 795 873</td>
<td>North Tynedale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbottle</td>
<td>NT 935 046</td>
<td>Coquetdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hethpool</td>
<td>NT 896 284</td>
<td>College Burn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Rochester</td>
<td>NY 832 982</td>
<td>Redesdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holystone</td>
<td>NT 955 026</td>
<td>Coquetdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingram</td>
<td>NU 019 164</td>
<td>Breamish Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilham</td>
<td>NT 884 325</td>
<td>Glendale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirknewton</td>
<td>NT 915 303</td>
<td>Glendale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarset</td>
<td>NY 788 855</td>
<td>North Tynedale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westnewton</td>
<td>NT 903 303</td>
<td>Glendale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Villages do not exist as self-contained units, but rather as focal points within the wider landscape. It is important, therefore, in attempting an understanding of the development of villages themselves, that the study villages are investigated in the context of their wider landscapes, which may be definable by bounded areas, such as parishes and townships, or by topographic features such as river valleys.

Modern villages exist within clearly demarcated territories known as civil parishes, which are generally based on the boundaries of earlier territorial units labelled townships – units of settlement with pre-Norman origins which were regarded as discrete communities within each ecclesiastical parish. The ecclesiastical parish represented a unit of land paying tithes to a parish church, and in upland Northumberland, these parishes were often vast, incorporating entire dales and numerous townships. A township has its own settlement nucleus and field system and is thus an area of common agricultural unity and is often equivalent to the medieval vill – though the latter frequently refers to a taxation unit or administrative entity, whereas a territorial township refers to the physical fabric of the community (fields, buildings, woods & rivers). Township boundaries sometimes follow pre-Norman estate divisions and in some cases may even be earlier - it seems likely that a system of land organisation based around agricultural territories was in operation in Roman or pre-Roman times. Therefore, in some instances very ancient boundary lines may have been preserved by later land divisions. The various forms of parish and township and their development over time are discussed more extensively in the historical synthesis in Section 3.
In order to carry out a study focussing on the village core whilst attempting also to understand it within the local and regional context, a variety of approaches has been taken using information derived from a wide range of sources, including existing archaeological and historic buildings records, historic maps and documents, historic and aerial photographs and published information. In the present section (Section 1) the location of the village is discussed and an indication is given of the area covered by the present study. Section 2 provides a background to the sources of information used to compile the report, listing the archives consulted and some of the most significant maps, documents and photographs used to compile a list of cultural heritage sites. Section 3 provides a listing of all the historic and archaeological monuments identified within the study area and synthesizes the collected data to provide a summary of the known history of the settlement. Section 4 contains suggestions for future work and sets out the report’s conclusions regarding the village’s historical development which in turn inform the judgements regarding the levels of archaeological sensitivity applied to different parts of the settlement and displayed graphically on the ‘sensitivity maps’. The appendices contain catalogues of the various categories of collected data. A glossary of historical terms used and a full bibliography are also provided.

One final point cannot be over-emphasized. Too often the completion of a substantial work of this kind tends to create the impression that everything is now known regarding a particular subject and thereby discourages further investigation. In compiling this report, the consultants have on the contrary been all too conscious of barely scratching the surface and aware that many additional avenues of research could have been pursued. The Historic Village Atlas should be a starting point not a conclusion to the exploration of this broad and fascinating field.
2. LOCATION AND TOPOGRAPHY

2.1 Location and topography

Tarset and Greenhaugh are situated about 8km north west of Bellingham in the upper reaches of North Tynedale, within the southern part of the Northumberland National Park (see figures 1 and 2). Today the settlement of Greenhaugh lies either side of a road running from Comb in the north towards Tarset in the south, with Greenhaugh Burn cutting through the south of the village, separating Greenhaugh Hall [34] from the remainder of the village. The settlement of Tarset is situated about 1km south of Greenhaugh and comprises a number of farmsteads centred around the remains of the castle, plus the hamlet of Lanehead at the crossroads. The main road from Bellingham to Kielder runs through the area, along with the disused Border Counties Railway, which clips the southern edge of the castle earthworks. To the north the area is bounded by the Tarset Burn which flows into the River North Tyne a short distance to the southwest of the settlement. Both Greenhaugh and Tarset are overlooked by the great conifer plantations to the north, west and south, whilst the vast moorland expanses of Hareshaw Common and Troughend Common sweep away to the east.

2.2 Area of Study

Tarset was a township or vill during the medieval period and Greenhaugh probably fell within the township of Tarsethope. However in the early 18th century upper North Tynedale was divided into a series of new Poor Law townships, which form the basis of the territorial units described in the County History (NCH XV (1940)). As a consequence the immediate environs of Tarset and Greenhaugh were split up between several townships – Thorneyburn, Tarset West, Tarretburn and Charlton West Quarter – None of these covers all the relevant settlements and together they embrace too large an area to use as the basis of this study. Accordingly, a smaller, more coherent study area has been adopted, which is focussed on the settlements of Tarset, Lanehead and Greenhaugh. To the south the study area is bounded by the North Tyne and extends along both sides of the Tarset Burn in a 2-3km wide corridor as far north as Gatehouse. The development of the parochial and township structures is discussed more fully in the historical synthesis contained in Section 3.
3. TERRITORIAL UNITS AND SETTLEMENT TYPES

3.1 Parishes and Townships, Baronies and Manors

To understand the history of any village settlement, it is necessary to distinguish and define the various different territorial units within which the village was incorporated, and which provided the framework for the development of that community. Each of these units related to different aspects of the settlement’s communal relations – religious, economic and administrative, and seigneurial – and their function changed over time. The development of the institution of the civil township, in particular, was remarkably complex.

The Parish was the basic unit of ecclesiastical administration and essentially represented ‘a community whose spiritual needs were served by a parish priest, who was supported by tithe and other dues paid by his parishioners’ (Winchester 1987, 23). It was the payment of tithes - established as a legal principle since the reign of King Edgar 959-75 (Platt 1981, 47) - which gave the parish a territorial dimension so that the boundaries of the parish came to embrace all that community’s landed resources. Only the most remote areas of upland waste or ‘forest’, such as Kidland and Cheviot Forest, remained ‘extra-parochial’. Ecclesiastical parishes in the Northumbrian uplands typically covered extensive areas, sometimes very extensive areas. Simonburn in North Tynedale, Kirknewton in Glendale and Elsdon in Redesdale were amongst the largest parishes in the country. Alwinton, Ingram and Alnham were not quite in the same class, but, in common with almost all the upland parishes, they embraced several civil township communities or villas. In all, six of the seventeen villages studied in this survey were parochial centres in the medieval period, namely Elsdon, Holystone, Alwinton, Alnham, Ingram and Kirknewton. Others, such as Falstone, Harbottle, Akeld, Kilham, Hethpool and perhaps Byrness were the site of dependent chapels of ease. The presence of early medieval carved stonework at Falstone suggests it had long been an ecclesiastical centre and may have had greater significance in the 8th and 9th centuries (as a small monastic site?) than it possessed later on. However several of our study villages contain no places of worship whatsoever, and it is clear that the traditional, almost unconscious, English equation of village and parish church does not apply in Northumberland, and certainly not in the Northumbrian uplands.

It is thus clear that these large medieval parishes embraced many distinct communities and the church was often too distant to conveniently serve all the spiritual needs of the parishioners in the outlying townships. However there are relatively few instances of new parishes being carved out of a well-established parish and practically none after 1150. The payment of tithes created a strong disincentive to do so since creating a new parochial territory would inevitably reduce the income of the priest in the existing parish. This relatively early fossilisation of parish territories was given added impetus once ownership of parish churches was largely transferred from the hereditary priests or local lay lords whose predecessors had founded the churches over to the monasteries in the 12th and 13th century, since these ecclesiastical corporations strenuously defended their legal and economic rights (Lomas 1996, 111, 116-7; Dixon 1985 I, 64). Instead the needs of the more distant township communities were catered for by the construction of dependent chapels of ease, which were established either by the monastic institutional patrons or on the individual initiative of local lay lords. Even so many townships had neither a church nor chapel of their own (Lomas 1996, 111-4).

In the medieval era the parish was a purely ecclesiastical institution and was to remain so until the beginning of the 17th century when the Elizabethan Poor Law Act of 1601 made this territorial unit responsible for the maintenance of the poor through the appointment of
overseers for the poor and the setting of a poor rate (Statutes 43 Eliz. I c.2; cf. Winchester 1978, 56; Charlton 1987, 98). This is in many respects typical of the history of English local government whereby ‘new administrative units have generally been created by giving new functions to existing territorial divisions’ (Winchester 1987, 27). Thereafter parochial administration of poor law was particularly prevalent in southern and midland England, where parishes were generally smaller and often coterminous with the civil townships. However in northern England even these additional functions tended to devolve down to the constituent townships which were a more convenient and manageable size than the extensive parishes. The modern civil parishes were established by the Local Government Act of 1889 and were substantially based on the earlier townships rather than the ecclesiastical parishes (Statutes 52/53 Vict. c.63).

The Township or Vill (derived from the medieval Latin villa) was the basic territorial unit in Northumberland, instead of the ecclesiastical parish. The term vill can be defined in two ways, on the one hand as a territorial community, which may be labelled the territorial vill, and on the other as the basic unit of civil administration in medieval England, the administrative vill. The two units were related and they could indeed be cover identical territorial divisions, but this was not always the case and they must therefore be carefully distinguished.

The territorial vill is synonymous with the English words town or township, deriving from the Old English tun, the commonest element in English placenames, i.e. a settlement with a distinct, delimited territory, the latter representing the expanse of land in which that particular community of peasants lived and practised agriculture. A township/territorial vill was not the same as the village itself, which was simply the nucleated settlement which commonly lay at the heart (though not necessarily the geographical centre) of the township, and where the bulk of the individuals who made up the community might reside. A classic township, centred on a nucleated village settlement, was composed of three main elements, the village itself, the cultivated arable land and meadows, and the moorland waste or common. However a township community might live scattered about in dispersed farms instead of as well as being grouped together in a nucleated village or hamlet. Any combination of these elements was possible, but some permanent settlement was required for there had to be a community for a township to exist. Writing between 1235 and 1259, the lawyer Henry de Bracton defined the township thus (De Legibus et Consuetudinibus Angliae, iii, 394-5; cited by Winchester 1978, 69; Dixon 1985, I, 75-6):

“If a person should build a single edifice in the fields, there will not be a vill (villa), but when in the process of time several edifices have begun to be built adjoining to or neighbouring to one another, there begins to be a vill.”

A township’s consciousness of itself as a distinct community would have been reinforced by the communal agricultural labour required to work the land. This is particularly obvious in the cases where the township was centred on a nucleated village, its members living and working alongside one another, but even in townships composed of scattered hamlets or farmsteads it was just as vital to regulate access to the use of communal resources such as the upland waste or commons. Such activities would have generated a sense of communal cohesion however fragmented the framework of manorial lordship and estate management in the township might have become over time (see below).

The boundaries of such township communities would have become fixed when the land appropriated by one community extended up to that belonging to neighbouring settlements (Winchester 1987, 29). In the lowlands intensive cultivation had been practised for millennia prior to the medieval period, when townships are first documented. It is therefore conceivable/has been argued that many of these boundaries were of considerable antiquity,
particularly where obvious natural features such as rivers and streams and watersheds were followed, although such antiquity is difficult to prove conclusively. In the uplands, settlement is thought to have experienced successive cycles of expansion and contraction in response to a variety of stimuli, including environmental factors such as climatic change, but doubtless also political and economic issues. This may have resulted in periodic obscuring of the boundaries when communities were not fully exploiting the available resources and hence had less need to precisely define their limits. In all areas the definitive boundary network recorded by the first Ordnance Survey maps is obviously a composite pattern, in which precise delineation occurred in a piecemeal fashion over the centuries.

The administrative vill: The term vill also designated the basic unit of civil administration in medieval England, representing a village or grouping of hamlets or farmsteads which were obliged to perform a range of communal administrative duties. The latter included the delivery of evidence at inquests, the upkeep of roads and bridges, the apprehension of criminals within its bounds and the assessment and collection of taxes (Vinogradoff 1908, 475; Winchester 1978, 61; 1987, 32; Dixon 1985 I, 78). The most comprehensive listing of these administrative vills is provided by the occasional tax returns known as Lay Subsidy Rolls. The assessment units recorded therein essentially correspond to the vills and, although clearly incomplete, sufficient survives of the 1296 and 1336 Northumberland rolls to provide a good impression of the number and distribution of the administrative units in many parts of the county (cf. Fraser (ed.) 1968, xv-xvi). In many areas these administrative vills correspond very closely to the territorial vills and with the later poor law townships (see below). Dixon has shown this to be the largely case in north Northumberland (north of the Coquet), for example (1985 I, 78-9). This was by no means the case everywhere in the border counties, however. In the district of Copeland in West Cumbria, where a predominantly dispersed settlement pattern of scattered ‘single farmsteads, small hamlets and looser groupings of farms’ prevails, Winchester has demonstrated that the administrative vills had a composite structure, frequently embracing several ‘members’ or ‘hamlets’ which correspond to the basic territorial townships (1978, 61-5). In many instances administrative vills were significantly larger than the later poor law townships. These relatively large, composite administrative vills correspond to what were termed villae integrae (‘entire vills’) elsewhere in England. It is possible that a similar pattern of composite administrative vills might be have been introduced in areas of the Northumbrian uplands such as Redesdale and North Tynedale, where hamlets and farmsteads were more common than nucleated villages. However these areas were liberties or franchises, like the lands of the Bishops of Durham, i.e. the normal apparatus of royal government was absent and their administration was entrusted instead to the baronial or ecclesiastical lord. This may have resulted in administration and justice being exercised through the structures of manorial lordship rather than a separate tier of specifically administrative land units. Finally, Winchester also suggests that the term vill gradually acquired a more specific administrative connotation as the organisation of local government became more standardised after the Statute of Winchester in 1285, with the result that in his study area, from the end of the 13th century, the term was restricted to the administrative units and no longer applied to the basic territorial townships (1978, 66-7). This idea of the vill as an area of land with defined boundaries, potentially enclosing a number of settlements, rather than a the territorial resource of a single community, is expressed in a passage by Sir John Fortescue, writing towards the end of the medieval period, and makes an interesting contrast with Bracton’s description over two hundred years earlier (Fortescue, 54-55; cf. Winchester ibid. n.27):

2 The 1296 roll omits Alnham, as well as Fawdon and Farnham (two of the ‘ten towns of Coquetdale’), Caistron, Wreighill, Prendwick and Unthank and probably Branton, Hedgeley, Glanton, Little Ryle and Shawdon (Fraser (ed.) 1968, xv-xvi), but this is most likely simply to reflect the loss of parts of the original roll rather than the absorption of these vills in a larger‘villa integra’.

On the other hand the regalian liberties of Redesdale, upper Tynedale and the Northumbrian holdings of the Prince Bishops of Durham were never included in the roll (ibid., xiii).

---

2 The 1296 roll omits Alnham, as well as Fawdon and Farnham (two of the ‘ten towns of Coquetdale’), Caistron, Wreighill, Prendwick and Unthank and probably Branton, Hedgeley, Glanton, Little Ryle and Shawdon (Fraser (ed.) 1968, xv-xvi), but this is most likely simply to reflect the loss of parts of the original roll rather than the absorption of these vills in a larger‘villa integra’.

On the other hand the regalian liberties of Redesdale, upper Tynedale and the Northumbrian holdings of the Prince Bishops of Durham were never included in the roll (ibid., xiii).
Hundreds again are divided into vills . . . . the boundaries of vills are not marked by walls, buildings, or streets, but by the confines of fields, by large tracts of land, by certain hamlets and by many other things such as the limits of water courses, woods and wastes . . . . there is scarcely any place in England that is not contained within the ambits of vills

The Poor Law Township, to use Winchester’s term (1978), is the form of township community most familiar today through in the works such as the Northumberland County History and Hodgson’s History of Northumberland, where, along with the parish, it provides the framework for the historical narrative of individual localities. The boundaries of these territorial communities were mapped by the 1st edition Ordnance Survey in the mid-19th century and they have generally been presumed to have had a long and largely uninterrupted history stretching back in most cases to the townships of the medieval period. They are conveniently depicted on the maps which front of each volume of the Northumberland County History, from which figure 3 in each of the individual village reports is derived. A more detailed record of each township territory is provided by their respective tithe and enclosure maps and other historic maps catalogued and reproduced in the village reports.

The assumption that the medieval administrative vill was the direct ancestor of the post-medieval poor law township, and hence of the modern civil parish, was a reasonable one since functionally they are somewhat similar, representing the most basic level of civil administration. However the actual line of descent is much more complex.

The administration of poor relief was originally established at parochial rather than township level, with the requirement of the Elizabethan Poor Law Act of 1601 that overseers for the poor be appointed in every ecclesiastical parish in England (Statutes 43 Eliz. I c.2; cf. Winchester 1978, 56). Following pressure in parliament to permit the subdivision of the huge ecclesiastical parishes in the northern counties into smaller, more convenient units, the 1662 Poor Law Act allowed ‘every Township or Village’ in northern England to become a unit for poor-rate assessment and collection with their own overseers (Statutes 14 Charles II c.12, s.21; (cf. Winchester 1987, 27). Winchester has argued, on the basis of the arrangements he documented in the Copeland district of west Cumbria, that it was the territorial townships rather than the administrative vills which were most frequently adopted to serve as the new poor law townships. However in Northumberland north of the Coquet there was in any case relatively little difference between the medieval territorial and administrative units, as noted above, and about three quarters of the townships identifiable in the 13th century may be equated with the poor law townships recorded by the Ordnance Survey. The disappearance or radical alteration of the remaining 25 percent was the result of settlement abandonment or colonisation during the late medieval period and estate reorganisation in the post-medieval period (Dixon 1985, I, 79-84)³. The upland dales south of the Coquet were a very different matter. Redesdale and North Tynedale fell within the vast parishes of Elsdon and Simonburn respectively, the latter with a dependent chapelry at Bellingham which itself embraced all of upper North Tynedale. In Redesdale, six large ‘wards’ or townships are found, namely Elsdon, Otterburn, Woodside, Rochester, Troughen and Monkridge, plus the small extra-parochial township of Ramshope (Hodgson 1827, 82-3). The wards were almost certainly created in response to the 1662 act and presumably represent subdivision of the parish to facilitate the administration of poor relief. There is no indication that they existed at an earlier date. They are not recorded in the 1604 border survey, which instead lists a great number of ‘places’ or ‘parts of the manor’ within the constituent parishes of the Manor of Harbottle. These places were in most cases more than hamlets, groups of farms or individual farmsteads, the kind of small early territorial township found in upland areas. The twelve townships of upper North Tynedale, described in the County History (NCH XV (1940), 234-

³ Dixon (1985, I) provides a comprehensive summary of these changes for north Northumberland, including lists of abandoned early townships, new townships and identifiable boundary shifts or rationalisations.
80), were established in 1729 by Thomas Sharp, Archdeacon of Northumberland, specifically to administer poor relief, each township being responsible for the maintenance of its own poor and setting a separate poor rate (Charlton 1987, 98-9). Some of these townships may have been based on earlier territorial units, but others have rather artificial names – West Tarset or Plashetts and Tynehead- indicative of institutions established by bureaucratic fiat.

It is from these ‘poor law townships’, however ancient or recent their origins, rather than the medieval administrative vill, that the modern civil parish is directly derived in northern England. The Local Government Act of 1889, which established the civil parish, specifically stated it was to be ‘a place for which a separate poor rate is or can be made’ (Statutes 52/53 Vict. c.63 sec. 5). Today’s civil parishes, however, are generally somewhat larger than the preceding townships, in part as a result of more recent amalgamations.

**The Manor** was a territorial unit of lordship and the basic unit of seigneurial estate administration. Jurisdiction was exercised by the manorial lord over the estate, its assets, economic activities and customary and legal rights, through his manor court sometimes termed the *court baron*.

Manorial lordship thus represented only one link in the chain of feudal and tenurial relationships which extended from the lowly peasant through to the baronial superior lord and ultimately right up to the king himself. In its simplest form a township would be encapsulated within a single manor and would therefore have the same territorial limits. However such ‘classic’ manors were much rarer than primary school history lessons might have us believe. Then as now, the processes of succession and inheritance and the inevitable variability in human fortunes resulted in the amalgamation or, more often, fragmentation of estates. Most townships therefore were divided between a number of manorial landholders.

Thus a parish, township and manor could all be coterminous, with a small parish serving the spiritual needs of a single township community whose landed resources formed a single manorial estate and whose members were bound by a variety of personal and tenurial relationships to a single lord. However this simple arrangement was highly unusual in Northumberland, and particularly so in the upland areas of the county, where, as we have seen, the parishes were often very large (e.g. Elsdon, Simonburn, Alwinton-Holystone, and Kirknewton). Thus there were only 63 parishes in the county in 1295, whilst the total number of townships at the same time, although not precisely quantifiable, was probably not far short of 450 (Lomas 1996, 71, 108-10). The number of manors would have been greater still.

### 3.2 Villages, Hamlets and Farmsteads

The territorial labels discussed above can all be defined with relative ease, despite the complexity caused by their changing role over time (which is especially marked in the case of the township), since they describe specific entities which figure in legislation and other formal records from the medieval period onwards. However it is a very different matter when it comes to precisely defining the terms used to describe different types of settlement, such as ‘village’ or ‘hamlet’. As the foremost scholars of landscape and settlement studies have admitted (e.g. Roberts 1996, 14) it is extraordinarily difficult to define these terms with precision in such a way as to impose any absolute consistency of usage upon them.

For the purposes of this study the following definitions of settlement were used, all drawn from Brian Roberts’ extensive work, in particular the succinct discussion provided in *Landscapes of Settlement* (1996, 15-19):

---

4 Prior to 1729, the Chapelry of Bellingham had been subdivided into four wards for more convenient collection of the poor rate, but these wards had not set a separate rate.
VILLAGE: A clustered assembly of dwellings and farmsteads, larger than a hamlet, but smaller than a town
and
A rural settlement with sufficient dwellings to possess a recognisable form (Roberts 1976, 256).

HAMLET: A small cluster of farmsteads

FARMSTEAD: ‘An assemblage of agricultural buildings from which the land is worked’

TOWN: A relatively large concentration of people possessing rights and skills which separate them from direct food production.

The most substantial body of work on village morphology is that undertaken by Brian Roberts (e.g. 1972; 1976; 1977; 1990). Roberts has identified a complex series of village types based on two main forms, termed ‘rows’ and ‘agglomerations’, multiplied by a series of variable factors:

- Regular or irregular
- The presence or absence of greens
- Complexity – e.g. multiple row villages
- Building density – infilling of toft areas
- Fragmentation – ‘exploded’ versions of row villages and village agglomerations

This provides a useful schema for classifying villages, but it is difficult to determine what these different morphological characteristics actually signify. Dixon (1985, 1) is sceptical of regularity or irregularity as a significant factor, noting that irregularity does not necessarily mean that a village was not laid out in a particular order at a particular time; that the regularity of a layout is a subjective judgement; and that an irregular row may simply be a consequence of local terrain or topography. He also points out that however irregular it might appear, by its very existence the row constitutes an element of regularity. He is especially dismissive of the presence or absence of a green as a significant factor in village morphology, arguing that a green is simply an intrusion of the common waste into the settlement; if such a space is broad it is called a green, if narrow it is a street or gate.

In the case of the Historic Village Atlas Project a still more substantial problem is posed by the lack of detailed mapping earlier than c. 1800 for many of the 17 villages considered. In other words, there is no reliable cartographic evidence which predates the late 18th-19th century transformation of populous village communities of the medieval and early modern era into ‘farm hamlets’, i.e. settlements focussed on one or two large integrated farm complexes. In Northumberland, particularly in the northern half of the county, the 1st edition Ordnance Survey – so often the first resort in analysing settlement morphology – and even the relevant tithe map do not provide a reliable guide to the early modern or medieval form of any given village. Moreover the documentary evidence assembled by Wrathmell and Dixon suggests there was often a marked reduction in the size of the village population in the later 17th and early 18th centuries, accompanying a gradual reduction in the number of tenancies. Thus, even where 18th-century mapping does survive for a particular village, it may actually underrepresent the extent of the earlier, medieval and 16th-17th century phases of that settlement.

If Brian Roberts, using the methods of historical geography, has perhaps done more to shape current thinking on the overall pattern of medieval village settlement than any other scholar, at the micro level of the individual village and its components the seminal investigation in Northumberland has been Michael Jarrett’s archaeological excavation of West Whelpington village. Conducted over a period of fifteen years from 1966 onwards this revealed a
substantial proportion of a medieval village (Jarrett et al. 1987; 1988). Lomas (1996, 71-86) has recently emphasised the fundamental degree to which our understanding of life in a medieval Northumbrian village rests on the programme of research at West Whelpington.

Two major studies (both regrettably unpublished), which to some degree were able to draw on the work of Roberts and Jarrett, comprise Stuart Wrathmell’s PhD thesis on medieval village settlement in south Northumberland (Wrathmell 1975) and Piers Dixon’s equivalent doctoral research on the medieval villages of north Northumberland (Dixon 1985). Dixon’s work, in particular is of fundamental importance for the Historic Village Atlas, as the citations in the text of the individual reports and the synthesis makes clear, since it covered many of the settlements in the northern half of the Northumberland National Park included in the Project. The villages in the central band of the county between the River Coquet and the North Tyne catchment remain as yet uncovered by any equivalent study, however.

This lacuna particularly unfortunate because a similar level of coverage of the south side of the Coquet and Redesdale would have served to emphasise how similar the settlement pattern in these areas was to that prevailing in upper North Tynedale and how different from that encountered in north Northumberland, even in the Cheviot uplands and Glendale. Lomas (1996, 86), has characterised the long Pennine dales in the eastern half of the county as areas of ‘commons with settlements’ rather than ‘settlements with commons’. These areas – North Tynedale, Redesdale, and the south side of Coquetdale, along with South Tynedale, and East and West Allendale largely outside the National Park – were distinguished by a prevailing settlement pattern of dispersed farmsteads and hamlets. In marked contrast, a more nucleated pattern predominated in the upland Cheviot valleys of north Northumberland, although the density of such settlements was inevitably reduced by comparison with the lowland districts in the northern part of the county. The excellent fertility of the Cheviot soils permitted intensive agricultural cultivation during optimal climatic phases, but only at locations within the massif where there was sufficient level ground – such as Hethpool – and even there substantial terracing of the adjacent hillsides was required to create enough ploughland to make the settlement viable.

To some extent the gap left by Wrathmell and Dixon in Redesdale and southern Coquetdale has been filled by the programme of investigation conducted by Beryl Charlton, John Day and others on behalf of the Ministry of Defence, which resulted in a series of synthetic discussions of various aspects of settlement in the two valleys (Charlton & Day 1978; 1979; 1982; Day & Charlton 1981; all summarised in Charlton & Day 1976 and Charlton 1996 and 2004). These may be compared with the summary of the development of medieval and early modern settlement in upper North Tynedale provided by Harbottle and Newman (1973). However the former was restricted in scope by its emphasis for the most part on the Otterburn Training Area (although the authors did extend their scope beyond the confines of the military range where this obviously provided a more coherent analysis5), whilst the principal focus of Harbottle and Newman’s work was the rescue excavation of a series of early modern and later farmsteads threatened by the construction of Kielder Water, to which the settlement overview provided an invaluable but all too brief introduction. Hence all three valleys still merit comprehensive syntheses of their medieval/early modern settlement patterns, combining analysis of the historic maps and documents – including what is known regarding the pattern of seigneurial and ecclesiastical landholding – with the evidence of the surviving physical remains and site layouts.

5 In particular the initial overview provided by Charlton & Day 1976, plus Charlton & Day 1978, covering the late prehistoric and Romano-British settlements, and Charlton & Day 1982, dealing with the corn mills and drying kilns, extend their treatment well beyond the Otterburn Training Area.
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SOURCES OF EVIDENCE
4. LOCATION OF EVIDENCE

Accessible regional and national archives, libraries and record offices consulted for documentary, cartographic and pictorial material relevant to the present study include the following:

- Northumberland Record Office, Melton Park, Gosforth (NRO-MP)
- Northumberland Record Office, The Kylins, Morpeth (NRO-TK)
- Northumberland County Council Sites & Monuments Record, County Hall, Morpeth (NCC-SMR)
- Morpeth County Library, Local Studies Section (ML)
- Museum of Antiquities Records Room, University of Newcastle upon Tyne (MA)
- Newcastle Central Library, Local Studies Section (NCL)
- The Robinson Library, Newcastle University (NUL)
- Palace Green Library, University of Durham (DUL)
- The Public Record Office, Kew (PRO)
- National Monuments Record (NMR)

4.1 Compiling the project database

Assembly of the research material required to produce the Atlas has been achieved by the following methods:

4.1.1 Air Photographic coverage

All locally accessible air photographic coverage of the listed villages was inspected and catalogued, including photographs held by Northumberland National Park, the Northumberland County Sites and Monuments Record (SMR), Newcastle Central Library and the Museum of Antiquities at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne. In addition, a considerable body of new oblique aerial photography, specifically commissioned for the project and covering all the designated villages was analysed in order to provide pointers for further research both within and outside the scope of the present study.

4.1.2 Documentary survey

A wide range of medieval and early modern documentation, including inquisitions post mortem, ecclesiastical chartularies, royal charters and judicial proceedings, Border Surveys and other official correspondence, has been used to illuminate the history and development of the village and its setting. In addition several categories of more recent archival material - maps, sketches, photographs - and local historical descriptions, have proved informative.

Documentary sources provide most of our information on certain aspects of the village’s past, notably its medieval origins and development, and its tenurial and ecclesiastical framework. A targeted approach to the analysis of data from such sources was adopted in order to maximise the amount of information gained in the available timescale. Accordingly, data gathering focussed on cartographic, pictorial and photographic evidence, whilst the County History volumes and other historical syntheses covering sub-regional geographic units or settlements were used to identify particularly important documentary source material worthy of further scrutiny.
Historic Maps

All available historic maps and plans were examined and, where possible, copied. These include the successive county maps - Saxton 1576, Speed 1611, Armstrong 1769, Smith 1808, Fryer 1820, Greenwood 1828, etc. (figures 20, 21, 28 & 30) - but more importantly the tithe (c. 1840) (figs. 32-39) and enclosure maps and Ordnance Survey editions (figs. 41-49), as well as other detailed mapping, privately commissioned during the 17th-19th centuries. The tithe and enclosure maps for the relevant townships, provide evidence for the layout of field patterns to assist in interpreting the extant earthwork systems. The 1st edition Ordnance Survey in many instances constitutes the earliest reliable and comprehensive evidence for the settlement pattern in each village. The relationship of this baseline record to surviving earthworks is key to understanding the dynamic processes involved in the development of the settlement.

Pictorial representations

Pictorial representations - prints, sketches and paintings - and early photographs, were examined and, where possible, copied. The principal source of such representations was the NRO Photographic archive. Such photographs show the appearance of buildings shown in plan on historic maps, as well as features not included on such plans. In some cases they also provide useful information on the function of such buildings. The participation of local individuals who have made available their collections of earlier photographs, postcards or paintings, has been particularly useful and may provide a source of additional material in the future.

Published Syntheses and published collections of sources

Existing published research covering the historic village has been summarised for inclusion in the historical synthesis. Harbottle and Newman (1973, 138-54) produced a general synthesis of the historical development of settlement in upper North Tynedale from the medieval period to the present, whilst Charlton (1987) has provided a historical overview of the valley. Volume XV of the Northumberland County History (NCH XV (1940)) and S. Wrathmell’s unpublished PhD thesis on medieval settlement in south Northumberland (Wrathmell 1975) contain much detailed information. The County History volume, in particular has useful excerpts from Comyn and Swinburne Inquisitions Post Mortem (IPMs), which are also reproduced in chronological order in calendar volumes published by the Public Record Office, the Calendars of Inquisitions Post Mortem (Cal IPM), the Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous (CalMisc) and the Calendar of Documents relating to Scotland (CalDocScot).

The most detailed information for the high medieval era derives from the ‘Iter of Wark’, a summary of judicial proceedings conducted by the royal justices dispatched annually from Scotland to hold the eyre at Wark-on-Tyne, the capital of the liberty of Tynedale. The proceedings for two years, 1279 and 1293, have survived. The Latin text of the proceedings for 1279 was published by Hartshorne in an appendix in the Feudal and Military Antiquities in Northumberland and the Scottish Borders (1858, ix-lxvii; cited here as Iter of Wark). For the 16th-17th centuries, Bowes and Ellerker’s Border survey of 1541 (reproduced in Bates 1891), the Border Watch Schedule of 1552 (reproduced in the Leges Marchiarum edited by W. Nicolson) and the Survey of Debateable and Border Land, taken A D 1604, edited by R.P. Sanderson (1604 Survey; see below, Part 3 - Synthesis and Analysis: Selected Sources and Surveys 3), provide useful information on contemporary settlement patterns in upper North Tynedale.

4.1.3 Archaeological Survey

The Northumberland County Sites and Monuments Record was consulted in order to prepare a summary gazetteer of all archaeological sites recorded in each township, including industrial archaeological monuments, find spots and communications routes. Sites newly identified during the course of the study have also been added to the gazetteer.
Listed Building Records were consulted through the NMR along with Grundy's survey of the historic buildings in the National Park (1988) in order to compile a gazetteer of historic buildings in the township. Photographs of the exterior of each building have been incorporated in the archive gazetteer. A small number of structures, which by virtue of their importance and complexity of fabric are considered by the project team to merit stone-by-stone recording, have also been identified.

4.1.4 Survey of Village environs
The wider setting of the villages have been assessed, using the territorial framework of the historic township where relevant, through a combination of aerial photographs, historic maps, documents, previous historical syntheses and site visits. Where possible the various components - infield arable and meadow, outfield pasture, woodland – have been identified and different phases of activity evidence of change over time have been noted in the historical synthesis. Information regarding the extent of outlying settlement has also been summarised in the synthesis, and particular attention has been paid to essential components as watermills, which could often be, located some distance from the main settlement.

More detailed recording of the surrounding field systems could form the basis of future community-led studies. These might involve recording the wavelength of ridge-and-furrow, examining field boundary walls to detect different structural phases present (sometimes evident in longstanding walls such as the head-dyke separating enclosed infields from the rough pasture (outfield) beyond, for example) or noting where a wall or sod-cast hedge has been replaced by more recent fencing and identifying ancient hedgelines by the variety of flora present. The data gathered could then be interpreted using the assembled resource of historic maps, aerial photographs and documented history provided by this report.

4.1.5 Site inspections
Site visits were undertaken to examine the village and wider township area, their principal monuments, built environment and field systems. Rather than being a comprehensive field survey, this was carried out to enable the project team to characterise the built fabric, archaeological landscape features and wider landscape setting of the village and to examine features which other data collection methods (air photography/documentary survey etc.) identified as being of particular importance. Photographs were taken of all the historic buildings and other sites or features of especial significance.

4.1.6 Public information and involvement
The NNPA Archaeologist organised presentations or guided walks at six of the largest villages under study. At least one member of the project team participated in these presentations/walks. It was anticipated that this would help to identify knowledgeable local informants who could be interviewed further during the site visits. This proved to be the case. A more informal process of gathering such local information was undertaken during the site visits at the smaller communities under study. This process in turn assisted in selection of suitable individuals for an associated oral history project, focussed on the communities of upper North Tynedale, Redesdale and upper Coquetdale, which was established as an important adjunct to the material Atlas research.6

It was also anticipated that these methods would also identify questions concerning the historical past of the villages which were of particular interest to members of the local community and which the project might address in its report, or alternatively might form the basis for follow-on community based projects. It was clear from the meetings and presentations that there was a significant degree of interest amongst several communities in the past of their settlements. It is hoped that this engagement with the past can be supported

---

through future community-led projects, aimed at facilitating more detailed, long term studies of these villages and their landscape settings. The meetings and presentations were particularly successful in prompting local participation in data collection, inspiring the villagers to assemble and bring in for copying numerous privately-held photographs, historic maps, photographs, deeds and other documents. These have all been scanned and incorporated in the project archive and many have been included in the individual Historic Atlas Village Reports. Northumberland Record Office have also made digital copies of the maps and documents to ensure the preservation of this valuable record. Although much new material has been come to light by this means, it is doubtful that the potential has been exhausted.
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5. **GAZETTEER OF CULTURAL HERITAGE SITES**

A summary site gazetteer is set out below. Fuller descriptions are provided in Appendix 4 and complete entries for those sites listed in the Northumberland Sites and Monuments Record (NSMR) may be consulted by contacting the Conservation Team at County Hall, Morpeth. The gazetteer sites are all located on figure 4 and, in the case of those in the immediate vicinity of the Greenhaugh village and in that village core, on figures 5 and 6 respectively, whilst those situated in the immediate vicinity of the Tarset and Lanehead and in the Tarset and Lanehead core area are shown on figures 7 and 8 respectively. For convenience, figures 4, 5 and 7 are reproduced in this section as figures 88, 89 and 90, whilst the Greenhaugh and Tarset/Lanehead village core sites are marked on the respective archaeological sensitivity plans in Part 4 (figs. 91-92). For further ease of identifiability, the site catalogue numbers are placed between square brackets when cited in the report text. Thus catalogue number 1, for example, would normally appear as [1].

**Table 1: Known sites of cultural heritage importance within the wider study area.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue No.</th>
<th>SMR No.</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Grid Ref.</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6992</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Gatehouse North and South Bastles</td>
<td>NY 378780 588940</td>
<td>Grade II*, SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6992</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Gatehouse North and South Bastles</td>
<td>NY 378780 588940</td>
<td>Grade II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6993</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Redheugh Farmhouse</td>
<td>NY 378400 588500</td>
<td>Grade II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6995</td>
<td>MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Tarset fortified house, 180m east of Tarset Hall</td>
<td>NY 378830 585480</td>
<td>Grade II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6996</td>
<td>ROMAN</td>
<td>Boggle Hill, settlement</td>
<td>NY 378230 586150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6997</td>
<td>MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Tower house, Burnbank</td>
<td>NY 379090 587570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6998</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Ruined bastle 500m SSE of Thornyburn Church</td>
<td>NY 378730 587190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7004</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Gatehouse Farmhouse, incorporating bastle</td>
<td>NY 378850 588900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7005</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Gatehouse, remains of bastles 20m south east of Gatehouse Farmhouse</td>
<td>NY 378870 588880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7006</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Burnmouth, possible bastle</td>
<td>NY 379200 588000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7008</td>
<td>MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Tirsethoppe, deserted medieval village</td>
<td>NY 379000 588000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7010</td>
<td>MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Tarset, deserted medieval village</td>
<td>NY 378900 585500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7011</td>
<td>MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Gatehouse, deserted medieval village</td>
<td>NY 378800 588900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7013</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Dovecote c.100 yards south of Redheugh Farmhouse</td>
<td>NY 378380 588390</td>
<td>Grade II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7016</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Bridge over Tarset Burn</td>
<td>NY 378780 585880</td>
<td>Grade II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7052</td>
<td>MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Newton, deserted medieval village</td>
<td>NY 379700 584500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7936</td>
<td>ROMAN</td>
<td>Romano-British farmstead 170m north of Cleugh Head</td>
<td>NY 380000 587590</td>
<td>SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>13633</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Church of St Aidan, Thornyburn</td>
<td>NY 378619 587687</td>
<td>Grade II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>13634</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Thornyburn Rectory</td>
<td>NY 38648 587634</td>
<td>Grade II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>13636</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Stable and coach house c.30 yards north-west of Thornyburn Rectory</td>
<td>NY 378625 587643</td>
<td>Grade II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Brown Knowe</td>
<td>NY 379300 586400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Cleugh Head</td>
<td>NY 380080 587420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Former Presbyterian school near Gatehouse</td>
<td>NY 378900 588920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Bouthhill, Greenhaugh</td>
<td>NY 379200 586200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Farmbuildings at Bouthhill, Greenhaugh</td>
<td>NY 379200 586200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Ford over Tarset Burn, c. 200 yards NE of Bouthhill</td>
<td>NY 379280 586710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Burnbank, Greenhaugh</td>
<td>NY 379330 587540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Farmbuildings at Burnbank, Greenhaugh</td>
<td>NY 379330 587540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Buildings to the N side of the road at Greenhaugh</td>
<td>NY 379560 579270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Grid Refs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Buildings to the S side of the road at Greenhaugh (inc. Hollybush Inn)</td>
<td>NY 379560 579270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Greenhaugh Bridge</td>
<td>NY 379 587</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Garden Cottage, Greenhaugh</td>
<td>NY 379 587</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Greenhaugh Farm</td>
<td>NY 379450 587260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Greenhaugh Hall</td>
<td>NY 379520 586920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Lanehead Church House</td>
<td>NY 379350 585660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Village Hall, Lanehead</td>
<td>NY 379350 585660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Ivy Cottage, Redmire</td>
<td>NY 379190 585770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Redmire</td>
<td>NY 379190 585770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>The Sneep</td>
<td>NY 379220 585860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Bridge over Tarret Burn</td>
<td>NY 379530 588340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Snowe Hall</td>
<td>NY 379340 586090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Redmire Cottage</td>
<td>NY 379050 585930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Tarset Hall</td>
<td>NY 378440 585610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Farmbuildings at Tarset Hall</td>
<td>NY 378440 585610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Disused railway bridge over Tarset Burn near Tarset Hall</td>
<td>NY 378650 585570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Wade Head House and attached outbuildings</td>
<td>NY 379410 585050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Knoppingholme</td>
<td>NY 378490 585620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Earthworks. Possible stack stand or horse engine</td>
<td>NY 379450 587260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Well cut into side of Greenhaugh Burn (about 20m W of Greenhaugh Bridge)</td>
<td>NY 379 587</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Field walls and boundaries associated with Bastle</td>
<td>NY 378730 587190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>High Shield farmstead complex</td>
<td>NY 37991 58785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Mount Pleasant outbarn and field system</td>
<td>NY 37991 58760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Holloway linking Mount Pleasant and High Shield</td>
<td>NY 37991 58770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Small outbarn and associated field system</td>
<td>NY 37995 58770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Ruined farmstead</td>
<td>NY 38055 58770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Ruined farmstead</td>
<td>NY 37974 58795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Earthworks. Possibly medieval rectilinear structure</td>
<td>NY 37890 58670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Possible site of mill at Boughthill Farm</td>
<td>NY 379200 586200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Old sheep dip?? Using natural flow of burn in wood NWW of Boughthill Farm</td>
<td>NY 37920 58620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Coal pits</td>
<td>NY 3803 5872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Stone trough to the rear of Knoppingholme</td>
<td>NY 378490 585620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Embankment along Tarset Burn</td>
<td>NY 378 585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Tarset station and station house</td>
<td>NY 37895 58540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Quarrying</td>
<td>NY 37915 58570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Holloways (on hill side)</td>
<td>NY 37825 58600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Ruin at Black Hugh head</td>
<td>NY 37950 58660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Mill at Gatehouse</td>
<td>NY 37880 58870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Burnmouth Mill</td>
<td>NY 37930 58800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>POST MEDIEVAL</td>
<td>Border Counties Railway</td>
<td>NY 378 585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. HISTORICAL SYNTHESIS

6.1 Standard works


6.2 Prehistory

The attractions of the upper reaches of the North Tyne valley for early hunter-gatherer populations can be readily appreciated and in an extensively forested landscape would have provided such groups with a convenient route for seasonal migration from the coast to the uplands allowing access to a wide range of resources. Communities in this Mesolithic - Middle Stone Age - period would have been small - essentially extended family groups - and probably foraged over very extensive areas. Following the introduction of farming c. 4000-3500 BC, more permanent settlement was possible, but evidence for Neolithic - New Stone Age - occupation and dwellings has proved elusive in this part of Northumberland. The possible persistence of regular seasonal migration, or 'transhumance', but now with domesticated flocks and herds, along the lines practised in the medieval and early modern periods, cannot be excluded. The adoption of agriculture and pastoralism enabled population sizes and densities to increase. Kinship groups probably grew larger as a result, whilst occasional festivals may have prompted wider population gatherings for the purposes of exchanging goods and marriage partners etc., providing a mechanism for the development of wider clan or tribal associations.

Further up the valley the Devil's Lapful long cairn near Kielder provides an impressive and atmospheric relic of these early communities. Such monuments would have been the focus of communal burial practices centred on worship of the ancestors. It has also been suggested that by placing such a prominent monument to their forefathers in the landscape these early farming groups were also establishing a powerful ancestral claim to this land. Deadmans Cairn, a round cairn located further down the slope on the same hillside may be somewhat later in date, perhaps relating to the early-middle Bronze Age. It would have performed a similar function, although individual burials were generally interred in these later monuments, rather than the collections of bones from many individuals - disarticulated as a result of initial outside exposure of the corpses - typical of the Neolithic long cairns. Such changes in burial practice are considered important indicators of social change, perhaps signifying a move towards a more stratified society led by a chiefly elite. The highly decorated Beaker drinking vessels found in association with cist burials at Smalesmouth and The Sneep (the latter cist containing a complete female skeleton) demonstrates that this shift to the individual burial of prominent local figures with prestigious grave goods certainly became established in Tarsetdale and Tarretdale during the Late Neolithic/early Bronze Age.7

A settlement pattern composed predominantly of unenclosed settlements comprising round houses and irregular field systems is suspected during the Bronze Age, by analogy with other parts of upland Northumberland, but has not so far been identified within or adjacent to the study area. Furthermore, relatively few hillforts and palisaded hilltop enclosures, typical of the late Bronze Age and Iron Age, have been identified in this part of North Tynedale. Such

---

7 The bifacially-flaked flint dagger recovered as a stray surface find near a spring close to Highfield Hope belongs to broadly the same period. It may represent a ritual offering to spirits, ancestors or deities of the underworld deposited in the spring.
sites represent obvious central places or focal points for entire communities. In their absence, it is difficult to map a clear settlement pattern, and the valley may conceivably have been relatively sparsely populated at this time.

6.3 Romano-British Period

From the later 1st century AD, North Tynedale, along with the rest of the Northumbrian uplands, fell under the control of expanding Roman empire. The principal bases of Roman power in the wider area lay to the east and northeast, at the forts of Risingham (Habitancum) and High Rochester (Bremenium), both situated on Dere Street, the main road into Scotland, and to the west at Bewcastle (Fanum Cocidii). No official Roman military sites have been identified in North Tynedale north of the Hadrian's Wall zone. However Armstrong does mark a site just north of Wadge Head, east of Tarset, using the square symbol he normally reserves for Roman military fortifications - forts or temporary camps. It is difficult to interpret the significance of this. There is no indication that a Roman road ran up the valley and no traces of any official Roman activity have been identified at this spot. The site may represent another one of the rectilinear enclosed farmsteads, which are so common in North Tynedale, although none is known at that location and other examples in the locality such as Cleugh Head, Boggle Hill are not so identified. Alternatively it was perhaps a structure associated with the medieval park of Tarset, which is located in that area.

In contrast to this one doubtful piece of evidence for an official Roman military presence in upper North Tynedale, the local rural population have left abundant traces in the shape of the rectilinear enclosed sites, which were characteristic form of settlement in North Tynedale during this period (see Jobey 1960). Several fine examples of this kind of site survive as earthworks in the immediate vicinity of Tarset and Greenhaugh, notably at Boggle Hill [Gazetteer site 5], Sidwood (NY 773893), Cleugh Head [17] above Greenhaugh, and at Riding Wood further down the valley towards Bellingham, which was excavated by George Jobey in 1958 (1960, 5, fig.3). These settlements typically comprise a roughly squarish, rectangular or slightly trapezoidal enclosure, defined by a stone wall or a ditch and bank, pierced by a single causewayed entrance in the middle of the front wall. Just inside the enclosure, on either side of the entrance, a couple of yards or pens, probably intended to hold livestock, can generally be found. Three or four round houses usually lay towards the rear of the enclosure.

Excavation of similar sites further up the valley, at Tower Knowe (next to the Northumbria Water visitor centre beside Kielder Dam), Belling Law, Kennel Hall Knowe near Plashetts, and Gowanburn Camp, directed by George Jobey in the 1970s in advance of the flooding of the valley by Kielder Water, revealed that this type of settlement originated during the late Iron Age (Jobey 1973; 1977; 1978; 1983, 199ff; Higham 1986, 122-3, 134-7, 193-5). The original sites were built of wood, featuring timber roundhouses and palisaded enclosures, which were replaced several times over. Radiocarbon dates clustering in the last two centuries BC and 1st century AD were associated with these earlier phases, which were followed by a rebuilding in stone no earlier than the mid second century AD. However, whilst the building material was different, the overall form of the original settlements was very similar to the later ones and the change in material was probably related to an increasing shortage of good building timber as settlement, cultivation and population expanded during

---

8 The gazetteer sites referred to in the text are all located on figures 4 and 88. Those in the immediate vicinity of the Greenhaugh village and in the village core are also shown on figures 5 & 89 and 6 & 91, respectively whilst those in the immediate vicinity of the Tarset/Lanehead and in the Tarset/Lanehead core area appear on figures 7 & 90 and 8 & 92. For ease of identifiability the site catalogue numbers are placed between square brackets in the report text; thus site no. 5 henceforth appears as [5].

9 Traces of a palisade trench, in the form of a linear groove visible on the surface, were also noted by Jobey at Boggle Hill [5], west of Tarset (Jobey 1984).
the late Iron Age and the Romano-British period. Indeed, some of the settlements provide evidence for population growth with the single round house usually evident in the earlier timber phase being replaced by up to three roundhouses when the sites were rebuilt in stone, accompanied by a corresponding increase in the size of the enclosures. Elsewhere, at Sidwood near Tarset for example, roundhouses are visible outside, but adjacent to, the enclosure, suggesting further expansion, which could not be contained within the established compound (Jobey 1960, 3, fig. 1). Towards the head of the valley, around Kielder, the form of these enclosed settlements changes from rectilinear to oval or circular in plan, perhaps in part a response to the narrower valley and steeper slopes which caused the settlements to be terraced into the hillsides, but the basic components of the settlements remain the same, i.e. walled enclosure, stockyards and roundhouses (Jobey 1962; 1964).

Despite featuring stone-walled, ditched and embanked or palisaded compounds, these settlements were not fortified in the way that the earlier hillforts were. It would be better to see their enclosures as protective rather than defensive, i.e. they were designed to secure the livestock from predation by wild animals and perhaps keep out small groups of thieves and rustlers. The enclosure ditches would also have helped to create well-drained site platforms. We should imagine these settlements housing individual family groups, extended families at the most, who were perhaps linked with the inhabitants of neighbouring settlements by notional bonds of kinship to form lineages, clans and tribes. The sites were distributed relatively evenly along the valley to form a dispersed settlement pattern of farmsteads not dissimilar to that prevailing in more recent periods. It is likely there was a strong emphasis on pastoralism, based on the exploitation of the extensive moorland grazing which was available to these upland communities, enabling them to rear substantial herds of cattle and flocks of sheep. Cattle may have been more important than sheep at this time, as was also the case in the medieval and early modern periods periods, with the latter vulnerable to foot-rot and liver fluke and less suited to the poorly-drained pastures prevalent before the agricultural improvements of the later 18th and 19th centuries, but sheep would important for their wool. In largely cashless economy livestock would have been the principal form of transferable wealth, and represented a family’s savings to be drawn on in times of crisis, as is the case in pastoralist societies in the developing world today – a deposit account on the hoof.

6.4 The Early Medieval Period

Little is known of settlement patterns in the Northumbrian uplands in the centuries following the collapse of Roman imperial authority. It is likely that the enclosed farmsteads which were such a feature of rural settlement in the preceding period, continued to be occupied well into the early medieval era, but diagnostic dating evidence is lacking.

The discovery at Falstone of several pieces of early medieval carved stonework, which evidently belonged originally to two separate monuments provides one precious piece of evidence for settlement in upper North Tynedale during this period. Four carved sandstone fragments (one now lost) were found in 1885, in the graveyard of St Peter's Church, in the wall of the adjoining farmhouse and in the wall enclosing the garden attached to the farmhouse (Hall 1889; NCH XV (1940), 165). These can be reconstructed into a single cross shaft, which can be dated to to AD 850-900 on the basis of its stylistic parallels (Corpus, Falstone 1; Cramp & Miket 1982, 16 no. 38, pls. 7-8). The second monument, an inscribed, house-shaped memorial stone, was found by the Rev. James Wood, the Presbyterian Minister of Falstone, in c. 1813, less than quarter of a mile north west of the village. It forms a copy in stone of the type of metal or bone reliquaries or shrines known from the British Isles and on the continent from the 7th and 8th centuries. Surviving examples of such caskets feature handles with clasps of the type depicted on the Falstone carving. On the basis of these stylistic parallels, the stone monument is dated to AD 750-850.
It is likely that both monuments originally derived from the same early Christian site, which was probably located in the same place as St Peter’s churchyard (see the Falstone village report for detailed discussion). This was probably also the site of the chapel mentioned in 14th and 16th century sources. The presence of this assemblage of carved stonework indicates a long-term ecclesiastical presence at Falstone in one form or another from at least the 8th/9th centuries AD. The location of the churchyard on a knoll demarcated by a bend in the Falstone Burn forms a neatly demarcated location, which might have proved attractive for an early Christian monastic community, for instance. It may represent a minor monastic site, established before the Viking onslaught had extinguished the once bright light of Northumbrian monasticism, or perhaps a chapel owned by the local lord.

However, what this assemblage of carved stonework undeniably demonstrates is that the upper reaches of North Tynedale were far from deserted in the 8th and 9th centuries (cf. Barrow 1974, 170). Elaborate carved and inscribed monuments are an indication of a high status site, usually with ecclesiastical functions. It is extremely unlikely that such a site stood in isolation, in a valley otherwise devoid of permanent settlement. Rather it would have been located at the top of a hierarchy of lesser, satellite settlements, inhabited by communities of dependent peasants which, through their labours, provided the resources to sustain such conspicuous expenditure by the elite - lay or ecclesiastical - of the Northumbrian kingdom.

### 6.4.1 Early Medieval patterns of lordship

Aside from these discoveries of carved stonework, archaeological fieldwork has so far shed very little light of the early-medieval era in North Tynedale and there is no contemporary documentation. However the pattern of landholding and lordship in the upland valleys of Northumbria prior to the Norman Conquest may be glimpsed through a combination of the parochial framework and placename evidence. It is striking that the parochial centres of medieval North Tynedale and Redesdale all have toponyms incorporating personal names. Thus the parish of Simonburn ('Simondeburn' in 1228-9), which embraced most of North Tynedale, seems to incorporate a personal name, Sigemund (Mawer 1920, 180). It is tempting to infer, tentatively, that these parishes may, in effect, have fossilised 9th/11th century estate boundaries, a phenomenon well-recognised elsewhere (cf. Winchester 1987, 22-7), whilst the placenames preserve some memory of early proprietors. Similarly Elsdon (Ellesden in the earliest sources) presumably signifies Elli's or perhaps Aelf's valley, whilst Corsenside (Crossensete) combines an Irish personal name, Crossan, with the Norse term for hill pasture saetr, and may hint at Irish-Norse settlement (Beckensall 1992; Mawer 1920, 55, 74). That this form of placename can be associated with early landholdings is demonstrated by the case of Gilsland (Gilles' land), which derives from the territory of Gille son of Boet, who held the western end of the Tyne gap up until the reign of Henry II. Given the size of Simonburn parish, in particular, it is tempting to see it as the surviving trace of a 'shire', one of the large estates, of early medieval date, for which widespread evidence has been identified elsewhere in the county, e.g. Norhamshire, Islandshire and Bamburghshire in north Northumberland (cf. Dixon 1985, I, 69-75; Barrow 1973, 7-68; Jolliffe 1926). Much of the evidence for such an estate would have been lost as a result of it later being subsumed in the even larger liberty of Tynedale and its internal structures would have been disrupted by the process of subinfeudation.

A further possible clue to the early-medieval framework is provided by the dedication to St Cuthbert of the chapel at Bellingham. This belongs to a string of churches and chapels in the upland hinterland of Northumberland - Elsdon, Corsenside, Bellingham, Haydon Bridge, Beltingham - which are consecrated to St Cuthbert (cf. Bates 1889, 326-7). Whilst some dedications to St Cuthbert can be related to the medieval holdings of the Prince-Bishops of Durham the same cannot be said of this upland series. It is possible the series in some way reflects early proselytising by Cuthbert himself (as suggested by Bates, ibid.), however a more attractive hypothesis may be advanced. The dedication sites can be linked to form a single itinerary leading from north Northumberland along the edge of the uplands and through the
Tyne-Solway gap to Cumbria. It is tempting to identify this with the route followed by the Community of St Cuthbert during the late-ninth century, when it fled from its first refuge at Norham to a temporary haven in Cumbria in the face of the Danish onslaught (cf. Higham 1986, 310 with regard to Cumbrian church dedications). Indeed, just such a tradition of extensive church and chapel foundation 'in the western districts', by the itinerant Community, is preserved by the 15th-century prior Wessington of Durham (cited by Bates 1889, 327 n.38). The dedications may reflect a process of alliance-building between the Community, anxious for military support, and the local secular elite, marked by the establishment of chapels on important estates and sanctified by the temporary presence there of Cuthbert's remains. It also falls within a broader pattern of similar activity, as the foundations of the English parochial structure were laid by the widespread creation of estate chapels from the ninth century onwards.

6.5 Medieval period

6.5.1 Medieval Settlement in upper North Tynedale

The development of settlement in the upper reaches of the valley has been intensively analysed by Harbottle and Newman (1973, 138-42 and esp. fig. 2, reproduced here as fig. 54) and by Charlton (1987, 29-39). Their accounts are largely followed here with some modifications to take account of additional pieces of evidence.

Sources

In discussing the sources relating to North Tynedale pride of place must go to the ‘Iter of Wark’, a summary of judicial proceedings conducted by the royal justices dispatched annually from Scotland to hold the eyre at Wark-on-Tyne, the capital of the liberty of Tynedale. The proceedings for two years, 1279 and 1293, have survived. The Latin text of former was published by Hartshorne in an appendix in the Feudal and Military Antiquities in Northumberland and the Scottish Borders (1858), promptly summarised by Charlton (1859a) and extensively drawn upon by Moore in her study of the English lordships held by the king of Scotland (Moore 1915) and later by volume XV of the Northumberland County History (NCH XV (1940)). The 1293 proceedings, which are held in the Public Record Office, still await the publication they so clearly merit. Together these provide a vivid impression of life in upper Tynedale towards the end of the 13th century, before conditions were utterly transformed by the escalating crisis between England and Scotland which plunged the two kingdoms into centuries of intermittent warfare. Although the emphasis of these documents is inevitably on human misdeeds, as is the case with all such judicial proceedings, it should be emphasised that the level of violence which they reveal within Tynedale, whilst undeniably present, was not beyond the normal parameters of medieval society. There is no indication that the kind of spiralling descent into chronic lawlessness, which was to give rise to clan society of the reivers during the late medieval and early modern eras, had yet commenced.

Reference should also be made to a series of Inquisitions Post Mortem (IPMs) and related documents, mostly belonging to the period 1326-30 (an assignments of dower and a mandate for the delivery of land), which give a fairly comprehensive impression of the extent, distribution and organisation of settlement at the late 13th century high point as well as revealing the devastating impact of Robert the Bruce’s raids. These have been reproduced in translation in a variety of works, notably the calendared volumes of IPMs and other documents published by the Public Record Office, Bain’s Calendar of Documents relating to Scotland and in the Northumberland County History, volume XV.

Tynedale in the twelfth-thirteenth centuries

It is not often appreciated just how late the Norman conquest came to upper Tynedale. There is no evidence that North and South Tynedale were incorporated into the feudal structures of the Anglo-Norman kingdom before the reign of Henry II. This was long after much of South Wales had witnessed Norman settlement and many areas of lowland Scotland had
experienced the installation of Norman, Breton or Flemmish lords by the modernising king, David (Ritchie 1954). Indeed, both Barrow (RRS I, 111) and Kapelle (1979, 130, 268) have argued that these valleys did not even lie within the nominal boundaries of the English kingdom during the first half of the twelfth century, but fell under the authority of the King of the Scots instead, although the evidence appears inconclusive. Certainly, the local lord of northeast Cumbria, Gille, son of Boet, acknowledged Scottish overlordship and blocked Anglo-Norman expansion into the western end of the Tyne-Irthing gap, until the 1150s.

Thus it was not until 1157, that upper Tynedale acquired a feudal overlord, when the two valleys were granted by Henry II as a large fief to William, brother of the Scottish king, Malcolm IV, in partial recompense for having peremptorily dispossessed William of the earldom of Northumberland (Hartshorne 1858, 254; Moore 1915, 3). At the same time the Barony of Gilsland (Gille's land) was established in north-east Cumbria and the small barony of Langley in South Tynedale was formed and granted to Adam de Tindale. This last measure usefully ensured that the Scottish kings did not have uninterrupted control over the Tyne-Irthing gap and with it communications between Newcastle and Carlisle. During the remainder of the twelfth century, under Malcolm II and William I, feudal subinfeudation progressed with the confirmation of land grants to individuals and religious institutions (RRS I, 103; II, 79, 84, 143, 172, 197, 227, 529, 538; Moore 1915, 40-7, 84).

The structure of lordship: The Liberty of Tynedale

Tynedale was not an ordinary barony. Instead it belonged to a class of lordship variously termed realtages, franchises or liberties, where the baron was responsible for performing the administrative and judicial tasks undertaken elsewhere by the sheriff and other royal officials. There were several of these in Northumberland, covering much of the county, including the Palatinate of Durham with its northern districts of Norhamshire, Islandshire and Bedlingtonshire, the Umfraville liberty of Redesdale, and the ecclesiastical liberties of Hexhamshire and Tynemouthshire (cf. Lomas 1996, 150-61). This viceregal authority did not confer any right to alter or make laws, and its continuance was always conditional on the goodwill of the English Crown, symbolised on the death of each baronial incumbent when the liberty automatically reverted to the state until a successor had been acknowledged. For the English monarchy this clearly represented a pragmatic and economical means of administering and policing the remote uplands of Northumberland. Tynedale was the largest of these liberties, covering more than 200,000 acres in total, and was retained by William's successors until the beginning of the Anglo-Scottish wars in 1296 (Moore 1915, 21-6; Lomas 1996, 155-8).

In the eyes of contemporaries, at least, it might appear that the liberty was part of Scotland. In the Northumberland Assize Roll of 1279, Tynedale is described as 'outside the kingdom of England in the kingdom of Scotland' (Northumb. Assize R., 365). However, despite being held by the King of Scotland, the Tynedale liberty remained English territory. The Scottish kings' powers there, particularly in the judicial field, were certainly greater than they possessed in their other English fiefs, such as the Honour of Huntingdon, but the royal justices dispatched annually from Scotland to hold the eyre at Wark-on-Tyne, the capital of the liberty, conducted those proceedings in accordance with English not Scottish law (Iter of Wark; cf. Lomas 1996, 155-7; RRS II, 54; Hartshorne 1858, 253-65; Moore 1915, 57-8). Moreover the English Crown reserved certain powers to itself, for example the right to grant markets and fairs and to establish boroughs, and the authority to licence individual feudal tenants to 'crenelate' (or fortify) their manor houses.

Territorially, the liberty embraced all of upper North Tynedale, above the confluence with the Rede, plus all the land on the west side of the North Tyne as far as its confluence with the South Tyne, as well as most of South Tynedale. The centre of the lordship was the manorial complex of Mote Hills at Wark on Tyne, originally probably a ringwork castle built of earth and timber. It was here that the itinerant royal justices dispensed law on their periodic visits, and those awaiting trial were held in the prison presumably situated within its circuit. There was also a bakehouse, brewery, and a forge, again perhaps located within the castle, as well as both a fulling mill and a corn mill, and a deer park (NCH XV (1940), 282-3).

Grindon, in South Tynedale, was also a royal manor for a time (Moore 1915), as was a third part of Bellingham (see below). However most of the liberty was not held directly by the king, but was instead granted to subordinate lords belonging to the nobility of both kingdoms, a process known as subinfeudation. In this way Upper North Tynedale seems to have been divided between three principal manors during the 13th century – Bellingham (where there was also a chapel and later a market), Tarset and Chirdon.

6.5.2 Manorial structure

The Manor of Bellingham
This manor embraced the area corresponding to the 18th-19th century townships of Bellingham, The Nook, Lee Malling on the south side of the river and much of Charlton East Quarter. Two thirds of the manor were held by the Bellingham lineage. In 1279 William de Belllingham claimed to hold it by hereditary service of being the king of Scotland’s forester in Tynedale forest (Iter of Wark, xxviii-xxix). Elsewhere in the same proceedings it is stated that William’s grandfather, Alan son of Dolfin, likewise held two thirds of Bellingham (Iter of Wark, xli). Alan granted land at Ealingham to Jedburgh Abbey which gave rise to a complex dispute between his grandson and the Abbey over grazing rights on Ealingham Common and Hesleyside (Iter of Wark, xiv, xv, xvii, xix, xxxii, xi). The remaining third of the manor was held directly by the King himself.

The Manor of Chirdon
This estate embraced the entire valley of the Chirdon Burn, one of the main tributaries of the North Tyne on the south side of the dale above Bellingham (NCH XV (1940), 273-80). As the Chirdon Burn and Tarset Burn flow into the North Tyne at virtually the same point, the core holdings of Chirdon and Tarset manors lay opposite one another, however Chirdon manor was nowhere near as extensive as its neighbour.

The manor was granted to the Justiciar of Scotland, David de Lindsay in 1233 and held by his descendents until the outbreak of the Anglo-Scottish wars whereupon it was confiscated. The manorial centre, or ‘capital messuage’ was represented by Dally Castle, where the ruins of a small 13th-century hall-house can still be seen esconced on a natural mound beside the Chirdon Burn. It contained a mill probably situated beside the castle, two parks, a dependent hamlet with five bondage tenants at Snabdaugh, beside the river and 22 shielings along the upper reaches and side tributaries of the burn.

The Manor of Tarset
Dwarfing both these two estates, however, was the manor of Tarset, which is of principal interest here. This comprised all the land in the upper valley from the limits of Bellingham manor right up to the head of the valley, with the exception of the Chirdon Burn on the south side. It included Charlton, Sundaysight (Sundayheigh), Greenhaugh and Cariteth (le Caryte), Shitlington in Wark parish, the modern parish of Thorneyburn, including Emblehope, Thorneyburn and Donkleywood, and the modern parish of Falstone, including Kielder, Belling (le Belles), Hawkhope (Haucop), Bewshaugh (le Bowhous), and Greenside
The centre (or caput) of the manor lay at Tarset Hall or Castle beside the confluence of the North Tyne and the Tarset Burn. In the 13th century the manor was held by the Comyns, one of the principal Scottish baronial lineages. The manor owed suit (i.e. the obligation to attend and support proceedings there) to the court of Wark.

In addition one or two much smaller subordinate manors figure in the sources, their lords holding the estates as fiefs (feudal tenancies) from the Comyns. Thus Adam de Charlton held the manor of Charlton, between Tarset and Bellingham, at the end of the 13th century and Adam de Swinburne held Lusburn (Lewisburn) one of the side valleys towards the head of the dale.

6.5.3 Ecclesiastical structure
Whereas South Tynedale was divided between half a dozen parishes, those parts of the liberty which lay in North Tynedale were incorporated within a single vast parish, that of Simonburn, covering over 130,000 acres. In the upper reaches of the valley, above the confluence of the North Tyne and the Rede, there were subordinate chapels at Bellingham and Falstone (see Falstone village report) and perhaps even at Belles at the very head of the valley. There is evidence that these sites were very long established ecclesiastical centres, with 8th-9th century carved stonework from both Falstone and Simonburn (cf. Cramp 1984). The earliest reference to a chapel at Bellingham is c. 1140, but even here the chapel’s dedication to St Cuthbert has given rise to the suggestion that it might have been established much earlier, perhaps in the 9th century (see above).

6.5.4 Structure of settlement: vills, villages and hamlets
The Iter of Wark mentions a total of seven vills in upper North Tynedale, namely Bellingham, Charlton, Tarset, Tirsethoppe, Chirdon, Donkleywood (Duncliffe), and Thorneyburn (Iter: lxi-lxv, lxiv-lv). These do not necessarily represent villages. Rather, as discussed above, they were territorial townships or administrative units. In this case, since the vills are recorded in the context of judicial proceedings and principally in connection with the payment of communal fines, it is likely they represent administrative vills. Moreover the list is not necessarily comprehensive. No vill is recorded on the south side of the river above Chirdon, although the existence of three or four inhabited places can be inferred there and none above Donkleywood on the north side although again a number of settlements can be identified extending far up the valley, including the chapel site at Falstone.

It is by no means clear that the majority of these vills actually contained a nucleated village in the conventional sense, as opposed to a hamlet or a scatter of dispersed farmsteads. Bellingham was probably the most substantial of the settlements, since it was the site of a chapel as well as a manorial centre (caput), complete with mill and presumably a manor house for the Bellingham lineage. There may also have been a nucleated village at Charlton. The Inquisition Post Mortem for John Comyn of Badenagh, lord of Tarset, lists as part of the

---

11 In the Northumberland County History it is noted that the manor of Tarset covered the third of Bellingham which was not held by the family of Bellingham, however under the heading of the Manor of Bellingham it is noted that the remaining third was held by the king of Scotland and comprised Reedswood, Haining Rigg, the Rowe head of Nook and the Shaw (op. cit. 236). Elsewhere it is noted that Dunterley, the Eales (Eals) and Barnardstead (now Barneystead), all on the south side of the river were part of the kings lands in Bellingham (op. cit. 238).

12 Hope Dodds (NCH XV (1940) 242-3), following Hodgson (1835, 417), suggests that the manor was part of the hereditary estate of Waltheof, earl of Northumberland. In 1130 Waltheof’s son, Uchtred, paid king Henry I a total of 20 marks of silver, three palfreys and 3 ‘chasur’s’ for the privilege of ‘sac and soc’ in all his lands, however the location of these is not specified. Richard Comyn married Hextilda, daughter and heiress of Uchtred, and the couple were granted or had confirmed land in South Tynedale as part of the inheritance of Uchtred. However there is no specific reference to Tarset in this context and it may conceivably have come into the Comyn’s hands as part of the normal process of establishing subordinate manors following the creation of the liberty of Tynedale.

13 The date of ‘Belles Kirk’ is uncertain and may reflect the movement of settlers from Scotland later in the medieval period.
manorial holdings fourteen bondages ‘in Charlton’, each comprising one toft and 20 acres of land. Even this was masks greater complexity since the settlements of Little Charlton and South Charlton are also mentioned with Little Charlton, at least, if not South Charlton as well, apparently lying south of the river with rights of common in Hesleyside. (NCH XV (1940), 251-2; Harbottle & Newman 1973, 139). These may relate to the manor of Charlton, a sub-manor of Tarset, held by Adam of Charlton at the end of the 13th century, whereas the 14 bondage tenancies (in Charlton pro?) were held directly by the Comyn lords. Greystead, on the other hand, is explicitly labelled a hamlet and Snabdaugh, in the manor of Chirdon, where Robert Swinburne had held five bondages each with one toft and 16 acres of land, probably falls into the same category. Indeed it seems likely that virtually all the sites listed in the inquisitions or inferred from their occurrence as part of the surnames of people mentioned by the Iter of Wark were hamlets or farmsteads.

6.5.5 Tarset – Components of the medieval site and manor

Evidence for settlement, population levels and tenurial development at Tarset has been collated by Wrathmell (1975, II, 506). The Inquisitions Post Mortem held in 1326 and 1329 to value the holdings of John Comyn of Badenagh, who had died in 1315, provides one of the most detailed inventories of the manor and all its components:

(NCH XV (1940), 244-5; CalDocScot III, no. 886; Cal IPM VI, no. 697 – AD 1326)

John Comyn held of the king in chief the manor of Tyrset in Tyndale by the service of one and a half knights’ fees and doing suit at the court of Wark in Tyndale every three weeks:

- The manor and orchard used to be worth in time of peace 2s. yearly, and now nothing lying waste and destroyed by the Scots.
- There are 38 acres of demesne land each worth in time of peace 12d., of which there are in occupation 10 acres which are farmed out at 3s. 4d to be paid at the feasts of Pentecost and St. Martin, the price of an acre 4d. and the rest lies waste from want of tenants.
- There is a park which was worth yearly in herbage £10, and now 3s. 4d.
- There is a hope called Tyresthope formerly worth yearly in herbage £26 13s. 4d., and now 13s 4d to be paid at the said terms.
- There is another hope called Emelhope, formerly worth yearly in herbage £6 13s 4d., and now nothing because of want of tenants.
- There is a shieling called le Grenehalgh, formerly worth yearly in herbage £8 and now 2s 6d; also hope called le Caryte formerly worth yearly in herbage 106s. 8d. and now 4s. 6d.
- And a hope called Kielder formerly worth in herbage £26 13s. 4d. yearly, and now nothing because it lies waste for want of tenants.
- And a shieling called Kielderheys formerly worth in herbage £4 yearly and now worth nothing for the same cause.
- And a hope called Thorneybourne with le Brendis formerly worth in herbage £12 10s yearly and now 13s. 4d.
- And there are 14 bondages in Charleton pertaining to the said manor, each containing one toft and 20 acres of land and each being formerly worth 20s. yearly, of which there are in occupation 20 acres which are farmed out at 6s. 8d. to be paid at the said terms. The rest lies waste and uncultivated.
- And a pasture called Byrchenshop formerly worth 13s. 4d. yearly and now nothing because it lies waste.
- And a hamlet called Grenestede formerly worth 60s. yearly in herbage and now 3s. 4d.
- And a hope called Doncliwode formerly worth yearly in herbage £8 and now 10s.

14 For the Inquisition Post Mortem for Adam de Charlton, dated 1303, see Charlton 1859b.
And a hope called Waynhop formerly worth yearly in herbage £9 and now nothing because it lies waste for want of tenants.

And a park (at Wainhope) formerly worth yearly in herbage £8 and now nothing for the same cause.

And a hope called Trivetbourne with le Grene formerly worth yearly in herbage £26 13s. 4d. and now 20s.

And a hope called Poltreneth formerly worth yearly in herbage £12 and now nothing.

And a hope called le Belles with le Bowhous formerly worth in herbage £12 now nothing.

And a hope called Stokhalgh with le Bernes formerly worth yearly in herbage £9 and now 6s 8d.

And a hope called Haucop formerly worth £10 13s. 4d. and now nothing for the cause aforesaid.

And a hope called Sundayhaygh formerly worth yearly £30, and now nothing because it lies broken and out of order.”

(CalDocScot III, no.979 – AD 1329)

Not extended formerly:

42 acres of demesne in Tyrsete manor, each worth 12d

a hope there called Shouelburne, worth £26 13s. 4d.

Another called Smal and Yeuralgh, worth £14

In 1329, John Comyn’s widow, Margaret, afterwards wife of Edmund earl of Kent, was assigned a third part of the manorial holding as a dower, as was customary, comprising a third part of Sholeburnhope, the hope of Kielderheies, the site of a capital messuage with the demesne lands in Wainhope and certain lands in Dedewaynhope, Poltrevet, land worth £14 13s. 4d. in time of peace in Le Green, Le Karite which was worth 106s. 8d in time of peace, Dunkleywood worth £8 in time of peace, a third of the mills and park of Tarset, of the park of Wainhope and of the forest of Emelhope, and a third of some other land, name illegible, worth 12s. in time of peace (CalDocScot III, no. 993; Cal IPM VI, no. 252; cited in NCH XV (1940), 245).

6.5.6 Tarset castle [4] (cf. Cathcart King 1983, 341-2, 371-2 n.261a; NCH XV (1940) 246-247; cf. figs. 25, 52, 75-76)

The manorial centre, termed the capital messuage in medieval documents, was located on a steep-sided promontory above the Tarset Burn. The promontory is cut off by a deep ditch on its east and south sides and the west side may also have been scarped during construction. The SW corner of the site was truncated by the Border Counties Railway line, whilst the action of the Tarset Burn may have eroded away part of the north side during the intervening centuries.

The castle’s history has traditionally been assumed to have begun in 1267 when a detailed licence to crenelate was issued to John Comyn (CalDocScot I, no. 2463; Cal. Pat. Rolls 178; discussed and reproduced by. Bates 1891, 7-8 n.30). However in 1244, more than twenty years previously, Hugh de Bolbec, sheriff of Northumberland was instructed to take into his keeping the ‘castle of Tyreset’, which the King of Scots would have delivered to him; its lord, Walter Comyn, was to be allowed to remove his stores, weapons etc. (Cal Close R. 1242-1247, 221; cf. Cathcart King 1983, 341; Harbottle & Newman 1973, 139 n. 9). This was a period of tension between the two kingdoms and Henry III was evidently anxious to ensure that this strategically positioned fortress, close to the border, did not provide the Scots with an advance base if relations deteriorated into outright warfare. It also clearly demonstrates the
limits of the Scottish king’s autonomy in his liberty of Tynedale. When the King of England wished to exercise control there was no question as to who was the superior lord.

The apparent problem posed by these apparently conflicting records is easily resolved if it is assumed that the earlier record refers to an earth and timber ‘ringwork’ castle probably constructed by Richard Comyn when the family first acquired the manor in the 12th century. Ringworks, which simply comprise a massively ditched and embanked enclosure, are more common in North Tynedale and Redesdale than the better known type of motte-and-bailey castles, with both the Mote Hill at Wark and Warden Castle adopting this form. Even the earthwork castle at Elsdon - traditionally thought of as a motte-and-bailey - has been re-evaluated more recently and shown to be a ringwork and bailey (Cathcart King & Alcock 1969, 119). There is now no clear trace of earthen ramparts at Tarset and it is possible these were levelled to create a more elevated platform when the castle was rebuilt in stone in 1267, or perhaps dispensed with altogether. Given the scale of the ditch, they were scarcely necessary in any case.

The licence to crenelate, coupled with the results of various antiquarian investigations, suggest that the stone castle built in 1267 was a rectangular hall-house, or more correctly hall-tower, probably of two storeys, with turrets at each corner of the range (Pevsner et al. 2002, 61-2, 582). This was typical of the kind of manorial residence being erected by the Northumbrian gentry at this time. The licence allowing John Comyn to enclose and crenelate his chamber (camera) specifically states that it was to be fortified in the same manner as the existing chamber of Adam de Gesemuth (Jesmond), one end of which, known as ‘King John’s Palace’, can still be seen in Heaton Park in Newcastle.

The castle disappears from view after the early 14th century. It is likely that it suffered as the-as the manor of Tarset was split into two parts and passed repeatedly from one short term holder to another. However it reappears in the early 16th century when its potential as a stronghold to ‘bridge Tynedale’ was recognised by the royal authorities. It was recommended for a garrison in 1522 (LP Hen VIII iii, no. 1986) and in 1523 Sir Ralph Fenwick, the Keeper of Tynedale, was stationed there with 80 men to overawe ‘the Tynedale thieves’. He was driven out in the following year by William Charlton of Bellingham and 200 North Tynedale men, but returned with a new garrison of 100 men in 1525, only for the castle to be recaptured by an alliance of Tynedale men and 400 Scots and burnt (NCH XV (1940), 246-7). The Crown was not prepared to lavish sufficient resources on the castle to make it a secure stronghold and it was still derelict when Sir Robert Bowes and Sir Ralph Ellerker conducted their survey of border defences, in 1541 (cf. Bates 1891, 48-9).

6.5.7 Demesne fields
The 1326-29 Comyn IPMs, cited above, record a combined total of 80 acres of demesne arable at Tarset, most of which was then uncultivated for lack of tenants. This may have been distributed in two separate blocks of 38 and 42 acres since the 42-acre parcel was omitted from the first inquisition.

6.5.8 The park
A park is also listed at Tarset by the inquisitions. This lay a little to the east of the castle, where the element ‘park’ figures in several placenames – Park Cottage, Park Hill and Park Bank (the last being the name of the field between Park Cottage the castle shown on a Bell estate map of 1837: NRO ZHE 43-23). Hence the general location of the park is clear even if its outline cannot now be traced.

---

15 LP Hen VIII iv, nos. 328, 346, 427, 482, 1338, 1428-9.
16 Compare Leland writing around 1538: ‘Tarset castelle ruines in Northumberland ha’d by north Tyne (be)long now to the lord Borow’ (Itinerary v, fo. 102; cited in Bates 1891, 25).
6.5.9 The mill
Another virtually indispensable element of manorial lordship, a mill, is listed repeatedly in the inquisitions. In 1326 to have formerly been worth £30 per annum, ‘but now nothing because it lies broken and out of order.’ Reference in the Iter of Wark to ‘the fulling mill of Tarset’ (molenidum fullonicum de Tyrset), where Richard the Fuller (Ricardus le Fulur) suffered a burglary in 1279 (Hartshorne 1858, liii), reveals that this mill was associated with the processing of cloth rather than grain, once again underlining the importance of livestock and their products to the economy of the upland manor. The mill’s precise location, presumably either on the Tarset Burn or North Tyne, cannot be identified. It may even have lain on the site of the present Tarset Hall [43].

6.5.10 The settlement – village or hamlet?
Harbottle and Newman suggest there was a village at Tarset (1973, 138-9), however Wrathmell is more circumspect (1975 II, 506) noting that ‘no indication has been found of the size or composition of the medieval settlement there’. No bondage tenants are recorded there in any of the early 14th century inquisitions (see inset box below for the importance of bondages in a conventional lowland township and manor). Instead fourteen bondage holdings at neighbouring Charlton are listed. 16th-17th century documents indicate there had been 19 tenants of Tarset at some stage before 1584 and there were 13 houses registered for the Hearth Tax there in 1666, but it is not clear whether these records refer to the population of a nucleated village site or settlement dispersed throughout the township in scattered farmsteads.

All this does not mean there was no settlement at Tarset alongside the castle and the other adjuncts of manorial lordship and economy. The occurrence of the surname de Tyrset would imply there was at least a hamlet there (although it could perhaps also denote origin from an area or township territory rather than a specific settlement). However the evidence, in particular the absence of bondage holdings, does suggest that Tarset was not a regular nucleated village with rows of peasant farmers’ houses and attached toft enclosures plus open fields of arable riggs and meadow beyond, such as one would expect to find in the coastal plain of Northumberland.

Neither the aerial photographs nor surface examination have revealed any earthworks other than those of the castle itself and some ridge and furrow in the adjacent field to the east. At present Tarset comprises a single farmstead, Tarset Hall, with a small hamlet nearby, at Laneheads.

Bondage holdings, unfree tenants and free tenants
A bondage holding would typically comprise a messuage (building plot) and a parcel of arable and meadow, 24-30 acres being the standard allotment in Northumberland. Bondmen were ‘unfree’ tenants, also known as customary tenants, villeins or tenants in villeinage. With their viable tenancies, the Bondmen generally formed the core of the township community and the foundation of the manor’s financial productivity, in the lowlands at least. In addition there would typically be a number of freeholders, as well as other categories of unfree tenant, such as cotmen – smallholders who worked as day labourers. Unfree tenants generally bore a greater weight of rents, labour services and other obligations to their lord, by comparison with free tenants, although it should be noted that even the latter did not ‘own’ their holdings outright, in the modern sense of the term. Most importantly, whilst unfree tenure was determined by the custom of the manor, regulated through the lord’s manorial court, free tenure was governed by common law, with the result that free tenants paid rents fixed in

17 The North East Mills Group report that Eric Griffith looked for the site of the mill in the 1970s and recorded that ‘no trace of the mill can be found except possible remains of a dam across the Tarset Burn not far upstream from its confluence with the North Tyne. Just below the possible dam site there can be seen a stone ford laid across the river bed’ (Griffith 1974).
perpetuity, could sell or grant their holdings without seigneurial interference and could sue their lord in the royal courts (Lomas 1996, 76-7; Bailey 2002, 26). Free tenancies were generally held in return for performing certain limited services, principally attendance at the baron’s court and support for its operations (an obligation known as ‘suit of court’), and the payment of a fixed cash rent or perhaps a pound of spices (Lomas 1996, 19; Bailey 2002, 27-8).

6.5.11 Charlton
As stated above, Charlton appears to have been the principal, if not the only, settlement of bonded, or unfree, peasant tenants on the manor. In the light of this, apparent meaning of the placename Charlton, and its variant forms Carleton and Carlatton, denoting ‘the settlement of the ceorls’ or peasants’ is intriguing. Winchester (1987, 19) has suggested the name was given especially to settlements of the bondmen who tilled the royal demesne. The relationship of Charlton with its bondage tenancies to Tarset would appear to match this very closely. Moreover, given the fact that there was more than one settlement with the name Charlton in this area, with the hamlets of Little Charlton and South Charlton also figuring in the sources, it is possible that the area between Bellingham and Tarset was the zone of dependent ceorl settlements whose labour originally served all the neighbouring manorial estates.

6.5.12 The highland pastures: hopes and shielings
However the principal wealth of the manor clearly lay not in its control over a community of unfree tenants cultivating tracts of arable land, but in the extensive upland grazing areas it incorporated. It is not altogether clear how the manor extracted value from these pastures. The Comyn inquisitions contain no references to seigneurial cattle farms (vaccaries), sheep farms (berceries) or stud farms in the highlands, of the kind that are clearly documented in the Umfraville manors of Harbottle and Otterburn in the neighbouring Liberty of Redesdale. An deed of 1360 does however refer the ‘mottes’ of Kielder and Emelhope, which might represent something of the kind, perhaps moated farms rather than mottes in the motte and bailey sense (Laing Charter no. 49; Macdonald 1950, no.29; see below Selected Sources and Surveys 1). Shielings are mentioned at Greenhaugh and Kielderheys. The latter can perhaps be identified with the large, regularly laid out settlement consisting of rectangular house platforms, enclosures and lazy beds at Colour Cleughs, beside White Kielder Burn (NY 675984). A further 22 shielings are also recorded in the neighbouring manor of Chirdon in the Inquisition Post Mortem for Robert Swinburne in 1326 (NCH XV (1940) 277; Cal IPM VI no. 693). These were probably associated with long distance transhumance (Harbottle and Newman 1973, 140-1; Winchester 2000, 93). However the bulk of the pastures are simply described as ‘a hope called . . .’. Sometimes this is associated with a further name, e.g. Belleshope with le Bowhous and Stokhalghhope with le Bernes. Harbottle and Newman suggest that these were additional shielings (1973, 141). However at least one of these places figures in a surname recorded in the Iter of Wark (Williemus de le Bernes, cf. Hartshorne 1858, lv) suggesting there was some form of permanent settlement there in 1279. Similarly, the reference to a certain John Makam ‘of Kielder’, who ‘dropped down dead’ in the market place at Bellingham in 1293, and Emma of Waynhoppe who was taken for theft and promptly decapitated in 1279, point to the existence of permanent settlements at both these remote locations (Wilson & Leathart 1982, 61; Iter of Wark, lxv). Yet another individual possibly resident in the upper end of the valley is Gilbert son of Peter de Belles, mentioned in 1279 (Iter of Wark, lxii).

Thus, the surname evidence, coupled with the presence of a supplementary manorial complex at Wainhope, would suggest there was a scatter of permanent settlements extending right up to Kielder and Belles at the head of the valley. The substantial stonewall of the attached park,

---

18 These manorial stock farms are not named or located with one exception, the stud farm in Cottonshope (cf. Rushworth 1994, 11-12).
which was later known as **Kennel Park** (see Armstrong’s map, 1769, cf. fig. 56), can still be seen in the forest on the north shore of Kielder Water. Its scale suggests a substantial investment. The capital messuage itself may have lain a little further west, again on the north shore, at White Knowe, near Gowanburn, where the remains of what appears to be a medieval settlement complex can be traced beneath the trees. In addition, Tirsethoppe must have contained some permanent settlement since it is termed a vill in the Iter of Wark and pays communal fines accordingly. It presumably embraced the higher reaches of the Tarset Burn certainly well above Tarset itself, which was also a vill (perhaps above the confluence with the Tarretburn). Similarly Thorneyburnehope must lie relatively close to the vill - and therefore permanent settlement - of Thorneyburne.

These areas were clearly exploited by tenants, since they are said to be worth nothing for want of such. However there were clearly no nucleated settlements of bondmen in the manner characteristic of lowland manorial farming. Instead a complex mixed pattern of exploitation of these uplands should probably be envisaged, involving both the use of extensive designated shieling grounds by tenants transhuming seasonally over considerable distances and also the establishment of permanent farmsteads or even hamlets inhabited by tenants engaged in shorter distance stock management. The bulk of the manor’s earnings probably came from charges for grazing rights paid by the tenant farmers and those using the shieling grounds.

### 6.6 The Origins of Greenhaugh

Greenhaugh is first mentioned in the Comyn Inquisition Post Mortem of 1326 as a shieling. By 15th century it may well be a permanent settlement. It is included in a list of placenames in an Inquisition Post Mortem of Henry Percy, third Earl of Northumberland, in 1464, along with Sidwood, Gatehouse and Dunstead, though it is not clear which of these were settlements and which were shieling grounds (*cf.* Harbottle & Newman 1973, 142; Hartshorne 1858, 260; see below, *Selected Sources and Surveys* 2). It was certainly a permanent settlement – perhaps a small hamlet – by the 16th century (Harbottle & Newman 1973, 143). The placename Gatehouse – or Yethouse as it was often appears in documentary sources – suggests there was a road, or ‘gate’, probably already of some antiquity, running up Tarsetdale by this date.

### 6.7 Tarset and Greenhaugh from 1350-1700

#### 6.7.1 Lordship, liberties and manors

In the later medieval period feudal overlordship in the valley weakened and new social structures emerged to counterbalance this. The liberty of Tynedale, previously held by the kings of Scotland, was taken into the hands of the English Crown in 1296 and then granted and regranted to no less than six different lords in the following forty years. As Tuck (1971, 26-27) notes, most of these new lords were absentee and most were men of no great social standing. Eventually, in 1336, the liberty was sold to Queen Philippa and held by her until her death, when Edward III then granted it to his fourth son, Edmund Langley, earl of Cambridge in the 1370s. Frequent changes in lordship were especially disruptive in the vice-regal franchises or liberties, like Tynedale, because there most of the responsibility for the maintenance of law and order rested with the lord, rather than with the king’s sheriff, as was the case in Northumberland proper. Whenever the lordship changed hands, judicial authority lapsed until the new lord reasserted it, and it is suggested that he did not act unless prompted by petition from the lordship’s unfortunate inhabitants. As a result the machinery for law enforcement seems to have broken down in Tynedale. By the early 16th century both the old liberties of Tynedale and Redesdale had come under the direct control of the English Crown, in an effort secure the Border more effectively and deal with the problems of chronic
lawlessness and disorder there. The liberties were abolished and henceforth the two territories were simply termed the manors of Wark and Harbottle.

The same instability affected lordship at the manorial level. By the 1320s the male line of the Comyns had died out and the manor of Tarset was divided between two female coheiresses, Margaret and Elizabeth, sisters of John Comyn. Both halves, or moieties, in turn went through a complex succession which is detailed in the County History (NCH XV (1940), 245-48, 266-68). One moiety, which contained Tarset Castle, descended to David Strabolgi, earl of Athol in 1325 and subsequently to his son, also called David, in 1336. By the 1360s, this last David earl of Athol was leasing out substantial tracts of the manor to members of the Northumbrian gentry for set periods. Thus the pastures shieling grounds, park and 'mottes' (moated manorial sites or vaccaries?) at the upper end of Tynedale, including Kielder, Kielder Burn/Kielderhead, Bewshaugh, Bells, Wainhope with its park (Kennel Park) and Emblehope, were leased to William del Strother for five years in 1360 (see below, Selected Sources and Surveys 1), whilst Tarset was leased to Sir William Heron for 30 years in 1362. Following the earl of Athol’s death in 1369 the moiety had been reunited the hands of the Burghs who held it throughout the 16th century. Following Lord Burgh’s death in 1598, his holding passed to Sir Anthony Palmer. In the 1604 Border Survey, the lands were described as 'sometime of the possessions of the late Lord Burgh and now in the tenure of Sir Anthony Paumer, Knight' (1604 Survey, 40). However it is clear from the list of freeholders in the same document that much of the moiety was alienated at this stage, although Palmer continued to hold ‘Tarset hall with the members belonging thereunto' (op.cit., 54).

The second moiety passed to Elizabeth, the younger sister of John Comyn, who married Sir Richard Talbot of Goodrich Castle in Herefordshire. This estate passed to their son, Gilbert, who sold a large part of it, henceforth known as the Talbot Lands, to Henry Percy, first Earl of Northumberland, in 1373. Although suffering the vicissitudes of all the Percy’s estates, the Talbot lands remained in Percy hands throughout the 15th and 16th century with only occasional interruptions due to the vicissitudes in dynastic fortunes. This long Percy tenure of the Talbot lands, plus to a lesser extent the Burgh tenure of the other moiety, probably provided a measure of stability in North Tynedale, but it is likely that the manorial structure had been significantly weakened by the frequent changes in lordship and the resort to leasehold agreement by absentee lords in the early-mid 14th century.

The Percy lands were organised as the manor of Charlton (1604 Survey, 54; see below Selected Sources and Surveys 3) or Charlton Yate at the beginning of the 17th century. The minutes of the court baron for Charlton Yate manor, held in 1605 and 1610 have been preserved in the Duke of Northumberland’s archives at Alnwick Castle (Aln Cas C XII; 1605 minutes reproduced in NCH XV (1940), 248-49) and provide a detailed picture of population, settlement and landuse in Tarsetdale during this period (see below, Selected Sources and Surveys 4).

6.7.2 Surnames and graynes: Reiver society
In response to prolonged Anglo-Scottish conflict and weakened lordship, we see the emergence of kinship-based social groups in the valley, the North Tynedale ‘surnames’. The use of surnames became much more common from the 14th century onwards, but they were to have a special significance in North Tynedale and Redesdale where they became associated with the border reiving clans, collectively known as the ‘Tynedale thieves’ in late 15th and 16th century documents. Indeed ‘surname’, rather than the Scottish Highland label ‘clan’, was the term used to refer to these groupings in contemporary sources. Effectively these were kinship-based self-protection groups, which emerged in the late medieval period as a result of the chronic insecurity due to prolonged Anglo-Scottish conflict and weakened, lordship. Such groups provided some measure of security for the valley’s inhabitants during these turbulent conditions through the threat of collective clan retaliation and feud. They also provided the
government with much needed military manpower along the Border, which was to prove especially important in the early 16th century. The four principal surnames in North Tynedale were the Charltons – the chief surname – the Robsons, Dodds and Milburns. The Dodds and Milburns tended too predominate in Tarsedale and Tarretdale, whilst the Robsons were more prevalent towards the upper end of the valley and the Charltons lower down the dale, between Tarset Burn and Bellingham, but also in Tarsedale itself.

Relatively little is known regarding the origins of this distinctive society and the dispersed settlements, comprising small hamlets and groups of farmsteads, which these kinship groups occupied. Most of the available documentation derives from the 16th and early 17th centuries, after the Crown had taken direct control of the area. From this latter period there is superabundance of material – correspondence between royal officers and officials in the border counties and ministers at court, surveys of the state of the frontier, maps and plans – all collated, calendared and published in works such as the collections of State Papers, the Calendar of Border Papers produced by the Public Record Office as well as Bowes and Ellerker’s Border survey of 1541 (reproduced in Bates 1891), the Border Watch Schedule of 1552 (reproduced in the Leges Marchiarum edited by W. Nicolson) and the Survey of Debateable and Border Land, taken A D 1604, edited by R.P. Sanderson (1604 Survey), which provide useful information on contemporary settlement patterns in upper North Tynedale. Nevertheless it seems clear that it originated during the later medieval period. Documentary evidence shows the Dodds, later the predominant surname in Tarsedale, were already established there by the end of the 14th century. In 1397 the Earl of Northumberland obtained pardons for three Dodds of Tarset (Cal Pat R 1396-99, 62, 72; cf. NCH XV 1940, 247). Similarly, the presence of several Robsons is attested at Falstone around the same time (1371) (see the Falstone Historic Village Atlas report for further discussion). The Robson surname was likewise to become especially prominent at Falstone and in the neighbouring part of the valley during later centuries. Together these and other pieces of evidence suggest the surnames were beginning to emerge in North Tynedale and Redesdale during the late 14th century.

By the 16th century the Robsons of Falstone seem to have become the senior lineage, or ‘grayne’ in 16th-century parlance, of their surname. Parallels for this kind of social structure have been recognised around the world by anthropologists and are termed segmentary tribal societies, the term ‘segmentary’ signifying that each larger unit, the ‘surname’, was composed of several smaller units, the lineage or ‘grayne’, itself composed of several cousinly families inhabiting a neighbourhood of dispersed farmsteads or hamlets. Each set of the smaller social units is said, in anthropological terms, to be ‘nested’ within the larger level grouping to which it belonged. As is common in segmentary societies, this internal structure was not necessarily rigid or permanently fixed and the number of graynes within any particular surname could fluctuate over time. The leading member of the senior grayne, e.g. the Charlton of Hesleyside or Robson of Falstone, was the acknowledged figurehead of the surname, a kind of chieftain labelled the ‘heidsman’ or ‘laird’.

This distinctive society probably maintained itself for perhaps c. 250-300 years. By the last decades of the 16th century, however, for a variety of reasons the surnames were coming under increasing pressure. These factors included economic recession in the late Elizabethan era, the probable steady reduction in the size of tenancies due to partible inheritance which meant tenants no longer had sufficient resources to properly equip themselves, the loss of powerful noble or gentry patrons, and supervision by royal officials more concerned to discipline the English surnames than to protect the upland dales from Scottish reiving, particularly as all concerned knew that the Scottish king would eventually become their monarch too. Together they combined to place the Northumbrian surnames in a situation of much greater vulnerability than they had hitherto experienced. Indeed so weakened were the Redesdale and Tynedale surnames by the last decades of Elizabeth’s reign that their Scottish counterparts could strike with virtual impunity. In the survey of ‘decays’ made in 1584 all
nineteen tenants of Tarset were said to have been slain by the Scots (PRO SP15/28). In the early 17th century, the new Stuart regime of James VI and I made determined efforts to break the reiving clans, establish order and transform the English and Scottish border counties into ‘the Middle Shires’ of the new combined realm. The royal manors of Wark and Harbottle were granted to new lords who were encouraged to transform the customary border tenancies, which paid low rents in return for performing military service on the border, into more normal copyhold tenancies which paid higher rents.

6.7.3 Settlement
Harbottle and Newman have summarised the development of settlement in the dale during the late medieval and early modern periods (1973, 142-46, esp. 144, fig. 3, reproduced as fig. 55 here), showing how it expanded in extent as the valley was recolonised after the crisis of the early-mid 14th century, but more particularly increased in density with the multiplication of small settlements. Henceforth the basic unit was clearly the farmstead and the distribution pattern is essentially familiar today. In assessing the degree of change this represents with regard to previous centuries several points need making in qualification. Firstly, even taking into consideration the 13th century Iter of Wark, the quantity of documentary evidence relating to the 16th and early 17th centuries is very much greater than has survived in respect of the preceding period, for the reasons noted above. This in turn is likely to result in more placenames appearing in the latter centuries. Furthermore there was a greater tendency in the earlier centuries to refer to settlement in terms of the administrative vills, such as Tarset or Tirsenthoppe. However there is no firm evidence that these vills were centred on a nucleated settlements in every, or even in most, cases. Tirsenthoppe is much more likely to have comprised a number of (unnamed) scattered farmsteads, and mostly consisted of large expanses of upland grazing and shieling grounds. Finally, even though the density of 16th century settlement may have exceeded that of the 13th century, the extent of settlement in the main valley during the latter period does not appear to equal that of the earlier, when there was apparently a secondary manorial complex or at least a hunting lodge with a park at ‘Wainhope’ (see above)\(^{19}\) and the evidence of surnames suggests there may have been permanent settlements of some kind as far up the valley as Kielder and Belles. Settlement may have pushed further up Tarsetdale, but even here there is no indication that Emblehope was anything other than a shieling ground in the 16th and 17th centuries, whereas there seems to have been some kind of permanent establishment there in 1360 when the ‘motte of Emelhope’ is referred to (Macdonald 1950, no. 29; see below, Selected Sources and Surveys 1).

Bastles
From the late 16th or beginning of the 17th century these settlements become associated with a distinctive type of fortified farmhouse known as a bastle. There are numerous examples of these two storey stone dwellings in Tarsetdale, with some settlements – notably Gatehouse (with perhaps 5 examples) and Black Middens (2) – containing two or more. Typically livestock were accommodated in ground floor accessed by a single stoutly barred doorway and often featuring a barrel-vaulted ceiling. The proprietor and his family occupied the upper floor, its doorway accessed via a removable ladder which was usually replaced by a flight of stone steps added to the outside of the building when conditions improved later in the 17th century. The windows were generally small – though large enough to shoot out of – and protected by iron bars, whilst the door again could be secured by stout timber drawbars. In addition to Black Middens and Gatehouse [1-2, 8-9] (figs. 61, 82), six other bastles survive in the upper valley alone, at the Comb, Hill House, Waterhead, Shilla Hill (originally perhaps Starr Head or Starheyd), Highfield, Boghead (also known as Corbie Castle and Barty’s Pele, cf. fig. 62), with others inferred at Redheugh [3] and Sidwood, on the basis of documentary evidence, whilst further examples, such as one to the north of High Boughthill [7] (fig. 77),

\(^{19}\) The park is probably represented by Kennel Park which straddled the North Tyne, the ‘capital messuage’ was presumably located close by.
Burnbank [6] and Burnmouth [10] (fig. 81), have been identified lower down the valley (cf. Ramm et al. 1970, 91-92; Lax 1999). Harbottle and Newman estimate that the incidence of such buildings was one in every four or five settlements (1973, 146). However more have since been discovered since they wrote and this figure may be an underestimate, particularly in upper Tarsetdale, where their incidence appears exceptionally dense.

**Greenhaugh and Tarset**

No remains of any bastles have been identified at Greenhaugh, although this may simply be an accident of survival. Nor is there any indication that Greenhaugh could yet be described as a village by this stage, but it is one of the more frequently mentioned of the settlements and would appear to have comprised more than a single farmstead (see below, Selected Sources and Surveys 4, for instance). A collection of farmsteads, deserving the title of a small hamlet at the most, should probably be envisaged.

The report on Border depopulation since the 27th year of Henry VIII’s reign (1535/6) made in 1584 suggests many of the settlements were depopulated or, to be more precise perhaps, lacked able-bodied men by the late 16th century (Harbottle & Newman 1973, 143-45 citing PRO SP 15/28). Nevertheless, as Harbottle and Newman point out (op. cit., 145), despite the unremitting gloom exhibited by the official records, no settlements mentioned in 1584 actually were abandoned at this time as far as can be judged, since all the placenames reappear in documents of the late 16th or 17th century. Indeed, by the middle of the 17th century, the population level had apparently recovered, with the Hearth Tax of 1666 recording thirteen houses in Tarset (PRO E179/158/103). It is not clear what exactly ‘Tarset’ signifies in these context, i.e. were these houses clustered in a single nucleated settlement or alternatively do they represent a number of dispersed farmsteads scattered throughout the district surrounding Tarset Hall? Given everything else that is known of the settlement pattern in Tarsetdale at this time, the latter is the more likely hypothesis, but the precise limits of the territory designated ‘Tarset’ cannot as yet be reconstructed. It is probably comparable with if not identical to the relatively small territorial township or administrative vill which is labelled Tarset during the medieval era. It certainly does not equate to any of the townships or ‘wards’ encountered in North Tynedale after the administrative reorganisation of 1729.

6.8 **The Parishes and Townships of North Tynedale**

In the usual manner of county histories, volume XV of the *Northumberland County History* (NCH XV (1940), 234-80) discusses the history of North Tynedale primarily within the framework of ecclesiastical parishes and their constituent townships, following the example of all the previous volumes in the series and John Hodgson’s *History of Northumberland* before that. Yet these 19th century parishes and townships were relatively recent creations in North Tynedale.

The townships of Charlton West Quarter, Tarrethburn and West Tarset, which all feature as a territorial units in the *Northumberland County History*, were established in 1729 by Thomas Sharp, Archdeacon of Northumberland, specifically to administer poor relief, taking advantage of the 1662 Poor Law Act which had designated ‘every Township or Village’ in northern England as the unit for poor-rate assessment and collection (Charlton 1987, 98-9; cf. Winchester 1987, 27). Each of these townships was henceforth responsible for the maintenance of its own poor and setting a separate poor rate. Prior to 1729, the Chapelry of Bellingham had been subdivided into four wards for more convenient collection of the poor rate, but these wards had not set a separate rate.
Some of these townships may have been based on earlier territorial units, but their names have a rather artificial character – West Tarset or Plashetts and Tynehead – indicative of institutions established by bureaucratic fiat.

6.9 Upper North Tynedale – 1700–2000

6.9.1 Background
During the latter part of the medieval period, the northernmost part of the North Tyne valley had experienced both a cessation in agricultural activity and a loss of population. As a result of the intermittent wars between the English and Scottish crowns and the dislocation of the civil population, no restoration of reasonable government and economic activity was possible until the Union of the Crowns in 1603. The policies of James I of England and VI of Scotland restored peace to the region and permitted some resettlement of population and reoccupation of some of the previously deserted farms. However, residual feuding between the leading families of the area, interruption in government during the Civil War and Jacobite agitation leading to open rebellion in 1715, militated against the development of a settled economic infrastructure. Reasonable prosperity and population growth did not return until the mid-eighteenth century with the development of better-organised agriculture in the North Tyne valley.

6.9.2 Recovery and resettlement
A survey was undertaken in 1604 of the areas which were described as the “debatable and border lands” on the English side of the former Anglo-Scottish frontier. The survey report showed that family groups held tenancies that usually consisted of groups of small farms in the lower part of the North Tyne valley, that is in the section of the valley between the modern villages of Falstone and Bellingham. They held these in return for military service and, on the death of the head of the family, the property was usually divided up among the heirs. King James and his ministers clearly felt that this was an antiquated system that was now unnecessary, as a result of there now being a single monarch over both kingdoms. There was also some evidence that the upper North Tyne valley was relatively overpopulated and that many of the inhabitants were driven to crime in order to have sufficient income to live. Thus changing the pattern of tenure and form of government in the Borders might not only restore peace and make the area more governable, but would also restore a degree of prosperity to the inhabitants.

A number of measures helped to sweep the old system away and to replace it with more clearly defined farms that were leased to individuals for a monetary rent rather than to groups of people in return for military service. At the same time, many of the manors in which these agricultural holdings were located passed from Crown ownership into the hands of major families living in the region such as the Percy Earls of Northumberland. Over the next two centuries, as described below, these families began to reorganise their new landholdings so that by the early nineteenth century the pattern of farming in the North Tyne valley north of Bellingham had changed completely.

Farming in the seventeenth century was based on a pattern of small farmsteads located close to the valley floor where there were fields of flat land on which hay and corn crops could be grown. In general, the livestock owned by the farmer was a mixture of cattle and small flocks of sheep in which the former were the most valuable. The livestock was wintered on the cultivatable land close to the farm, but in the spring the stock was taken out to pastures on the surrounding moorland. During the summer, the ground on which the stock had been overwintered was used to grow crops such as oats and hay. The animals returned to the farmstead in the late summer to graze on the aftermath of the harvest before spending the winter close to the farm once more. This transhumance type of farming was essentially an
extension of the subsistence agriculture that had formed the basis of life in the valley in the late middle ages.

During the latter part of the seventeenth and the early part of the eighteenth century, local landowners encouraged the development of farms that were leased out to rent-paying tenants. The tenants were principally livestock farmers who cultivated some corn, usually oats, and some potatoes. Their main source of income was from the cattle that they raised and then sold on either for breeding or for slaughter. On many of these farms, landlords added some enclosed hill pasture in order to create more viable holdings and to enable farmers to summer their stock on hill land closer to their homes. From the available evidence, it would seem likely that this type of farming was at its most extensive by the late eighteenth century, but then began to change.

The alterations usually took place at the instigation of landlords who wished to make their estates more efficient, profitable and socially useful. A growing population throughout Britain, but particularly in the urban areas, created an increased demand for woollen textiles and for sheep meat that persuaded landowners in the uplands to encourage their tenants to take up sheep farming. Thus, in the North Tyne valley, farms were amalgamated to create larger holdings, to which were attached substantial enclosed areas of hill land which provided the extensive grazing required by large flocks of sheep. At the same time, large farms were more easily controlled for the purposes of hunting and shooting by the landowners and their friends. These trends are demonstrated most clearly on the estate of the Duke of Northumberland. By the early nineteenth century, at over 40 000 acres in extent, it was the largest estate in the valley and was divided into ten large farms ranging in size from Gowanburn (1208 acres) to West Kielder (8005 acres). One of the farms, Cranecleugh, with over 6000 acres, was an amalgam of two farms, Cranecleugh and Bull Crag, while another, The Belling (over 4300 acres) was made up of at least four earlier, smaller farms. The change in the type of farming is shown that, by 1850, Cranecleugh was stocked with 2000 sheep and only 20 cattle, while The Belling had 1700 sheep and 33 cattle.

While this process of farm amalgamation was going on, sporting interests on the estate were not neglected. Kielder Castle was built in 1775 as a base from which members of the Percy family and their friends could hunt and fish on their North Tyne estate. Originally a small shooting box, the castle was extended in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to accommodate larger parties for longer periods in pursuit of the grouse, pheasant and salmon to be found on the estate.

6.9.3 Extending the economy

Agricultural change undoubtedly underpinned the development of the North Tyne valley during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The policies of amalgamation followed by the Dukes of Northumberland were adopted by other landowners, like the Allgoods, the Swinburnes and the Charltons. Through a mixture of alterations of leases, private agreement and enclosure acts they too encouraged the growth of large sheep farms on their estates. The reasons for this were that the new type of livestock farming represented the best agricultural use of the land and permitted the farmers to produce economically commodities for which there was a steady demand in the developing urban industrial areas of the country. In response to these changes, Bellingham, the oldest and largest village, began a period of sustained growth while other village settlements at Falstone, Greenhaugh, Stannersburn and Kielder developed to serve the farming families further north in the valley. Important institutions in communal life, churches and schools, began to be built in these villages. The Commissioners of the Greenwich Hospital estates built churches at Thorneyburn (1820) and Greystead (1818) and a rectory at Falstone, which was reconstructed by public subscription in 1824, while the Presbyterians re-built the Meeting House in Falstone in 1807. Schools were opened at Falstone in 1813 and Kielder in 1851.
The transformation of the agricultural community described above underpinned the changes that took place in the valley by the middle of the nineteenth century. However, this type of extensive livestock husbandry was one in which the returns to landowners were not great, and, because there was little possibility for diversification, and was at the mercy of any changes in market forces that depressed prices and the profitability of the farms. With these difficulties in mind, the landowning families began to consider other sources of income on their estates.

The North Tyne valley was rich in mineral resources such as coal, limestone and iron ore. In the past, little use had been made from these other than as sources for locally used fuel, building materials and, with changes in farming practice, an expansion in the use of lime. The growth of the woollen towns, like Hawick, over the Scottish border provided an opportunity for the exploitation of coal and the development of cross-border trade. Thus, in the 1820s, the Swinburne family encouraged coal mining on their Mounces estate and the opening up of a road along the valley of the Lewis Burn to transport coal to Scottish towns. By the 1840s, the mines were sending away between 3000 and 4000 tons of coal each year and other landlords, like the Duke and Sir Matthew White Ridley, were beginning to investigate the opportunities for commercial mining on their properties. Meanwhile, in the 1840s, an iron foundry had operated on the Duke’s property in Bellingham producing several thousand tons of pig iron before it failed. The failure arose from a combination of circumstances including depression in trade and the dislocation in the growth of the railway market surrounding the failure of Hudson’s railway schemes but, in particular, because there was no rail transport in the valley to take away substantial quantities of cast iron.

A rail link to Scotland through either the Rede or the North Tyne valley had been projected on several occasions in the first half of the nineteenth century, but little had transpired from these ventures. The efforts in the 1850s were another matter and resulted in the opening of the Border Counties line linking Hexham to Riccarton Junction, in Scotland, being fully operational by July 1863 (see Sewell 1991). Although the line was never the financial success that was so optimistically predicted in the 1850s, it became an important feature of valley life. It provided speedier links for travellers to the Scottish towns and to Tyneside than heretofore, but its most important impact was as a carrier of freight. Over 90% of the returns to the line in the 1870s and 1880s were from goods traffic, the bulk of which was coal. The railway opened new methods of marketing and sources of supply for the farmers, but the most important enterprise that was served by the railway was the Plashetts coalfield.

It had been known for some years that there were large reserves of coal in the valley, but without rail transport to the markets, it was impossible to exploit these resources. The opening of the Border Counties line meant that over 40 000 tons of coal a year was exported from Plashetts in the 1870s giving employment to a village of several hundred people. The new village also created an increase demand for goods and services that helped to promote and sustain growth in the other settlements in the valley.

6.9.4 Recession and retrenchment

The prosperity of the coal trade was of increasing importance in the last two decades of the nineteenth century and the first of the twentieth for the well being of the economy of the North Tyne valley. The arrival of wool and sheep meat from the Antipodes coincided with three years of wet springs and cold summers from 1879 to 1881. Sheep farmers in the North Tyne suffered a decline in prices that meant that they could no longer meet the cost of renting their farms at current prices. Their landlords, faced with the potential ruin of their tenants, helped out by reducing rents and encouraging the farmers to rear more cattle in an effort to stabilise the situation. Helpful though this was, it was only the onset of a rearmament policy by government in the face of threats of war that caused market conditions to improve. When war did break out in 1914, prices paid for meat and wool rose and the prosperity of farming was restored.
However, within a year or two of the cessation of hostilities, market conditions deteriorated once more, not only for agriculture, but also for other sectors of the economy. Landlords were now faced not only with lower rental returns, but also had to contend with higher taxation, especially death duties. The Dukes of Northumberland were particularly badly hit by these difficulties and were forced to relinquish much of their property in the North Tyne. Fortunately these changes coincided with initiatives by the government to encourage the growth of more timber in Britain in order to reduce the quantity of imports. Thus the Forestry Commission took over a number of former Percy farms and began to plant them with trees. Those who had formerly worked on the farms now became foresters or left the area to find work elsewhere.

At Plashetts, all was well until the miners joined coal industry strikes in 1921 and 1926. During the strikes, the collieries sustained much damage and customers began to seek other suppliers of coal, as deliveries from the mine became erratic. By 1928, the mine had closed, with the exception of some few men working to supply local customers. As in the case of the farm workers, some of the miners began to work in the forests, but others left the valley never to return.

Forestry undoubtedly provided a new source of employment for some people, but it could not prevent an exodus from the valley and a decline in population that had damaging effects on numbers using the railway and the tradesmen living in the villages. A certain amount of retrenchment was possible, but the general level of the national economy in the late 1920s and 1930s inhibited the development of new industries and discouraged many city dwellers from taking country holidays. Other estate owners began to follow the Dukes’ example and the area of forest continued to increase. Once again, some salvation arose out of war, but it did not halt the forces of change in North Tynedale.

### 6.9.5 The North Tyne after 1945

Farmers in the North Tyne valley had made every effort to support the war effort. The instructions of the War Agricultural Committee had been followed as far as possible and crops and livestock produced to help feed the nation. In the 1940s and 1950s the government aim of a cheap food supply for all meant that new subsidies and assistance became available to the hill farmer. In the area between Falstone and Bellingham, a number of farmers established dairy herds and began to send milk to Tyneside, at first by train and, later, by lorry. At the same time, the Forestry Commission built three “forest villages” in the area, one of which was at Kielder. It seemed that there were better times ahead.

However, one feature of life in the North Tyne was under threat. For some time the Border Counties line had been a loss maker. Damage by flood to the bridge near Hexham in 1948 had created some difficulties, while receipts had continued to fall, especially as the Forestry Commission used much road transport to take felled timber from the valley. The inevitable closure took place, first with the withdrawal of passenger services in 1956, and then the ending of freight trains on the line in 1958, which brought the final demise of Tarset station [63]along with the entire line above Bellingham and below Redesmouth (access to Bellingham was maintained via the Wansbeck line from Morpeth via Scotsgap, West Woodburn and Redesmouth Junction until 1963 when this link was cut back to West Woodburn). For many of the folk of the valley, this was the loss of an old friend. To others it was surprising as in 1956, the valley north of Bellingham was designated part of the new Northumberland National Park and there was surprise that an important link to the new Park was closed down.

The closure of the line spelled the rise of the motorcar as the most important form of transport in the valley. Although the railway was replaced by bus services, they have not been as popular as private transport. In addition, all freight was now brought in by lorry and the milk
tanker also began to move among the dairy farms. The use of motorised transport has increased throughout the remainder of the twentieth century and the 1960s and 1970s saw the beginning of a new phenomenon, daily commuters to Tyneside from the upper North Tyne valley.

Other changes followed quickly. Forestry became more mechanised and the number of direct employees of the Commission has steadily declined as their work has been taken over by private contractors. Timber is sent away on huge lorries, now for wood pulp and chipboard and not for pit props. The forestry villages have gained other dwellers than forestry families. In the face of reduced demand for liquid milk and, later, Britain’s membership of the European Community, farmers have had to adapt in a variety of ways to new government and market demands. The number of farms continues to decline and those who remain have to try to find other ways of working to supplement a reduced income.

A new force has also entered the valley in the shape of the massive Kielder reservoir. Faced by demands from Teesside for more water for industry, it was decided, in the face of significant local opposition, to create a new reservoir in the Kielder area. This was constructed between 1975 and 1981 and by spring 1982 became the largest man-made lake in Western Europe with a shoreline over 27 miles long. Farms were flooded, as were some former forestry areas, new houses were built and the lake has become the centre of a new tourist industry. The National Park employs rangers and tourist information officers in order to service this trade and efforts have and are being made to increase the number of visitors. All of which has ensured some prosperity in the valley and work for those who continue to live in the villages.

6.10 Tarset, Lanehead and Greenhaugh in the 19th and 20th centuries

Armstrong’s map of 1769 (fig. 28) provides a comprehensive view of the dispersed settlement pattern in Tarsetdale in the later 17th century, whilst Fryer supplies another snapshot 50 years later (fig. 30). Tarset Hall, ‘Heads’ or Loanhead’ and ‘Green heughs’/’Green Haugh’ are indistinguishable from any of the neighbouring settlements in the manner of their depiction on these two maps and there is nothing to suggest they were anything other than farmsteads at this date. The development of the three settlements principally concerned can be traced in detail only from the mid 19th century when accurate map evidence becomes available.

Thereafter their development can be traced in detail through estate plans (figs. 31, 35), tithe maps and awards (32-34, 36-39) and successive editions of the Ordnance Survey (figs. 41-49). The overall pattern, however, changed relatively little. The three settlements are significantly different in form. Greenheugh displays the form of a recognisably nucleated settlement – a small village or at any rate a hamlet – laid out on either side of a single street. By contrast, Tarset and Lanehead can be characterised as a cluster of dispersed settlements of somewhat greater density than the surrounding pattern of dispersed settlement. The cluster includes the farmstead, Tarset Hall, to the south west, the railway station to the south east, Lanehead to the northeast, centred around a crossroads where the roads from Bellingham, Falstone, Tarset and Greenhaugh all meet, and another farmstead cluster at Redmire to the west.

At Greenhaugh, the Holly Bush Inn already figures on the 1st edition Ordnance Survey (c. 1860; cf. figs. 41-42) and a smithy is also shown. The village also had a post office by the early 20th century (cf. Roberts & West 1998, 23). However, the construction of Greenheugh Hall [34] (fig. 72) on the south side of Lancy’s Cleugh, to the south of the village, between 1860 and 1897 (compare figs.41 and 44), probably had the major impact on the village economy with many of the settlement’s inhabitants finding employment there, and at a
similarly large residence at Sidwood (Roberts & West 1998, 23). Greenhaugh Hall was built by the Spencers who owned Spencer’s Iron Works on the River Tyne at Newburn.

The enclosure of the commons in much of upper North Tynedale at the beginning of the 19th century resulted in the creation of a number of more direct roads which improved communications in the district. Even more significant was the coming of the Border Counties Railway in the 1850s (fig. 40), which sliced off the south-west corner of the castle platform at Tarset [69], but also, rather more constructively, resulted in the opening of a station there [63], a short distance to the south east (figs. 58, 64, 69). The station is already evident on the 1st edition Ordnance Survey (fig. 43) This served as a railhead for the farmsteads of Tarsetdale for the next 100 years.

Other important facilities established during the 19th century include the parish church [18], dedicated to St Aidan (fig. 73). This was, built in 1818 by the Greenwich Hospital Commissioners at a cost of £4000, ostensibly to serve Thorneyburn, but actually located much closer to Greenhaugh, ‘in a sequestered nook’ at Drapercroft, on the west side of the Tarset Burn (NCH XV (1940), 269-70). The construction of the church followed the break up of the massive parish of Simonburn into seven separate parishes in 1811. However, as Archdeacon Singleton prophesied in 1832 (op. cit., 269), the division of this stretch of North Tynedale between Falstone and Bellingham into two parishes, Thorneyburn on the north bank and Greystead on the south, was never a success as there was insufficient income to support the rector and the parishes eventually combined in 1922 to form Thorneyburn with Greystead Parish. Thereafter the rector resided at Thorneyburn rectory [19] situated on the south side of the church, and like the latter, originally built in 1818.

A Methodist chapel (fig. 63) was opened on the south side of the crossroads at Lanehead in 1903 (cf. Charlton 1987, 128). However an earlier Methodist chapel is already shown on the 2nd edition Ordnance Survey (1897), located just to the south of Craghead School (cf. fig 44). The school itself, situated midway between Greenhaugh and Lanehead, figures on the 1st edition Ordnance Survey (fig. 41). The present school at the north end of Greenhaugh was built in the 20th century. A village hall [36] was built at Lanehead in the early 20th century with wooden plank walls on a brick base and a corrugated metal roof.

Despite the great changes of the 20th century, including the establishment of Kielder Forest, the same basic settlement distribution pattern continues today. This stretch of the North Tynedale between Falstone and Bellingham (but not including the latter) was incorporated in the Northumberland National Park in 1956 to include the corridor of the Pennine Way and link the landscape of Hadrian’s Wall to the south with that of the Cheviots to the north. This did not prevent the closure of services built up during the 19th century, a seemingly inevitable result of profound economic, social and demographic changes. Thus the railway station finally closed, along with most of the Border Counties line, in 1958 (the passenger service had ended two years earlier in 1956). St Aidan’s church no longer has its own rector and services are carried out by vicars from Bellingham and Falstone, whilst the Methodist chapel at Lanehead, like Thorneyburn rectory, is now a private dwelling. However, the school is still open at present and the Holly Bush remains a welcoming focal point for the community. The density of population in Tarsetdale and in the main valley between Bellingham and Falstone is greater than in many parts of Northumberland National Park and that has helped to the area to retain some services and a degree of ‘critical mass’. This should provide a base for a vibrant community which can continue to develop into the future.

20 The enclosure of Thorneyburn, Greystead and Stannersburn (alias Eals alias Stokoe Fell) Commons was authorised by Act of Parliament in 1804 and the award completed in 1816 (cf. NRO QRA 55/1-3). That for Tarretburn Common or Blackburn Common was authorised in 1809 and awarded in 1818 (NRO QRA 54).
**Later Mills**

(Information supplied by the North East Mills Group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Grid Reference</th>
<th>First recorded</th>
<th>Last recorded</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gatehouse Mill</td>
<td>NY787888</td>
<td>pre 1860</td>
<td></td>
<td>Little is known about this mill on the Tarset Burn. By the 1860s Ordnance Survey the mill is shown as in ruins, the 1890s edition still names the mill but in subsequent editions it had gone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnmouth Mill</td>
<td>NY794881</td>
<td>pre 1860</td>
<td></td>
<td>The 1860s Ordnance Survey shows this mill to be in ruins and later editions no longer mark the site. Some evidence remains on the ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boughthill Mill</td>
<td>NY793867</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Like Gatehouse and Burnmouth mills little is known about this site. The name is given on early Ordnance Survey maps and the location certainly allows for there having been a mill there. It is possible to see what might have been the mill race on the ground but there is little obvious evidence in the remaining buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dally Castle Mill</td>
<td>NY776845</td>
<td>C18th</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>It is thought that this mill is a ‘Napoleonic Mill’ constructed to help supply the nation with flour during the conflicts with France. In 1803 Michael Scott was the miller and also the leader of the Presbyterian Secessionists at Bellingham (Griffith 1974). The mill is shown on Fryer’s County map (fig. 30) of 1820 and millers are listed in 1827 (Parson &amp; White) &amp; 1855 directories. By the 1860s Ordnance Survey an ‘Old Mill race’ is shown. May be on the site of the mill of Chirden manor recorded in IPM for Robert Swinburne in 1326 (NCH XV (1940) 277; Cal IPM VI, no. 693) and in the Iter of Wark in 1279 (Hartshorne 1858, lxvi), since it lies beside the manorial centre (caput), Dally Castle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. SELECTED SOURCES AND SURVEYS

1. The Laing Charters/Deeds relating to the Liberty of Tynedale

Set out below is a deed relating to North Tynedale included amongst a large collection of deeds assembled by the Scottish scholar-antiquarian David Laing and bequeathed to the University of Edinburgh. The majority of the Northumberland deeds deal with lay estates in the Glendale area. The documents were edited and published in chronological sequence by Anderson (Calendar of the Laing Charters, Edinburgh, 1889). The 71 deeds relating to Northumberland up to 1500 were subsequently calendared again by Macdonald (Archaeologia Aeliana 4th ser., 28 (1950), 115-131), whose reading is followed here. References to both calendars are given. The document relates to one half or moiety, of the former Comyn manor of Tarset

Laing Charter no. 49; Macdonald 1950, no. 29

3 October 1360. Indentures (in Norman French) between Sir David de Strabolgy, Earl of Athol, on the one part, and William del Strothre, Mayor of Newcastle upon Tyne, on the other part, whereby the Earl assigns and establishes the said William as his steward to lease all the lands and holdings which he had or might have in the county of Northumberland and the franchise of Tyndale (danz le Comtee de Northumbr' et las fraunchise de Tyndale), to hold and use the said office according to the force and effect of an indenture between the parties (dated at Newcastle, 9 August, 32nd year of Edward III, 1359), by which the Earl wills and grants, for himself and his heirs, that all things contained in the said Indenture shall be held to the end of the term comprised in the same, without challenge by either party (sans chalenge ou debate de lune partie ou de lautre), and the Earl grants that the said William and his heirs shall have and hold to him, his heirs and assignees, from the feast of St. Michael last, to the feast of St. Martin next to come, and from the feast of St. Martin to the end of five years complete, the lands and holdings, pastures and fisheries (pescheries) 'en demeyn et en service', that is, in Tyndale, Kelderhayes, the 'motte' of Kelder, 'Bowes come les Belles', Waynehopside with the park of Waynehope, Poltirernet, and the 'motte' of Emelhope, to hold for five years, rendering each year a rose at the Nativity of St. John the Baptist (une rose a la Natiuite Seint Johan le Baptiste, 24 June), for all services, etc. And if the said lands, holdings, etc., or any part of them be destroyed by war with the Scots (soient destruits per une gere Descoce) during the said term of five years, the said William and his heirs and assignees shall hold them after the term aforesaid, until they levy the full value of the destruction and disturbance made (tanquils eient leuez au pleyne a la valiance de las destructione et destourbance faitz), according to what the lords (les seigneurs) may have from the common right, and by reason may do or ought to pay to their tenants in like case, having regard to the yearly extent, made between the Earl and the said William, amounting to £13 (tresze livres) a year. With clause of warrantice by the Earl.

Witnesses: John de Coupland, Henry del Strothre, then sheriff of Northumberland, Robert de Angretoun, William de Hepescotes, William de Presfen, Nicholas Bagot.

Dated at Newcastle upon Tyne, the Sunday next after the feast of St. Michael (3 October) 1360.
2. **Inquisition Post Mortem of Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland, 19th June, 4 Edward IV (1464)** (reproduced extensively in Hartshorne 1858, 260)

The Earl was killed fighting on the losing Lancastrian side at the battle of Towton, on Palm Sunday, 1461. As a result his lands were forfeited to the victorious Yorkist king, Edward IV. It was found that:

The Earl forfeited to the king, among other estates held in his demesne as of fee, on the day of his death, within the liberty of Tindale, where the king’s writ did not run, certain lands and tenements called Talbot’s lands, with the appurtenances, viz.

- **the manor of Walwykgrange**
- **the towns and lordships of Hawden, Charleton, Overthornburn and Netherthornburn (Thorneyburn),**
- **28 messuages, 1000 acres of land, 300 acres of meadow, 3000 acres of pasture, 200 acres of wood, 200 acres of turbary (peat diggings) and 2000 acres of moor in Walwykgrange, Hawden, Charleton, Overthornburn, Netherthornburn, the Syde, Grayside, Langhalgh, Close Hill, Bullishil, Newton, Sundaysight, Highmore. Emlopp, Smallhall, Stokhall (Stoke), Bromehouse, Carne, Hedestede, Dunsted, Yatehouse, Grenehalgh, Grenestede, Cariteth, Tresset (Tarset), Tresset Park (Tarset Park), Barnes, Yarowe and Sydewode with appurtenances.**

which said premises were held by the Earl of Northumberland of Henry Earl of Essex and Isabella his wife, as in the right of the said Isabella, as of their manor and lordship of the liberty of Tindale.

In 1472, these lands, along with the other honours, title and estates of the deceased 3rd Earl, were restored to the Percies, in the person of Henry, eldest son of the former Earl.

3. **Survey of Debateable and Border Land, taken A D 1604, ed. R.P. Sanderson (1604 Survey, 54)**

**Freeholders in Upper North Tynedale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Individual’s Details</th>
<th>Rent now paid</th>
<th>Rent due to have been paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E: of Northumb:</td>
<td>Henry, Earle of Northumberland, holdeth the Manor of Charlton w/ the members thereof, parte of Walwick grange and the Township of Hedon, and payeth rent for the same</td>
<td>Nill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S' Ant: Paumer.</td>
<td>Sir Anthony Paumer, knight, holdeth Tarset hall w/ the members belonging to thervnto; payeth rent</td>
<td>Nill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S' James Bellingham.</td>
<td>Sir James Bellingham, knight, holdeth certen land at ye Nooke, the Township of Bellingham, the Black lawe, the Clues w/ inter-common in Hareshawe, and payeth chief rent for the same</td>
<td>xx’s</td>
<td>xxiiijs viijd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Rydley.</td>
<td>William Ridley, of the Westwood, holdeth Reads wood, Hening rigge,</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ij’d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Minutes of the Court Baron for the Manor of Charlton Yate held on the 7th-10th October 1605 (Aln Cas C XII; reproduced in NCH XV (1940), 248-49)

Inquiry as to the heirs of customary tenants who have died
The jury finds that John Dodde is son and heir to George Dodde to a tenement called Bruntbank. Cuthbert Dodds called John’s Cuddye is dead who held a tenement in Grenhalgh. Margaret Dodde and Hannah Dodde are his father’s sisters.

Names of free tenants
Edward Charleton gentleman
The heirs of Thomas Kirshoppe of Newbrough
William Charleton

Admissions of tenants according to the custom

Gren Halgh: John Dodde, Hector Dodde, in right of his wife, Edwarde Dodde, George Dodde admitted at this court.

Bruntbank: John Dodde, James Dodde, Roland Dodde, John Dodde otherwise called Jennet’s son

Division of the open grazing lands among the families or graynes of the manor

- Sandie Mylburne of Yatehouse and a number of other Milburns for themselves and the rest of their Grayne took by grant of the Earl’s commissioners the waste land called Hemlepp Burne Graynes (Emblehope).
- Michael Hunter of Water Head and the rest of the Hunter grayne took the waste ground at Hawkuppested (? Hawkhopehead).
- Edward Charleton of Hesleyside for his house and the Charletons of Shitlington, Cuthbert Charleton of Bellingham and Gilbert Charleton of Boughthylly for them and their houses, Jasper Charleton of Hawcuppe for his house and the Charletons of Snabdauge, William Charleton of Charlton Yate for the Charletons of Caryteth and the Bower, have taken the waste grounds of Lystenstone hyll. The parting of the high lands among those that are of the name of Charleton in two halves by Matthew Charleton of Ellingham, Gilbert Charleton of Boughthylly, Christopher Charleton of...
Hetherington and John Charleton of the Bower by the consents of all the rest of the Charletons. (The bounds are set out in full).

**Presentment of the names of those who sold wood out of the manor**
- A presentment made by Gilbert Charleton of Bought Hill of theie names which carried or sold or gave any of the woods lying in the highland of Tyndale belonging to the Earl. (List of names).

**Presentment of the names of those who permitted persons not of the manor to graze sheep on their lands**
- Edward Charleton of Hesleyside hath brought in Margaret, countess of Bothwell, with a flock of sheep and a sort of neet with the consent of all the rest of the Charletons.
- John Charleton of Reedsmouth hath brought in one Archie Roger, Scotishman, without the consent of any with a flock of sheep and ‘one hundred nowte’.
- William Charleton of Bogleholl hath brought in one George Niyou of Callaly with a flock of sheep and one hundred nowte.

---------------

- The whole Quest sayeth that as concerning the cutting of wood which we have of my Lord before this present day for our rent paying, it has ever been at our own pleasure and from this day we ordain that no manner of person shall sell bark or cut any kind of wood to any sort or other or yet to themselves to cut but to their own use under the pain of 14s to the owner.

- Item we find that James Dodd, otherwise Pluck of Bruntbank, is cast in two bloods and a fray – cometh in the Lord’s will.

- John Dodd, otherwise Jaffrey’s Jake of Bruntbank, is cast for wrongous mowing 3s 4d.
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8. CONCLUSIONS AND POTENTIAL FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

8.1 Conclusions

1. Relatively little is known of earlier Prehistoric (Palaeolithic-Bronze Age) settlement in Tarsetdale and Tarretdale. The Beakers found in association with cist burials at Smalesmouth and The Sneep and the broadly contemporary flint dagger recovered near Highfield Hope demonstrates people were living in this area during the Late Neolithic/early Bronze Age, whilst the presence of substantial Neolithic and Bronze Age burial cairns further up North Tynedale implies these individuals belonged to larger social groupings (clans or tribes?). A settlement pattern of unenclosed settlements comprising round houses and irregular field systems is suspected by analogy with other parts of upland Northumberland, but has not so far been identified within or adjacent to the study area.

2. In contrast the settlement pattern in upper north Tynedale during the Iron Age and Romano-British period is very apparent in the surviving archaeological record. It was characterised by dispersed enclosed farmsteads, initially built of timber and later largely of stone, the remains of which survive in considerable numbers. The enclosures were predominantly rectilinear in plan and contained a number of round houses.

3. The distribution and form of early medieval settlement in upper North Tynedale is unclear. No historical or documentary sources explicitly refer to the valley before the 12th century and diagnostic settlement forms associated with this period have as yet proved archaeologically elusive. We are largely reliant on inferences drawn from placenames, church dedications and the distribution carved stonework, belonging to cross shafts and other (mainly ecclesiastical) monuments of the period, and other such scraps of evidence.

4. Tarset was the centre (caput) of a vast upland manor during high medieval period. The principal components of this manorial centre were the fortified manor house of Tarset Castle, a park, a fulling mill and perhaps an adjacent nucleated settlement. Only the castle is clearly evident on the ground today. The location of the park can be traced through placenames. It is possible that fieldwork undertaken in conjunction with further documentary analysis might lead to the identification of additional components.

5. The settlement at Tarset is more likely to been a hamlet rather than the kind of village so characteristic of lowland Northumberland, inhabited by a core population of unfree tenants (bondagers) cultivating a system of open ploughfields. The manor may have had such a village at or near Charlton, however.

6. Greenhaugh originated as a sheiling site. It is first mentioned as such in an Inquisition Post Mortem of 1326. It may well have become a permanent settlement by the later 15th century, when it is mentioned again, and conceivably as early as the late 14th century. It had certainly achieved that status by the 16th century, by which time it probably constituted a small hamlet.

7. In the later medieval period feudal overlordship in the valley weakened as the liberty of Tynedale passed through the hands of a rapid succession of lords and we see the
emergence of kinship-based social groups in the valley, the North Tynedale ‘surnames’. These provided some measure of self protection in the disordered conditions which followed the onset of prolonged conflict between England and Scotland. Documentary evidence shows the Dodds, later the predominant surname in Tarsetdale, were already established there by the end of the 14th century.

8. The townships documented in the Northumberland County History (e.g. Charlton West Quarter, Tarretburn and West Tarset) were relatively late creations, established in 1729 to improve the administration of poor relief. Medieval vills, or townships, covering this area, are documented, namely Tarset and Tarsethope. Their boundaries are unclear. Some may be coterminous with later township boundaries, but it is clear that the introduction of the poor law townships constituted a significant territorial reorganisation.

8.2 Potential for Future Research

1. The earlier prehistoric period in upper North Tynedale is poorly understood and requires further investigation to resolve questions regarding the overall pattern and development of settlement, for example.

2. In contrast, this stretch of upper North Tynedale contains a fairly dense surviving distribution of late Iron Age/Romano-British settlements, characterised by their rectilinear enclosed form. These have proved informative when previously investigated by George Jobey and would merit further investigation.

3. The early medieval period has also proved archaeologically elusive thus far and is a major gap in our knowledge of the valley’s history.

4. The medieval manor of Tarset encompassed a very extensive territory comprising virtually all the upper valley as far as the Scottish Border. Such vast manors are typical of upland Pennine areas, but much investigation is still required to understand how one these manors functioned and how the different site components were integrated. There are many promising sites in the wider valley, including a surviving deer park wall within Kielder Forest (Kennel Park perhaps originally part of the Wainhope manorial complex) and the earthworks of a possible medieval settlement at Gowanburn (also on the north shore of Kielder). Questions currently unresolved include the extent to which there was a nucleated settlement at Tarset, as opposed to a manorial complex, and the degree to which the dramatic increase in the number of sites known from documents during 13th century represents an expansion of settlement in response to improving climatic and economic conditions during that century or simply an expansion of documentary evidence shedding light on settlement patterns which were already present.

5. Tarsetdale contains one of the finest groupings of 16th-17th century bastle settlements in the county and represents a prime candidate for the investigation of so-called ‘reiver society’. In particular, relatively little is known regarding the origins of these dispersed settlements and the distinctive kinship-based society with which they are associated – the Tynedale ‘surnames’. There is fairly abundant documentation for the 16th-17th centuries and a reasonable settlement distribution can be reconstructed for that period. In contrast, there is much less available for the late medieval period (late 14th-15th centuries), but what there is suggests that many of these hamlets and farmsteads originated, or became permanently inhabited at that time (including Greenhaugh itself), making it a prime focus for investigation.
9. ARCHAEOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY ISSUES

The grades of sensitivity shown on the accompanying archaeological sensitivity maps (figs. 91 & 92) are based on the foregoing conclusions drawn from the available archaeological, documentary and cartographic evidence. The following principles have been adopted as the basis of classifying the sensitivity areas. Sites or areas where the survival archaeological remains can be demonstrated are accorded high sensitivity. Areas where the former existence of historic settlement is known or suspected, but the degree of survival of any associated archaeological deposits is uncertain, are accorded medium sensitivity.

1. The site of Tarset Castle represents an extant medieval monument and is accorded the highest sensitivity.

2. The immediate environs of the castle represent the most likely potential location of any settlement associated with the manorial centre and is therefore accorded medium sensitivity. It is suggested (though not certain) that any such settlement is likely to be limited to a hamlet or cluster of farmsteads.

3. The general area of the medieval park at Tarset can be identified through placename evidence, but its outline cannot be established with confidence. Significant alterations to any of the field boundaries in this area should be treated as sensitive.

4. The North East Mills Group refer to the possible remains of a dam on the Tarset Burn ‘not far upstream of its confluence with the North Tyne’ with a stone ford just below. This might represent the site of the water mill, but its precise location has not been pinpointed.

5. The current settlement of Greenhaugh represents the most likely site of the late 13th/early 14th century shieling complex documented in inquisitions post mortem of the period, and of the late medieval hamlet which apparently grew out of the earlier seasonal settlement. The built-up area of the village is accorded medium sensitivity.

6. The historic settlement pattern in Tarsetdale was probably always a predominantly dispersed one, not dissimilar to that of today. The various present-day farmstead sites where medieval and early-modern settlement is attested by documentary evidence or extant archaeological remains should be regarded as equivalent in significance to the more nucleated agglomerations of today, and should be accorded a high or medium sensitivity depending on the degree of demonstrable archaeological survival.
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10. GLOSSARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advowson</td>
<td>the legal right to appoint a priest to a parish church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agistment</td>
<td>the grazing of livestock on pasture belonging to someone else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienate</td>
<td>to grant land to someone else or to an institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assart</td>
<td>land cleared for cultivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assize</td>
<td>a legal procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barony</td>
<td>the estate of a major feudal lord, normally held of the Crown by military tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>a town characterised by the presence of burgage tenure and some trading privileges for certain tenants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovate</td>
<td>measure of arable land, normally equivalent to approx. 12-15 acres. This measurement especially popular in eastern and northern counties of England.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgage</td>
<td>A form of property within a borough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Messuage</td>
<td>A messuage containing a high status dwelling house, often the manor house itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartulary</td>
<td>a book containing copies of deeds, charters, and other legal records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carucate</td>
<td>a unit of taxation in northern and eastern counties of England, equivalent to eight bovates or one hide (120 acres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>a legal document recording the grant of land or privileges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattels</td>
<td>movable personal property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common land</td>
<td>land over which tenants and perhaps villagers possessed certain rights, for example to graze animals, collect fuel etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common law</td>
<td>a body of laws that overrode local custom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyhold</td>
<td>a tenure in which land was held by copy of an entry recording admittance made in the record of the manor court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotland</td>
<td>a smallholding held on customary tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottar</td>
<td>an unfree smallholder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croft</td>
<td>an enclosed plot of land, often adjacent to a dwelling house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>a framework of local practices, rules and/or expectations pertaining to various economic or social activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Customary tenure**  
an unfree tenure in which land was held “at the will of the lord, according to the custom of the manor”. In practice usually a copyhold of inheritance in Cumbria by the sixteenth century.

**Deanery**  
unit of ecclesiastical administration consisting of a group of parishes under the oversight of a rural dean.

**Demesne**  
land within a manor allocated to the lord for his own use.

**Domain**  
all the land pertaining to a manor.

**Dower**  
widow’s right to hold a proportion (normally one-third) of her deceased husband’s land for the rest of her life.

**Dowry**  
land or money handed over with the bride at marriage.

**Enfeoff**  
to grant land as a fief.

**Engross**  
to amalgamate holdings or farms.

**Farm**  
in medieval usage, a fixed sum paid for leasing land, a farmer therefore being the lessee.

**Fealty**  
an oath of fidelity sworn by a new tenant to the lord in recognition of his obligations.

**Fee/Fief**  
hereditary land held from a superior lord in return for homage and often, military service.

**Fine**  
money payment to the lord to obtain a specific concession.

**Forest**  
a Crown or Palatinate hunting preserve consisting of land subject to Forest Law, which aimed to preserve game.

**Free chase**  
a forest belonging to a private landholder.

**Freehold**  
a tenure by which property is held “for ever”, in that it is free to descend to the tenant’s heirs or assigns without being subject to the will of the lord or the customs of the manor.

**Free tenure**  
tenure or status that denoted greater freedom of time and action than, say, customary tenure or status, a freeman was entitled to use the royal courts, and the title to free tenure was defensible there.

**Free warren**  
a royal franchise granted to a manorial lord allowing the holder to hunt small game, especially rabbit, hare, pheasant and partridge, within a designated vill.

**Furlong**  
a subdivision of open arable fields.

**Glebe**  
the landed endowment of a parish church.

**Headland**  
a ridge of unploughed land at the head of arable strips in open fields providing access to each strip and a turning place for the plough.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heriot</td>
<td>a death duty, normally the best beast, levied by the manorial lord on the estate of the deceased tenant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hide, hideage</td>
<td>Angl-Saxon land measurement, notionally 120 acres, used for calculating liability for geld. See carucate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homage</td>
<td>act by which a vassal acknowledges a superior lord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight’s fee</td>
<td>land held from a superior lord for the service of a knight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour services</td>
<td>the duty to work for the lord, often on the demesne land, as part of the tenant’s rent package.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leet</td>
<td>the court of a vill whose view of frankpledge had been franchised to a local lord by the Crown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor</td>
<td>estate over which the owner (“lord”) had jurisdiction, exercised through a manor court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>sum of money equivalent to two-thirds of a pound, i.e., 13s. 4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchet</td>
<td>a fine paid by villein tenants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messuage</td>
<td>a plot of land containing a dwelling house and outbuildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moot</td>
<td>a meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multure</td>
<td>a fee for grinding corn, normally paid in kind: multure can also refer to the corn thus rendered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neif</td>
<td>a hereditary serf by blood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pannage</td>
<td>payment for the fattening of domestic pigs on acorns etc. in woodland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perch</td>
<td>a linear measure of 16½ feet and a square measure equivalent to one fortieth of a rood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quitclaim</td>
<td>a charter formally renouncing a claim to land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief</td>
<td>payment made by a free tenant on entering a holding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rood</td>
<td>measure of land equivalent to one quarter of an acre; and forty perches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serf</td>
<td>an unfree peasant characterised by onerous personal servility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severalty</td>
<td>land in separate ownership, that is not subject to common rights, divided into hedged etc., fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>official responsible for the administration of a county by the Crown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shieling</td>
<td>temporary hut on summer pasture at a distance from farmstead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socage</td>
<td>a form of tenure of peasant land, normally free.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stint</td>
<td>limited right, especially on pasture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subinfeudate</td>
<td>the grant of land by one lord to another to hold as a <strong>knight’s fee</strong> or <strong>fief</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subinfeudation</td>
<td>the process of granting land in a lordship to be held as <strong>fiefs</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suit of court</td>
<td>the right and obligation to attend a court; the individual so attending is a <strong>suitor</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant in chief</td>
<td>a tenant holding land directly from the king, normally termed a <strong>baron</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenement</td>
<td>a land holding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenementum</td>
<td>a land holding (Latin).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tithe</td>
<td>a tenth of all issue and profit, mainly grain, fruit, livestock and game, owed by parishioners to their church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toft</td>
<td>an enclosure for a homestead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfree tenure</td>
<td>see <strong>customary tenure</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccary</td>
<td>a dairy farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vassal</td>
<td>a tenant, often of lordly status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vill</td>
<td>the local unit of civil administration, also used to designate a territorial township community (prior to the 14th century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villein</td>
<td>peasant whose freedom of time and action is constrained by his lord; a villein was not able to use the royal courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villeinage</td>
<td>see <strong>customary tenure</strong> and <strong>unfree tenure</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgate</td>
<td>a quarter of a <strong>hide</strong>; a standardised <strong>villein</strong> holding of around 30 acres. Also known as a <strong>yardland</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>administrative division; the word implies a guarded or defended unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The term most commonly relates to large administrative subdivisions of the county (usually 5 or 6) from the 13th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equivalent to a Poor Law township in Redesdale from 1662 onwards and in upper North Tynedale (Bellingham Chapelry) between 1662-1729.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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