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It is fitting that in the 100th edition of \textit{The Nottinghamshire Historian} and in the year of the 100th anniversary of the Armistice which effectively ended ‘The War that Will End War’ we take some time to reflect not only on the conflict itself but also on the social, economic and cultural impact of the events of 1914-1918. At a national level some historians have marked the war as a fundamental change in British social, political and economic development. For others it was little more than one event in the long flow of development of British society. The war undoubtedly affected all aspects of British life but its effects were anything but uniform and at a local level the war may well be considered to have had a much more significant and personal impact. Many of our local history societies and heritage groups will be offering their own views through presentations and publications to commemorate and memorialise the losses suffered by their communities and our Day School in March will focus on the broader theme of \textit{The Legacy of 1918}.

In this edition we are pleased to offer Chris Weir’s article on Hyson Green and the Great War and Rosemary Collins’ article on Rockley Park Memorial at Radcliffe on Trent both of which are the results of community projects which deal, in different ways, with very personal and very local losses. Val Wood reminds us in \textit{From Suffrage to Citizenship} that World War I also had a social and political impact, particularly for the 8.5 million women who were enfranchised by The Representation of the People Act of 1918 alongside all men from 21 years of age.

However, this is not just a World War I edition, we have also taken the opportunity to review some of the other aspects of our local heritage. Jenni Dobson offers us a look at the application of the Poor Law at Tuxford and Sutton-on-Trent based on an examination of parish records; James Wright updates his publication of \textit{Castles of Nottinghamshire} taking account of recent academic fieldwork and research studies; and Stephen Wallwork speculates on medieval land use in Beeston based on calculations derived from early records.

Lynda Naylor has provided us with an article on Nottingham Local Studies Library and its development and activities since its foundation in 1868. Despite the uncertainties on the fate of the Angel Row Library building Local Studies staff continue to provide support for enquiries and research; visits from groups; and support for local projects like \textit{Present Location Uncertain} and the Bilborough St. Martins project \textit{Hidden Treasure}. The Local Studies Library also hosts regular talks and events including NLHA’s quarterly \textit{Angel Row History Forum} - information about Local Studies events can be found on the NLHA events page, the NLHA monthly newsletter, Nottingham City Council’s \textit{Stay Connected} newsletter and the free mobile app \textit{Discover Nottingham’s History}.

We actively invite proposals for possible articles for inclusion in The Nottinghamshire Historian, especially at the moment for aspects of World War I but also for the wider perspective on Nottinghamshire local history and community heritage projects. For more information please email editor@nlha.org.uk. There is also the opportunity for groups and individuals to present their work at our Day Schools in Spring and Autumn. Our monthly newsletter goes out by email to 600 subscribers and, in many instances, is reprinted and forwarded for further distribution through local history groups, it even gets as far as Canada and New Zealand. Events and news items for inclusion in the monthly newsletter should be sent to chairman@nlha.org.uk.

Please remember that NLHA can support the publication of research and community projects – we have recently put funding into Nottingham Women’s History Group’s publication \textit{No Surrender!: Women’s Suffrage in Nottinghamshire} and Norwell History Group’s \textit{Norwell & The Great War}. We have also made funds available to help with the purchase of village heritage signs at Farnsfield and display banners for Notts and Derbyshire Labour History Society - in 2017 we provided a total of £1250 in grants for both projects and publications. We also provide web-hosting facilities for member societies which currently include sites for FONA, Collingham, East Leake, Edwinstowe, Sutton, Thos. Forman, Newark, East Bridgford, Tollerton and Green Spaces as well as our own site at www.nlha.org.uk.

NLHA is committed to working towards promoting and supporting the study of local history in our area and we are constantly looking to work co-operatively with groups organisations and individuals. In many ways we are fortunate in Nottinghamshire in that we have both a strong network of local groups throughout the county as well as the proactive support of both the City Local Studies Library, the local libraries and Archive facilities of INSPIRE; the research strengths of The Thoroton Society and the focus of Nottingham Family History Society. If you have any issues, projects or enquiries or if you would like to become more actively involved please feel free to get in touch with me at chairman@nlha.org.uk or with any of the other local groups whose contact details you will find on the NLHA webpage.

Thank you for your support.

John Parker – Chairman

January 2018.
Poor Laws At Work.

Jenni Dobson

Nottinghamshire is home to the first parish union workhouse of the type conceived by the Rev. Becher and opened in the 1820s. Thanks to the National Trust, visitors can learn about the principles on which it operated, nearly 200 years ago. Thus our local historians are well placed to learn about the system of poor relief built upon Becher’s concept of much enlarged parish unions served by a single workhouse, which was implemented in England following the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act and eventually acquired such a bad reputation. But how were the poor provided for prior to that date?

In mediaeval times providing for the poor and infirm was considered a Christian duty with monasteries giving food to the poor who came to their gates and admitting the sick to their infirmaries. Following the suppression of these establishments after Henry VIII’s break with Rome, this aid lapsed, leading in 1536 to the first statute requiring parishes to provide for their poor.

Provision was managed through a parish council known as the vestry, composed of a number of ratepayers from the community. The vestry was authorised to raise funds for local needs including, besides meeting the needs of the poor, repairs to the church and maintaining the roads. Throughout the centuries which followed, successive laws defined various aspects of poor relief, attempting to ensure that any parish only had to provide for its legitimate residents. Rights of settlement in a specific parish became a significant and complex part of the poor relief system but will not be discussed in detail here.

It is through surviving vestry minutes or church accounts that we can see how poor relief was provided and how the money raised was spent. From 1572, this task fell to two vestry members chosen annually by their fellows to be overseers of the Poor. As most ratepayers were men, these were likely to have been male. However, at Laxton in 1820, Mrs Ann Swineburn, a widow, was one of the overseers of the Poor, and it was she who presented that year’s Accounts.

How individual communities managed their statutory responsibility towards the poor can be illustrated by sampling record books for two separate parishes, up to about 1834. Those of the modest market town of Tuxford and the village of Sutton-on-Trent, lying a few miles further south on the Great North Road, contain both legal and practical details of their day-to-day provision.

Parish vestries collected their funds for Poor Relief chiefly from a levy upon all rate-payers in the parish, based upon the value of the property they either occupied or owned, paupers themselves being exempt from this charge. Theoretically a general vestry consisted of all parish ratepayers but this was too cumbersome for most purposes. Many parishes adopted the practice of electing a select vestry of twelve or sixteen for regular business needs. Tuxford vestry book frequently records the signing of a levy by magistrates, showing that the amount requested must have been justified to this third party. An example from 1822 on 26 February requesting a levy signing, was followed by a record dated 28 February of it being ‘signed at the rate of 4d in the Pound this evening at 6 o’clock’.

Immediately below on 3 March, it was noted that a further three Levies had been signed by the Magistrates (illus. 145 T). Sutton-on-Trent, for example, records getting levies and warrants signed by Mr Fox at Newark, which may be John Fox, attorney, listed in a directory of 1811.

At Tuxford, below the record mentioned previously, is a notice, dated 24 March (1822), calling for a vestry meeting ‘for the purpose of chusing new Overseer Poor’ and the next entry dated 28 March recorded the new overseers as Mr William Daft and Mr Peter Moore. Other entries both here and at Sutton-on-Trent show that each year’s new overseers were sworn in by local magistrates.

When Messrs Daft and Moore presented their summarised accounts on 10 April 1823, the amount disbursed was £391 9 shillings and 2½d. The income received was £384 11s 6½d, which meant they were owed £6 17s 8d. At other times the income may have exceeded outgoings and it would have been returned to the Parish Chest. Sutton-on-Trent’s book shows that these year-end accounts were examined and approved by fellow vestry members before the departing overseers swore an oath as to their veracity before magistrates.

By 1826, a levy signed by the magistrates was at the rate of 1s 6d in the pound, but noted “at the reduced valuation”. Just as today, no one wishes to feel they’re expected to pay too much and this entry suggests that recently Tuxford had organised a revaluation of its properties. Entries at Sutton-on-Trent also suggest similar concerns as their accounts include expenses for attending appeals on property tax at Newark.

A separate source of income towards the cost of Poor Relief could come from the rent paid for a parcel of land owned by the poor of the parish. This might have been gifted to the parish by a local benefactor in his or her will. Tuxford vestry accounts for 1822 contain a detailed description of the terms upon which such ‘a Close let belonging to the poor lying near Scarthingmoor Bridge’ will be held by the incoming tenants George Clarke and William Shelton and witnessed by Wm Daft, Overseer (see Figure 1).

Occasionally, the parish poor might receive an extra gift. On 9 April 1826 notice was given that all the poor people whose names were on the dole list were desired to attend in the vestry on Thursday evening to receive a
villager may have housed an elderly person, like William Bryan paid £1 11s 6d for 18 weeks ‘lodging for the Old Pensioner’ on 17 April 1811 at Sutton.

The means for them to live in their own homes was seen as an appropriate meeting of need – much as we might feel the same way today. Or another legacy left to the poor of Tuxford by Mr Mellor, an unknown benefactor whose death or will remains untraced. The Dole list is likely to be all those who were deemed to be entitled regularly to relief by the parish and, as some readers will likely be old enough to remember, the term ‘on the dole’ survived well into the 20th century to describe persons in receipt of National Assistance. In the 1820s, they would have collected their weekly payment from the overseer. Sutton-on-Trent records also show similar ‘Weekly Collections’ of about 15s with additional weekly sums shown separately ‘for children’ – noted as ‘for illegitimate children’ by one overseer – at about £1 12s 3d.

By implication, the dole list of poor invited to attend the vestry were living in their own accommodation rather than in a workhouse. A brief section of more detailed accounts at Tuxford for 1736-37 includes ‘Repairing the Common Houses £1 5s 3d’, suggesting that the town may have had almshouses, where at least some of these folk may have lived. Evidence that Tuxford had a workhouse lies in a General Vestry entry for 6 March 1828 for a meeting to be held to discuss the selling of a piece of land the money from which, if the General Vestry approved the sale, would be used towards defraying the expenses of a new workhouse. Sutton-on-Trent accounts also show payments for rent to named individuals (whether the pauper or the owner of the property inhabited by the pauper isn’t superficially clear) along with payments of workhouse bills, some of which are identified as being for Bulwell.

So how did an overseer decide who went to the workhouse and who didn’t? The 1536 Act defined three categories of the able-bodied poor: those unwilling to work; those willing to work; children aged 5-15 who were to be apprenticed, and lastly the ‘Impotent Poor’, being too infirm or aged to work to support themselves. It seems likely that in both Tuxford and Sutton-on-Trent, but especially in the latter, the overseers would have known amongst their fellow parishioners those who fell into the last group. These were the people later defined by Rev. Becher as the ‘Deserving Poor’ in his workhouse system. Even at that date, providing
Funerals of these folk were also likely to be at the parish’s expense, such as that of Thomas Willson on 3 Aug 1811 ‘late of this parish’ costing £3 7s 8d – perhaps a liked and respected elderly inhabitant.

Persons falling into either of the first two groups were more likely to be sent to a workhouse, several hundred of which were built nationally following Knatchbull’s Act of 1723. This introduced the ‘workhouse test’, giving a pauper poor relief only by admission to a work house. Gilbert’s Act of 1782 authorised the combining of parishes into unions, though these were usually modest in the numbers combined. A list dated 1776-77 for Nottinghamshire records 21 workhouses, one of which was at East Retford. An additional Tuxford book holds a contract, dated 1767, between East Retford, Blyth and Tuxford to hire a property to serve as a union workhouse, the costs of establishing it to be shared equally, then each parish to be responsible for charges in proportion to the number of paupers from them. There are two workhouses shown for ‘Sutton’, one ‘nr Newark’ the other ‘nr Retford’. The latter may be at Sutton cum Lound but whether the other could be Sutton-on-Trent depends on whether you think it is closer to Newark than Sutton-in-Ashfield! At this period, a parish such as Sutton may have rented an existed building as a workhouse, run by a contractor paid to feed and house the local poor at a fixed rate. He may have provided them with work, such as spinning flax at a fixed rate. He may have provided inducement for the man to agree. In this case, he was Richard Adcock.

No mention is made of a workhouse at Sutton in the trade directory closest to the period studied and as noted, payments to Bulwell overseers imply there are inmates at their workhouse with settlement at Sutton for which the village is paying. However, Sutton appears to have almshouses. On 13 April 1812, 10s 6d was paid for ‘work done on the Poorhouses’.

This brings us to the poor children of the parish, aged 5-15, who were to be apprenticed. Gilbert’s Act of 1781-82 revised the age at which a child could be forcibly separated from its parent to 7 years. So we may reasonably assume that Widow Jubb’s two children which Tuxford proposed to put out apprenticed in 1825 were at least 7 years old. A vestry meeting was called to discuss this on 12 Jun and on 16 Jun the decision was that the boys be put out apprentices. Sadly, no record was made of where or to what trade. The principle was a sound one, giving children a means of supporting themselves as adults and it relieved the parish of the cost of raising the child, for just a single payment to the master when the bond was drawn up. The master then became responsible for feeding, clothing and training the child, usually for a period of 7 years. In practice, it was a system easily open to abuse, as featured by Charles Dickens in ‘Oliver Twist’ where the beadle sets out to sell Oliver.

In the apparent absence of a workhouse, Sutton-on-Trent appears to be paying members of the community to care for its poor children. Whether this is seen as suitable employment for women paupers, as a means for them to ‘earn’ their own support, or whether they are villagers willing to house the children is not clear. Besides the weekly amounts referred to earlier, there are separate payments such as 28 February ‘Mrs Fotherby 3 Weeks for Wheats Children 3s’; 2 May ‘Mrs Fotherby for children 2s’, both 1813. The Wheat family appear regularly and presumably include growing children as there are intermittent payments for clothing and shoes for specific members of the family, e.g. a shirt for Ben Wheat 3s 8d; two shirts for Francis Wheat 1s 6d; a frock for Ann Wheat & making 3s 10d; paid to Jos Hooton for Benj Wheats shoes 8s 4d, between 1810-12. The fact that the Wheat family are recorded by name separately from the weekly payments for illegitimate children may suggest they’ve fallen to the care of the parish for a different reason.

Children might become a charge on the parish in a number of ways which were not recorded in the accounts. For example, if the father died but was known to have had settlement in the parish, then his children also had settlement there & needed to be supported, whether there was a widowed mother or not. The invention of steam-powered threshing machines which spread during the labour shortage of the Napoleonic Wars had added to the dangers of agricultural work, but before that a man might be killed or permanently crippled falling from a stack or be injured by being gored or kicked by a bull or horse and temporarily unable to work.

A national rise in illegitimacy by the mid-18th century also added to the numbers of infants to be supported. Women who gave birth to a bastard which was chargeable to a parish were to be sent to the local House of Correction. Records show there was such a house at Burgage Green, Southwell, so when Sutton records expenses of 8s ‘to Southwell with Mary Barlow & Ann Godson’ on 29 May 1813, it may have been to escort these women there. Sutton shows payments such as that on 26 May 1813 to Mary Selby for attending Mary Reed in labour and the new mother received payments during her ‘lying in’ period following the birth, normal at this time. Mary Selby may have been the village midwife by tradition. Parishes increased their efforts to identify fathers, either to extract payment for the child’s keep or even, to bribe the man to marry the pregnant woman – supposing he was free to do so.

There may be evidence for an example of this in the Sutton-on-Trent records. In 1813 on 20 February, 5s expenses were recorded for ‘attending the Swearing of Elizabeth Holmes at Newark’, which may have been her swearing to the identity of her baby’s father before a magistrate. The next day showed payment to Thos Smith for a marriage licence for Elizabeth Holmes costing £3 7s 6d (018 ST), which marriage was performed the same day at Sutton. A licence was an expensive item beyond the reach of the average person. Though paying for it shows the determination of the parish to secure a father for the infant, this may also look like an inducement for the man to agree. In this case, he was Richard Adcock. G.W. Tinley, a former overseer, was paid £2 4s on 5 February ‘on Acc’ Rich Adcock’, perhaps for locating him, then the overseer spent 3s for a warrant to ‘take him’, before he was examined at Southwell at a cost of 4s. John Leverton of Sutton, a witness at the marriage along with G. W. Tinley, was paid 12s for ‘attending Richard Adcock three days, and a further 8s for expenses to Southwell were also expended – which suggests that the vestry was keen that Richard
should not have chance to slip away! On 1 March Elizabeth Adcock received 2s relief then on 6 March expenses of 8s were recorded for a visit to Southwell to obtain a warrant for the removal of Elizabeth Adcock. She next appears on 17 March, with expenses of 8s for ‘going to Southwell with Eliz Adcock’, then the same day ‘2 warrants for ditto’ costing 6s. A further 2s 6d was paid as expenses for Elizabeth, two days going to Southwell, followed by ‘Removing the Same to South Leverton’ at 10s. That might be thought to be the end of this episode but on 27 March Jno Talbot was paid £1 15s 6d ‘for R Adcock’ then on 14 April appears ‘1 Quarter for Richard Adcocks child 19s 6d’. Sutton-on-Trent spent a total of £11 15s on this particular case, presumably considering it was cheaper to pay this now than pay out for seven years for mother and child.

Though medical care was nothing like today’s, Sutton-on-Trent’s accounts show that on 25 Jan 1812 a doctor’s bill for £7 3s 6d was paid in respect of Josh Wheat and Rd Hunstone. As neither man appears in their accounts later up to April 1812, we may infer that both patients may have died. An unexpectedly early instance of public health awareness appears at Tuxford on 9 Nov 1831. Following the cleansing of the drains etc.’ (See Figure 2). Whilst this is for the wellbeing of the entire community, it shows some understanding that keeping the poor from infections benefits everyone.

Stories like that of Elizabeth Adcock above also show that each time payment was made anywhere out of Sutton or Tuxford, whether to obtain a removal warrant, pay a workhouse bill, swear in new overseers or get accounts or a levy signed, there was a fee for the person taking it. Also the minute detailing of records at Sutton-on-Trent reminds us that at this date, it was the recipient who paid for a letter, not the sender. In the accounting year 1812-13 this parish disbursed £348 18s 11¾d, of which at least £10 14s 3d was in expenses.

We might wonder if covering these overheads, besides fees of professionals such as magistrates, was the wisest use of community money. Certainly one of the chief motivators for government to pass legislation to create parish unions to provide for the poor was that Southwell workhouse proved that it could reduce the costs of that provision. With hindsight, it also extended the de-personalisation of provision, consequent upon the smaller unions following Knatchbull’s Act. Whether Tuxford ever got as far as building their new workhouse, discussed in 1828, after 1834 the town became part of the E. Retford Union. On 19 Jun 1836, the vestry called for candidates to present their names for consideration for the office of guardian, to represent Tuxford on the governing body of the union workhouse (see Figure 3). The final scene in the story of the old system can be seen in the printed form, dated 15 February 1838, calling all ratepayers eligible to vote, to a meeting at the vestry on Thursday 22 February to consent to the guardians of the poor of the said union selling the Tuxford workhouse, the proceeds of which for the permanent advantage of the said parish.

The Poor Law dating from 1536 had lasted 300 years. Its evolution had produced documents like the Tuxford vestry book, which reveals the day-to-day administration of it, and Sutton-on-Trent church accounts, which in their careful and often repetitive detail suggest the personal commitment of the parish officers to their poorer neighbours and to the letter of the laws that determined their conduct. Both sets are name-rich over decades and allow us to come as close as we can to the communities which they inhabited.

Main sources:
Peter Higginbotham’s excellent site: www.workhouses.org.uk
Nottinghamshire Archives: PR 1922 Tuxford vestry Book; PR 8454 Tuxford contract with E. Retford; PR 7268 Sutton-on-Trent Church accounts.
Nottingham Heritage Gateway website: www.nottsheritagegateway.org.uk
Images courtesy of Inspire Nottinghamshire Archives (Reference PR1922)
Nottingham Local Studies Library.

Lynda Naylor, Local Studies Development Officer

Nottingham Local Studies Library has a long history dating back to the opening of the first free public library in Nottingham in 1868 on Thurland Street when a donation of about 100 local history books from a previous sheriff – Mr M I Preston - was received. So started the local history collection which would become the Local Studies library and which would grow to include books about significant local people – including writers like Lord Byron, D H Lawrence and Alan Silitoe – an important Robin Hood collection, and information about the places, buildings and industries of Nottingham and the wider county, as well as sporting teams and heroes, and local entertainments like Goose Fair.

What began as a collection of books soon expanded into collecting other printed material, so that our collections now include books, pamphlets, newspapers, maps, sales catalogues, oral histories, playbills, posters and broadsides –examples of some of these can be seen in the accompanying images. We also hold a significant photograph and image collection which was started in 1918 when an appeal was sent out to the Nottingham public for photographs of the local area. The response was excellent and many valuable photographs were presented, and so began the collection which now contains tens of thousands of images of local people, places and events some of which can be seen online at Picture the Past. Happy 100th birthday to the photographic collection!

By the 1930s the Local Studies collection was so large it needed its own classification system and this was designed in-house and implemented by 1932. This classification scheme, which we still use, is loosely based on Dewey (the scheme used in the rest of the library service for non-fiction books) and it is flexible enough to separate a history book about a Nottingham street from a book about a school on the same street, as well enabling us to find the correct edition of a book about Robin Hood within the hundreds of books and pamphlets (and the rest . . .) that we hold about our world famous legend.

Originally the Archives department and Local Studies were housed together at South Sherwood Street, the home of Nottingham Central Library from 1881, but as a Central Library move to Angel Row began to loom the Local Studies Library and Archives parted ways, with the Archives joining the County Records office on High Pavement in 1975 and Local Studies remaining with the Central Library. The move to Angel Row took place in 1977, with Local Studies initially allocated to floor 3, then floor 4 and in 2010 to its current home on floor 1.

So what do Local Studies collections contain? Essentially we collect published information about Nottingham and Nottinghamshire, both current and historical. The building which we currently inhabit is late Victorian (with later additions) but our collections contain items which are older than that, including Acts of Parliament relating to Nottingham from the reign of Henry VIII, pamphlets published during the English Civil War (in which Nottinghamshire would play a significant part), local religious dissent illustrated in sermons and pamphlets, and industrial change in Nottingham shown through maps and newspapers. And we continue to add to the collections, for if not, who will remember what Carrington Street looked like when the bus station was in place or what Nottingham Station looked like before its makeover?

Visitors to Local Studies will see that alongside the books which you would expect in a library, we have a mixture of old and new technology which enable our users to access all the different kinds of material we hold, from paper to microfilm to digital. At the centre of the floor – in some ways the heart of the service – is the card index affectionately known as the Doubleday Index. It was instigated by William Elliott Doubleday, a Nottingham man who started his librarian career in Nottingham Central Library in 1882, and who was incredibly interested in the history of Nottingham. In 1949 Nottingham City Council reached an agreement with Doubleday that his collection of manuscripts, books, pamphlets, maps, engravings, prints and scrapbooks along with his index cards (which by now amounted to around 300,000) would be purchased for £212.10s and that they would become the property of the City Council upon his death. Doubleday was still adding to the index up to his death in
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September 1959, aged 94. The index is arranged alphabetically and reveals information about people, places and subjects related to Nottinghamshire, and crucially they guide you in to our collections. So if you’re looking for why Hyson Green is so called, or is it Ison Green, or when Goose Fair moved to the Forest, or what did Skin- ner and Rook of Long Row sell, this is where to begin your search.

Our staff can help with enquiries if you come in person, as well as show you how to use the machines and find information you’re looking for. We also provide a research service for anyone who is unable to visit the library – details of this can be found on our webpage: www.nottingham- city.gov.uk/libraries/local-studies-and-family-history/. During this year we have helped over 2500 people find information and research their field of interest either in person or remotely via phone, email or letter, and we can confidently say that our service reaches a world wide audience.

We welcome visits from groups – from schools and colleges, U3A groups and visits from local societies. We also work with local projects by supporting their research and adding the publications they produce to the collections. This year we have supported ‘Present Location Uncertain’, a project based around the 1st World War letters of local man Harold Priestley, as well the ‘Hidden Treasures’ project based at Bilborough St Martin’s. We are currently working with the Theatre Royal on their heritage project led by David Longford, and ‘The Colour of Love - A celebration of mixed race relationships in Nottinghamshire 1940’s - 1970’s’, a project led by Coleen Francis.

We host regular talks and events linked to local and family history, including the quarterly Angel Row Forum meetings, and family history drop-in sessions which are on the first Wednesday of each month. For more on these events sign up to Nottingham City Council’s ‘Stay Connected’ newsletter or check the noticeboards in the library.

Finally, for anyone who would like to find out more about our collections or if you have an enquiry, please contact us on: 0115 915 2873 or email: local_studies.library@nottinghamcity.gov.uk and we’ll do our best to help you. You can also find out more about us on our app ‘Discover Nottingham’s History’ which is free to download on your mobile device.
Speculative Calculations Concerning Early Land Use in Beeston.

Stephen C. Wallwork

The earliest surviving records for most communities are those concerned with taxation by government and tithes for the church. The Domesday Book, compiled in 1086, gave William the Conqueror an account of what could be taxed in England. The accounts of Lenton Priory in 1297 recorded tithes received from Beeston as one of the villages where the priory had acquired jurisdiction of the church and its dues. Yet frequently land areas are quoted indirectly, often referred to as ‘land for x ploughs’ or simply by giving the number of ploughs. In the Lenton tithe and crop yield lists, some areas are quoted but not for Beeston. Can use of such records be made, therefore, to speculate usefully on this local topography, enabling us to estimate the areas devoted to arable crops and to meadow in medieval times? The process has been tested for Beeston by comparing the resulting areas with probable areas before enclosure of the open fields, which took place mainly around 1612 and 1809, derived from the map of the 1809 enclosure.

In Beeston’s Domesday entry the only area quoted specifically is a meadow of 24 acres. Arthur Cossons pointed out many years ago, that this must have been only a small proportion of the total meadow area if it was remotely similar to the approximately 200 acres at the time the 1809 enclosure, so it probably represented only the amount of taxable meadow. Other areas in the Domesday Book for this part of the country are often quoted in carucates and these, like acres, were not of a standard size. A carucate represented the amount of land that could be ploughed by a team of eight oxen in a year. It was therefore a smaller area where the soil was more difficult to work but it is generally taken to correspond to 100 to 120 acres and more often the higher figure. However, it is generally acknowledged that areas quoted in carucates, or as ‘land for x ploughs’, or simply as a number of ploughs, were not a measure of actual areas but of their taxable value. Even so, estimates of areas may be obtained by multiplying the number of ploughs recorded in the village by the 100 or 120 acres that each of these ploughs could cultivate in a year.

Applying this method to Beeston’s Domesday entry, land for four ploughs is first mentioned but this probably represents only the taxable area which is included within the full list which follows. There are listed ‘2 ploughs’ for William Peverel (lord of the manor, on his demesne or own farm) and ‘9 ploughs’ for 17 villagers and 1 freeman (or socman), who may...
have had connections with the earlier Danish occupation of this area. Multiplying the range of area cultivated per plough (100 to 120 acres) by the number of ploughs suggests that William Peverel had some 200-240 acres, and the 17 villagers together with the socman may have cultivated about 900-1080 acres (averaging 50 to 60 acres each, in strips of about a quarter acre in the common fields). This would give a total arable area of 1100 to 1320 acres. This may be compared with the 1612 arable acreages derived from the 1809 enclosure map of 970 acres in the three open fields, or 1120 acres if the Hassocks area is included, a promontory projecting into Lenton parish (which may have been meadow, pasture, or arable land, or either at different times). However, this agreement only holds if the Domesday area represents the total arable area (as does the calculation based on the 1809 map) rather than only the area under cultivation in any one year, to which would need to be added the considerable area lying fallow.

Margaret Cooper suggests that the socman held land on the western edge of Beeston, land that was perhaps unallocated at the time of the Danish invasions. Later it may have formed the portion of Beeston that came under the jurisdiction of Wymondley Abbey since it was an area already distinct from the main settlement. That portion may have been sold as a unit at the dissolution of the monasteries.

More detail about early land use can be derived from the Lenton Priory accounts for 1297, transcribed by F B Stitt and published in the Thoroton Society Record Series, volume 19, in 1959. These show the yields of different types of grain, both in the Lenton demesne (the priory's own farms) and as received as tithes from the churches under its jurisdiction, particularly those at Lenton and Beeston and from Nottingham St. Mary. The amounts of grain are quoted in quarters (a quarter was eight bushels or 64 gallons, though sometimes 72 gallons). The lack of standardization of measures of capacity is further shown by the quarters of oats being quoted in the accounts by 'the lesser measure' and converted by Stitt to correspond to the 'greater measure' quantities by halving the figures. This put them on the same basis as the other grain quantities.

For the demesne crops, the total amount harvested is quoted and also the area that had been seeded to produce that amount. This is useful because it allows calculation of yields per acre and, if similar yields per acre are assumed for Beeston’s crops, the area devoted to each crop can be estimated. Thus, the total tithe levied (in quarters) divided by yield in quarters per acre equals estimated area in acres that produced this amount of product. The results of all these calculations are shown for Lenton and Beeston in Table 1. No figures are available in the 1297 accounts for Beeston’s tithes of wheat or peas. However, for our present purpose approximate areas will suffice. Wheat would be needed as well as rye for making bread and, indeed, two of the arable areas in Beeston’s Nether Field before its early enclosure were called Wheatlands and Ryelands. (The latter name is still used for the area near the River Trent.) As a rough approximation, the area devoted to wheat has been assumed to be the same as that for oats, since there is a rough equivalence in Lenton demesne (80 acres for wheat and 76 acres for oats). No estimate has been made for tithe of peas, acknowledging that this will result in the total estimated area under cultivation being an underestimate.

The tithe was nominally a tenth of the total harvest, so the 75 acres estimated as the area required to grow Beeston’s tithe produce should perhaps be multiplied by ten to suggest 750 acres required to grow the total harvest of these crops. However, if a three-field system of crop rotation was the norm at Beeston, then these seedings to produce the tithe would

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>location</th>
<th>Lenton demesne</th>
<th>Lenton demesne</th>
<th>Lenton demesne</th>
<th>Lenton tithes</th>
<th>Lenton tithes</th>
<th>Beeston tithes</th>
<th>Beeston tithes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>crop</td>
<td>harvest (qrs.)</td>
<td>seeded (ac.)</td>
<td>yield (qrs. per ac.)</td>
<td>tithe (qrs.)</td>
<td>est. area (ac.)</td>
<td>tithe (qrs.)</td>
<td>est. area (ac.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wheat</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19 assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rye</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barley</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peas</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oats</td>
<td>95,75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>653.75</td>
<td>451.5</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Speculative calculation of tithed arable areas from grain crop yields. (qrs=quarters, ac=acres, est=estimated) Source: F B Stitt, Thoroton Record Series XIX (1959)
happen on two-thirds of Beeston’s total arable area in any one year – the remaining third being left fallow. That would imply a total arable area of $750 \times \frac{3}{2} = 1125$ acres. This compares well with the 970 to 1120 arable acres derived above from measurements made for 1612 on the 1809 enclosure map and with the 1100 - 1320 arable acres calculated from the Domesday Book.

A different type of calculation can be used to estimate the area of meadow in Beeston in 1297. The tithe of hay seems to have been paid in cash and amounted to two shillings from Horsedoles, 24 shillings and five pence from unspecified meadow in Beeston and two shillings from Heynings. The name may be derived from Old Norse as well as from Middle English and means enclosure, possibly meadow. Horsedoles may be the 24 acre meadow noted in the Domesday book and, if so, the tithe corresponds to a penny per acre. The unspecified meadow tithed at 24s.5d would therefore have area

293 acres (24\times12+5=293 pence tithe) at the same rate of tithe. The area corresponding to the 2s. paid for Heynings would be another 24 acres. If these were three separate assessments the total meadow area would be 24+293+24 = 341 acres. This is in reasonable agreement with the pre-1612 areas that could have been meadow, totalling about 380 acres. This assumes that 24 acres of the Heynings area and the whole of the Hassocks promontory were meadows at that time.

In conclusion, the Lenton Priory accounts show that Beeston grew at least rye, barley and oats in 1297, with the emphasis on rye which would be used for making bread. This is reflected, as mentioned above, in the fact that we still have a whole district of Beeston near the River Trent called Rylands. The portion of these crops reserved for tithe was stored, prior to being carted to Lenton, in a barn or grange in Beeston which was being repaired or rebuilt in 1297. Using the yields (quarters harvested per acre sown) calculated for crops grown on the Lenton Priory demesne as applying approximately also to Beeston, the areas devoted to each crop have been estimated and their totals are roughly similar to the total arable areas estimated from the 1086 Domesday Book and for pre-1612 enclosure, as estimated from the 1809 enclosure award. The accounts can also be interpreted to show that Beeston at that time had about 340 acres of meadow. The hay from this, together with the oats, would be used to feed perhaps about 340 animals. Arthur Cossons records that, of 27 Beeston wills dated between 1556 and 1616, 16 contain references to cattle, 5 to sheep and 6 to both.

It is a pleasure to thank Mrs Wendy Bowen for assistance with translating the Lenton Priory tithe accounts, Mrs Beryl-Anne Cobbing for transcribing the Deposition by Commission concerning the enclosure of the Nether Field and Mr Steve Vose for his work on the 1809 enclosure award.
Hyson Green & the Great War - Two Community Projects.

Christopher Weir

Three years ago I wandered into The Vine Community Centre on Bobbers Mill Road in Hyson Green, Nottingham. I was planning an urban walk through Hyson Green and Old Basford that I was leading at a later date. I was looking for a place to start the walk, out of the rain if needed. The Vine Centre, built in 1994, is attached to St Stephen’s Church. Cheryl Hemmings, the Vine manager, showed me round and we got talking about communities and heritage. That’s how it started.

I discovered that St Stephen’s Church was consecrated in 1898. The architect was William Douglas Caroe and his Arts & Crafts style is very much evident in the appearance of the building. What struck me above all as I looked around were the echoes of World War 1. A Roll of Honour sat, encased in glass and a thick wooden frame, on the wall. The Roll records more than 400 names, some with their regiments. It had begun with the names in typescript but later they were handwritten. You can feel the struggle of the community to keep up with the loss of their men on the battlefields of the Western Front. The organ case ment also lists men who had fallen in battle and a Book of Remembrance sits in front of the casement. A Great War memorial from St Paul’s Church (the church is now defunct) was fixed to one of the church interior walls after the two churches amalgamated in 1984.

At first glance it was clear that the Roll of Honour needed conservation work. However, because of the surface glass and thick frame, it was difficult to assess its condition. Other issues that immediately arose were the transcription of information and the possibility of copying the Roll itself.

Bit by bit a community project began to take shape. The Roll would be central to the project but what about other aims and possibilities? In particular could we engage young people and the community with what was happening? At an early stage we took our ideas to the Heritage Lottery Fund and their support and encouragement led to the creation of ‘Hyson Green & The Great War’. At this stage work began on an application to HLF through its WW1 funding stream. It would be managed and run as a partnership. Regular curriculum sessions are held at The Vine by IntoUniversity for young people from the area and they immediately entered into partnership with The Vine, St Stephens and myself acting as Heritage Consultant. Another element of the project was the involvement of Home Education families who were keen to be involved in researching and developing learning skills through the project. As soon as possible an application was submitted to the Heritage Lottery Fund and after it was approved arrangements were made for an official project launch in September 2015 with the Sheriff of Nottingham, Councillor Mohammed Saghir. Other official representatives were invited, along with partners and members of the community. Work then began. An application was made for a Faculty to remove the Roll from the Church wall for conservation, an initial condition survey on the Roll was undertaken, the names on the Roll were transcribed, research began and a trip to Crich Memorial for IntoUniversity students and community volunteers was planned. IntoUniversity decided to use this opportunity to explore what the Crich Memorial represents and what its meaning was in the past and to today’s generation. They decided to do this through artwork that they began in Crich and finished at the Study Room at Cromford Mill. Towards the end of the project a coach trip for IntoUniversity students and Home Education families visited the Imperial War Museum. The WW1 galleries are extensive and provided a historical context for the work on the Roll of Honour.

Individuals could approach the research in their own ways. Over time information was gathered on names on the Roll. Archibald Boaden lived at 56 Bateman Street in Hyson Green and his name appears in the St Stephen’s baptism parish register at Nottinghamshire Archives. On the 10 March 1915 the baptism of Archibald’s son, also named Archibald, is recorded in the register. This also records that Archibald senior, a (lace) threader, had been ‘Killed in the War’ on the 21st February. He was buried at Armen tieres Cemetery. Two Home Education students, Ruby Dunn and Iona Mcmillan, worked together to research two brothers listed on the Roll, William and Frank Newton, who had lived on Fisher Street. William joined the navy. He served on HMS Aboukir but was killed on the 22 September 1914 when it was sunk by a German torpedo. His brother Frank enlisted in the Army and fought in Gallipoli. Frank survived and after the war emigrated to Australia.

As the project progressed some descendants of men appearing on the Roll of Honour and in the Book of Remembrance came forward. A visitor to the church, David Priestley, came
forward with information about his grandfather, Harold Aaron Priestley, whose name appears in the Book of Remembrance and on the organ case- ment. Harold and his wife Eva had a one time lived in Mapperley but their house was bombed by a zeppelin. First they moved to live with relatives in St Ann's and later they moved to Hazelwood Road in Hyson Green. Harold found himself fighting on the front line in March 1918 when the Germans launched a major offensive. Sadly he was killed in action. David Priestley subsequently informed the project that he held a remarkable col- lection of WW1 letters from Harold, along with postcards and photographs. The letters touch many aspects of the couple's lives. In a letter written on the 7th September 1917 Harold writes that he has sent Eva 'a little Silk Handker- chief' and a brooch, 'a relic of the war so it is a little souvenir for you'.

Information from volunteers and visitors was incorporated into the project and underlined the value of the Roll of Honour as both a historical document, an expression of Remem- brance and a bridge to present-day lives, families and communities. Work also began on a series of bannerstands based on the project's research find- ings with two stands devoted to the area's local history in the early 1900s. Two stands were dedicated to Denis Marriott, a local historian of this part of Nottingham. Local history research revealed that many men were connected to local industries like brewing, hosiery, lace, dyeing and bleaching. As information accumulated copies were gathered together in a WW1 resource box that is now kept at The Vine so that anyone with future enquiries can use it to help their own research. This includes the full transcript of the Roll of Honour. Conservation work on the Roll also continued, with the deacidifi- cation of the Roll itself, re-staining of the wooden frame and other measures to stabilise and preserve the Roll for the future.

The end-of-project event was in March 2016. It began with a welcome from the Reverend Clive Burrows, the vicar of St Stephens and was led by the Sheriff of Nottingham. It was attended by 50 guests, with many young people, along with their par- ents, brothers and sisters. The young people were all awarded recognition certificates, presented to them by the Sheriff, for their contributions to the project. The evening also included a tour round the Church, display materi- als and viewing of the restored Roll of Honour. The bannerstands on 'Hyson Green & The Great War' will be available for local community venues and special events linked to World War 1 and local history. The Hyson Green project focused largely on the Roll of Honour in St Stephens Church. This artefact reflects the scale of the tragedy of World War 1 on just one parish community. Of course many other communities and organisations in the area experienced the same ter- rible sense of loss in a world that was changing in ways that touched every individual and family in the area.

Since the end of the Roll of Honour project I worked with the Vine and St Stephen's Church on a follow-up project that he held a remarkable col- collection of WW1 letters from Harold, along with postcards and photographs. The letters touch many aspects of the couple's lives. In a letter written on the 7th September 1917 Harold writes that he has sent Eva 'a little Silk Handker- chief' and a brooch, 'a relic of the war so it is a little souvenir for you'.

Information from volunteers and visitors was incorporated into the project and underlined the value of the Roll of Honour as both a historical document, an expression of Remem- brance and a bridge to present-day lives, families and communities. Work also began on a series of bannerstands based on the project's research find- ings with two stands devoted to the area's local history in the early 1900s. Two stands were dedicated to Denis Marriott, a local historian of this part of Nottingham. Local history research revealed that many men were connected to local industries like brewing, hosiery, lace, dyeing and bleaching. As information accumulated copies were gathered together in a WW1 resource box that is now kept at The Vine so that anyone with future enquiries can use it to help their own research. This includes the full transcript of the Roll of Honour. Conservation work on the Roll also continued, with the deacidifi- cation of the Roll itself, re-staining of the wooden frame and other measures to stabilise and preserve the Roll for the future.

The project partners learned in January 2017 that the application for funding had been successful. HLF funding will enable the project to con- tinue to the end of December 2017.

The moving account of Harold and the family’s struggles during WW1 was turned by local volunteers into a community theatre production, directed by Sarah Stephenson. Their workshops and rehearsals were filmed, along with elements of the project as it evolved. The project has engaged community volunteers of all ages in discover- ing how war affects the lives of both the soldiers fighting abroad but also their wives, children and friends...and their local community. Some of the volunteers and members of the works- shops have been from IntoUniversity (part of the University of Notting- ham), that works with young people in the area. There have been drama and historical workshops that have offered creative opportunities to get in- volved. The theatre performances took place at Djanogly Academy, Gregory Boulevard in front of 160 students and there were two community perfor- mances at St Stephen's Church, Hyson Green on the 28th July.

The project included an Angel Row (Nottingham Central Library) Forum, with David Priestley and Chris Weir, on the 9th May, hosted by Nottinghamshire Local History Association in liaison with Local Studies, that was based on Harold’s letters to his wife Eva, back home in Hyson Green.

An end-of-project event and Legacy presentation to Local Studies was held on the 11th November at Angel Row Central Library. It was hosted by Diana Willis, a Development Officer (Local Studies) at the City Library. This included a showing of the project film by Richard Swainson Productions in front of more than 60 people. The theatre performers were presented with volunteer Certificates of Appreciation by the Sheriff of Not- thingham, Co Glyn Jenkins. The film followed the entire story of ‘Present Location Uncertain’ including aspects of conservation, drama workshops, interviews and film of David Priestley talking about Harold and Eva and their letters. There were also speeches by Harold Priestley, the Heritage Lot- tery Fund and Diana Willis. Everyone involved with the project has come forward to share their knowledge and skills of many different kinds. A set of the digitised letters, the project film and a film of the whole PLU performance and other items were donated to Lynda Naylor of the City Library service. This ensured that the project had a legacy to carry forward the memory of Harold and Eva into the future.
Castles of Nottinghamshire: Reconsidered.

James Wright FSA

This article is dedicated to the memory of Philip Davis - a longstanding member of the Castle Studies Group and compiler of the invaluable online resource: Gatehouse Gazetteer.

A decade ago I published the modest volume Castles of Nottinghamshire - a summary of four years of research carried out for Nottinghamshire County Council (Wright 2008). It was never intended to be the last word on the subject. Given the limitations of an 82 page text, several sites were discounted from the study due to a lack of available data. Add to this, the fact that my archaeological career was still in the early stages and it is not hard to see that, ten years on, the subject is appropriate for reconsideration.

Castle studies have moved on during this time. Significant projects have been established to understand individual sites (Impey 2008). There have been analyses of the networks of interconnected regional estates, such as Bodiam Castle and the south-east (Johnson 2017). Castles of a particular period have been subjected to major academic fieldwork and research projects, such as that on the mid-twelfth century ‘Anarchy’ (Creighton & Wright 2017a & 2017b). Individual classes of monument have been assessed, such as Anglo-Saxon tower-nave churches (Shapland 2012). The technology of construction has been addressed (Hislop 2016).

More traditional regional studies have continued to be published in Nottinghamshire (Osborne 2014) which, alongside a series of ‘gazetteer’ style lectures by NLHA’s own Robert Mee, has helped to keep the subject alive. My own work has included historic building surveys for MOLA on sites such as the Tower of London and Knole. More local work has included doctoral research with the University of Nottingham on Tattershall Castle and consultancy work for Trent & Peak Archaeology at Nottingham Castle. Spurred on by the regional research framework (Knight, Vyner & Allen 2012) new discoveries have been made at Nottingham regarding our understanding of the Outer Bailey (Johnson & Richley 2014) and the identification of stonework possibly related to Edward IV’s 1470s building projects (Wright 2017). We can expect major phases of new research at Nottingham and Newark due to fieldwork in advance of new interpretation centres. Both sites were downplayed in 2008 as they had received significant prior attention (Drage 1989; Marshall 1998).

The focus of Castles of Nottinghamshire was largely Norman earthwork sites and late mediaeval fortified manor houses. Both classes of monument have continued to focus atten-
tion since publication. An earthwork survey of Bothamsall was the orphan of the castles project which was later published by the Thoroton Society (Gaunt & Wright 2012). The survey demonstrated potential for a Saxon enclosure remodelled in the aftermath of the Norman Conquest. Landscape analysis demonstrated strategic placement on high ground overlooking a river crossing by the King’s Highway on the northern boundary of Sherwood Forest. The road then passed out of Sherwood where the motte and bailey at East Bridgford commanded the southern approach. Evidence, perhaps, of a regional strategy to physically underpin the Conquest with statements of architectural power.

The Radcliffe Archaeological Project have re-investigated reports of a possible motte and bailey on Malkin Hill (Oswald 1939; Houldsworth 1951). Although the relatively substantial earthworks were built over by a housing development, excavations during the 1950s yielded pottery from c 1200 from the centre of the mound. The project is seeking funding but have made a start on village testpitting including the approximate location of the proposed castle. A number of other possible early sites were discounted from Castles of Nottinghamshire - Gringley on the Hill (Osborne 2014, 25), Thurgarton (Creighton 1998, 489) and Shelford (Speight 1995, 65-6) - but may warrant reappraisal as all feature intriguing earthworks, noted in previous studies, which have not been tested by rigorous modern archaeology.

The period of the mid-twelfth century ‘Anarchy’ had a substantial effect on the town and castle of Nottingham. The former was largely destroyed by fire after attack by Robert of Gloucester in 1140. The royalist garrison, under William Peveril, were then forced to hand the castle to Empress Matilda. The data pointed towards the use of the site as a residence by the Foliot family during the thirteenth century (Crook 2008, 147). The site received a licence to crenellate in 1264 (Davis 2006-7, 235), yet it is clear from Crook that there was already a substantial house there from c 1227 as Henry III visited three times after the creation of a deer park which followed an enquiry into the enforcement of the Charter of the Forest (Crook 2008, 147-8).

My own understanding of licences to crenellate (Wright 2008, 8) was shown to be widely off the mark by Philip Davis. I was ostensibly influenced by nineteenth century scholars. Their notions of a heavily bureaucratic, centralised, government of the British Empire led to a belief that licences were representative of the mediaeval state attempting to limit numbers of military structures (Davis 2006-7, 227; Davis 2008-9, 247, 253). Whereas, Charles Coulson states that licences were a recognised marker of status sought by socially aspirational men trying to affirm their place in society (Coulson 1982, 70-72). Effectively, the licence was proof of royal favour, evidence of social prestige and also of anxiety about affirming that social status (Davis 2008-9, 255-256). The Foliotics of Jordan Castle, alike to the de Canteloupes of Greasley who received a licence in 1340 (Davis 2006-7, 239), were men of emerging status keen to demonstrate their own worth through licences rather than seeking an early version of planning permission from a dominating monarchy.

Coulson also pointed towards the provision of walls, towers and gatehouses around the precincts of monasteries which divided the spiritual from the temporal but also afforded some level of protection to the inhabitants (Coulson 1982). We can see elements of this within Nottinghamshire via the mid-fourteenth century prebend’s tower house at Halloughton, the fifteenth century solar towers at Beavale and Lenton Priory’s hunting lodge at Aspley; and in the precinct of the Carmelite Friars at Nottingham (Emery 2000, 307).

Solar towers were routinely constructed at fortified manor houses during the late mediaeval period for the gentry as can be seen at Strelley (Wright 2009), Linby (Emery 2000, 307) and Clifton (Osborne 2014, 40). Anthony Emery (2000, 171) has pointed out that the county was unusually dominated by gentry rather than peerage families which led to a proliferation of great houses during the fifteenth century in particular. This was particularly true after the death of Ralph Lord Cromwell in 1456 and the fragmentation of his estates - which included a very substantial manor house at Lambley (Weir 1981). Consequently, the surviving gatehouses of Wiverton
(late fifteenth century), Hodsock (c 1490-1500) and Holme Pierrepont (c 1509) must all be reconsidered as they once afforded entry into substantial ranges of buildings. By 1324, Hodsock was surrounded by a moat enclosing over 5 acres accessed by drawbridge and gatehouse protected by a portcullis. The gatehouse had a chamber above and beyond were another three chambers, double stables and chapel. There was also a great hall with pantry, buttery, kitchen and bakehouse served by a garden, dovecote, fishponds, granary and two barns. A possible outer court had two more stables along with ox sheds and another garden (Titow 1969, 151).

Another possible double courtyard may have been Hawton, where land adjacent to Sir Thomas Molyneux’s moated manor house has yielded substantial evidence of contemporary occupation and industry within a square enclosure (Hood 2010). The moated site was later reused as a Parliamentary outpost in 1645 (Osborne 2014, 41) which was a shared fate with Nottingham and Newark. Notably, neither of these castles fell during repeated sieges, indicating that even with advances in military technology during the seventeenth century these medievals sites were still redoubtable.

The inside cover of Castles of Nottinghamshire features a map of 21 sites which were considered during the research. During many lectures on the subject, I have ruminated that this ought to be considered a map of a point in time. The early definition of a castle as ‘the private fortress and residence of a lord’ (Brown 1954, 17) has been refined as ‘the residence of a lord made imposing through the architectural trappings of fortification’ (Goodall 2011, 6) and perhaps even negated by Matthew Johnson’s psychological assessment of the subject: ‘To ask ‘was this or that castle primarily military in intent, or was it social/symbolic?’ is to bring a set of twentieth-century preconceptions to a late medieval context.’ I offer no updated map in 2018. The subject is simply too fluid and as castle studies alter, so will any map.
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From Suffrage to Citizenship

Val Wood

Most women saw changes because of World War 1 of which perhaps the most anticipated change was the vote. The Representation of the People Bill was introduced in Parliament in June 1917 and became law on Feb 6 1918. The Act which enfranchised 8.5 million women failed to give women the vote on the same terms as men. All men were enfranchised from the age of 21 whereas only women aged over 30 with certain property qualifications were given the vote. It was to take another decade before women became enfranchised on the same basis as men.

Preparations took place amongst the former suffrage groups in the city and county in readiness for the vote, first with the establishment of a Nottingham branch of the Women’s Citizen Association. From 1913, autonomous local Women Citizen’s Associations were formed throughout England following Eleanor Rathbone’s initiatives in Liverpool and Manchester leading to a National Association being formed when it became evident that women were to be awarded the parliamentary vote. After decades of campaigning for women’s suffrage, the aim of the association was to lay the foundations of women’s informed political participation in the early part of the 20th Century and stimulate women’s interest in social and political issues. In Nottingham, the first meeting took place at the Friends School Room on the 13 June 1917, chaired by the Hon Mary Handford daughter of Lord Belper and the President of the Nottingham and Notts branch of the National Council of Women (formerly the National Union of Working Women) and a social welfare reformer.

In the immediate post war period, the Nottingham Citizen’s Association acted as an umbrella organisation for women’s groups in the city and county wide. The membership was comprised of representatives of a range of diverse groups, including for example the Council of Women, the YWCA, the former suffrage societies in the city, the Women’s Local Government Association, the Teachers Federation and the NSPCC. It was reported that there were 600 members and entry was by subscription of one shilling. Some of the new members were newly enfranchised women according to the minutes of the association in the Nottingham Archives. The Citizens Association also organised themselves into the four districts covering the Parliamentary Areas. This was viewed as a positive undertaking, a group of women activists continuing to campaign on women’s issues such as women’s representation on public bodies including hospital boards, clean milk supplies, nurseries for children and hostels for working women. They also endorsed three women as candidates for local council elections in 1920, Annie Shepherd in Nottingham and Ethel Wainwright and a Mrs Godfrey in Mansfield but none were elected.

Women standing for and being elected to National and Local Government was to be a slow process both in the city and county. Women had been involved in local politics as Poor Law Guardians since the late 19th century and by 1929 comprised half of the Board of Guardians. Nottinghamshire saw no female MPs between the wars. In the Coupon Election of 1918 in which sixteen women stood nationally only one was elected. Locally, Violet Markham stood unsuccessfully and by all accounts reluctantly in her deceased brother’s constituency in Mansfield. The first women elected to the City Council occurred in 1920 when Helena Dowson representing the Liberal Party and Caroline Harper from the Conservative Unionist Party were elected. They were followed in 1921 by Annie Shepherd on an Independent ticket, in 1925, Elizabeth Webber, Conservative and in 1926 Elizabeth Hyatt the first woman elected from the Labour Party. In the county, women didn’t emerge as councillors until the 1930s, the exception was Ethel Wainwright who gained a seat in Mansfield. Women however were more successful in securing their place on the magisterial benches when the Sex Disqualification Act of 1919 came into force. This had been a long running campaign by women’s groups in the city. Three Nottingham women became Justices of the Peace in the city in 1920, Caroline Harper, Helena Dowson previously referred to and Mary Ball a working-class woman and secretary of the Female Lace Workers Society. On the county benches Mary Handford and Lady Maud Rolleston were selected as JPs. The period also saw the introduction of the first police women in Nottingham and an increase in the number of local women gaining degrees and entering the professions. To enable women to study indepen-
at last

John Bernard Partridge, PUNCH celebrating the representation of the People Act 1918, Public Domain, via Wikimedia Commons.

dently at University College Nottingham, Florence Boot paid for and established the first hostel for young women students in the city.

Undoubtedly the post war era was one of rising opportunities for women, there was a substantial increase in the volume of legislation affecting women, twenty laws specifically concerning women were passed between 1918 and 1925 compared with only six between 1898 and 1918. These included the Married Women’s Maintenance Act of 1922, acts affecting the provision of midwives and maternity services and the Guardianship of Infants Act. This act gave women and their children more chance of achieving custody after being divorced. The act stipulated that the welfare of the child should be taken into consideration, therefore undermining the father’s rights to custody of his children. After 1925 the volume and pace of legislation slowed as the politicians began to realise that women did not constitute a powerful electoral force as witnessed by the apparent low turn-out of women at the polls, which marked the inter-war period in Nottingham as well as nationally.

The Citizens Association in Nottingham continued to meet from 1918 to 1920 when it was absorbed by the Nottingham branch of the Council for Women. One of the issues they had faced was putting forward candidates that were acceptable to all their representative groups. With an over-arch-

ing resolve to remain non-political and non-sectarian they struggled with the concept of a block women’s vote that transcended class and allegiance, advising their members of their right to assist and support parliamentary and council candidates independently. Making it difficult to endorse women as candidates other than through the mainstream political parties, who were establishing their own women’s sections to capture the newly enfranchised woman voter. During this period the Nottingham branch of the National Union of Suffrage Societies which had continued campaigning throughout the war years and very much endorsing a Liberal perspective, renamed their organisation the Notts Women’s Service Association. In 1923 the Women’s Service Association disbanded and merged with the Nottingham Council of Women.

After a brief burst of feminist activity, the 1920s witnessed increasing fragmentation amongst the women’s organisations in Nottingham. Historians exploring the inter war period have identified this happening at National level and reflected on what appears to be two separate groupings of feminists, separating them as those pursing equal rights campaigning on pay and improved access to the professions; and welfare feminism whose focus was on women and the home and the issues affecting them such as birth control and Family Allowances. In terms of organisation within the women’s groups locally, the Women’s Council emerged as the stronger force absorbing the former suffrage societies and whilst retaining a campaigning arm, new groupings of women sprung up reflecting women’s interests in the home and the development of domestic skills. Citizenship became no longer just about women in the public sphere but women and their role in the home. Eleanor Rathbone writing about Women’s Citizens Associations in the NUWSS newspaper ‘Common Cause’ informed the readership ‘that citizenship was that which makes women, not just house- proud but town- proud in their own interests and those of their children. The Women’s Institute established as a rural organisation for women concerned about food production during WW1 became a popular outlet for women and for their urban counterparts the Townswomen’s Guilds established in 1929 after equal suffrage was awarded to women in 1918 had an aim to educate women about good citizenship. For younger women Girl Guiding became very popular during the inter-war period again as vehicle to educate girls in domestic skills and becoming good citizens. The local branches of the League of Nations were also very popular amongst women.

As women’s groups moved to embrace the concept of citizenship they appeared to lack the cohesion and national identity they had enjoyed as part of the suffrage campaign. Nonetheless the opportunity for women to belong to new single-sex organisations was apparent. It would also seem fair to say that there were still issues to overcome and barriers in place in the immediate period after enfranchisement.
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The Creation of Rockley Memorial Park: Memorialisation and the First World War

Rosemary Collins
Radcliffe-on-Trent WWI Group

Memorialisation was a major preoccupation for local communities in the aftermath of the Great War, representing people’s determination to honour the dead and providing a focus for widespread grief. Most memorial programmes were completed by 1923 and comprised permanent monuments recording the names of individual combatants in a particular locality. Some memorials were utilitarian responses to war-related circumstances. In West Bridgford, for instance, Sir Jesse Hind, chairman of Trent Bridge Pavilion Auxiliary Hospital, endowed and equipped an orthopaedic ward in memory of his son ‘Monty’ who was killed at the Somme. After the war the hospital reverted to its former use as a cricket pavilion and the ward was no longer required. Memorial buildings with a more permanent purpose were also established. The Nurses Memorial Home in Nottingham, built by public subscription in memory of the men and women of the city and county who had lost their lives, was opened in 1923 by the Prince of Wales. It provided residential accommodation for nurses up until the 1980s. A different type of memorial was created in Radcliffe on Trent in order that local people could enjoy a designated area of outstanding natural beauty in perpetuity. Rockley Memorial Park was opened in 1927 and remains in use today.

Rockley Memorial Park was the gift of Lisle Rockley, a self-made influential business man, who donated the park to the parish in honour of his son William, killed at Passchendaele, and local servicemen who lost their lives as a result of the war. The memorial, comprising a formal park with a pavilion, cliff walk, woodlands and access to the River Trent, embodied his interpretation of remembrance which included a desire to link memories of the dead to the seasonal cycle of the natural world and to open up private land for public pleasure.

The Rockley family

Lisle Rockley, born 1859 in Radcliffe on Trent, was the youngest child of William Rockley, a local master carpenter, and Letitia Heape from Derbyshire. He did not follow his father into the building trade but became involved in the billposting and advertising industry as a young adult. Developments in lithography in the 1880s meant that for the first time posters could be printed in vibrant colours. The industry took off and by the 1890s poster design was regarded as an art form as well as an essential part of advertising; there are many famous poster designers from this period such as Cheret, Toulouse-Lautrec and Mucha. Lisle Rockley’s business developed in line with the new art form. He travelled to New York on the Majestic in 1895 and stayed in America for a few months as an advertising contractor. His son, William Lisle Rockley, was born in New York in May 1896. The family returned to Nottingham shortly afterwards where his daughter Janet was born in 1897.
In 1898, Lisle founded Rockley’s Limited with a share capital of £50,000 in £1 shares to acquire and amalgamate five East Midlands’ billposting and advertising companies. Rockley’s Limited flourished in the early 1900s, changing the appearance of the city streets in the East Midlands with its posters. Mr Rockley’s hoardings were described as the ‘poor man’s art gallery’. More companies were acquired, including one in Mansfield. Mr Rockley was chairman of Rockley’s Limited for thirty years and had premises in Talbot Street, Nottingham. During his career he was a member of the British Poster Advertising Association and their president three times. He was also a member of the Parliamentary Publicity and Censorship Committees of the Association and was twice chairman of the United Billposter Association. He became assistant secretary of the Grand Lodge of Nottinghamshire Freemasons in 1898 and was treasurer of St. Mary’s Lodge for many years.

Life changed significantly for the Rockley family when war was declared in 1914. William had just completed his education and joined the University of Nottingham Officer Training Corps. He was soon commissioned, set off for Gallipoli in 1915 with the 6th York and Lancaster Regiment and received a Military Cross for gallantry. He contracted various diseases picked up from insanitary conditions and was seriously ill when the British Army evacuated the peninsula in December. Following hospitalisation in Malta he spent most of 1916 in England, returning to the Front in the spring of 1917. Lieutenant William Rockley was killed by an exploding shell on 10 October 1917 during the 3rd Battle of Ypres while serving with the 10th York and Lancaster Regiment. His body was not recovered, he was twenty-one years old.

Descendants of William’s sister, Janet, have reported that Lisle Rockley was grief-stricken by his son’s death and that creating a permanent memorial to him became of overriding importance. Now a successful and well-regarded business man, he decided to use his resources to create a memorial park commemorating both his son and WWI servicemen men from Radcliffe on Trent who had lost their lives. He also wanted a focus for remembrance that looked to the future and which would directly benefit the people of Radcliffe. Although he had lived in Nottingham since the mid 1890s, Mr Rockley never lost his love for his native village.

The Creation of Rockley Memorial Park

Radcliffe on Trent had always had a wild woodland area with cliffs leading down to the river but in the 1920s there was no public right of way across it or public space for people to enjoy what was then described as ‘one of the loveliest beauty spots in Nottinghamshire’. The cliffs had been owned by Earl Manvers until he sold much of his land to Colwick Estates and private landowners in the early 1920s. In August 1926 Mr Rockley approached Radcliffe Parish Council offering to buy several acres of the land now owned by Colwick Estates together with a small area of six acres held by twenty-five different owners. He wrote to the parish council as follows: ‘The object of my proposal is intended to provide a permanent, pleasant and useful memorial to the
men of Radcliffe on Trent who gave up their lives in the Great War where, as some of you are no doubt aware, my only son made the supreme sacrifice and I should like with your permission that his name be in some way associated with the memorial’. The parish councillors accepted his offer and met in November 1926 to consider a further letter from Mr Rockley describing parcels of land he had bought. Having detailed his purchases, he said:

‘As a native of the parish, I have felt that it is an anomaly that with regard to the River Trent and the Cliffs, which together account for the name of the village, that no inhabitant of Radcliffe on Trent is entitled as such or has any legal right to enjoy the possession of any portion of either the Cliffs or of any land having access to the River and I felt I should like to secure for the inhabitants of Radcliffe on Trent, my native village, the enjoyment of their Cliffs and access to their River Trent for ever’.

Work began in November 1926 on turning the wilderness into a recreational park with a walk along the cliff and paths to the river. Local men, many of whom were ex-servicemen, carried out the work under the direction of Messrs Kent and Brydon, a well-reputed Darlington firm. The area was transformed in the following months. Vistas were cut through the trees on the cliffs, superfluous growth cleared away, waterfalls constructed by tapping hidden springs and dell walks were made leading down to the river. At the top of the cliffs a mile long grass promenade was laid out. Four enclosed turfed plateaux shaded with trees and jutting out to the verge of the cliffs were added, with seating areas.

The layout of the park reflected, to a great extent, the tastes, attitudes and funds of the benefactor. Two small parks abutting the cliff walk were constructed. One was designated a ‘rest’ park where people could sit without being disturbed by games. The other was a ‘pleasure’ park, with flower beds, seats and a small pavilion for refuge in wet weather. A bungalow was built for a park-keeper and more than ten thousand ornamental shrubs, flowering trees and evergreens were planted. Mr. Rockley paid all the costs.

Opening and Dedication Ceremony

The opening and dedication ceremony took place on 15 October 1927, marking the 10th anniversary of William Rockley’s death. The date was significant because 15 October 1917 was the day the Rockley family had received a telegram telling them their son had been killed. The ceremony replicated the conventional pattern of hymns, prayers, speeches, buglers and dedication that had characterised the unveiling of memorials all over the country in the early 1920s.

Two bands led a procession of local ex-servicemen, boy scouts and girl guides from St Mary’s Church up to the new park where they were met by a huge crowd. Representatives from the military, ecclesiastical and civil spheres in Nottinghamshire were in attendance, giving recognition and status to the occasion. Among them were Alderman Huntsman, mayor-elect of Nottingham, Mr Butler Parr, chair of Radcliffe Parish Council, Mr Tweedale Meaby, clerk to the county council, Viscount Galway, chair of the county council, Major Robinson, four clergyman and the Rockley family. Several speeches were given including one by Mr Rockley who said:

‘Under my scheme I’ve preserved and developed the woodlands and provided the inhabitants with the rights of access to the river. It was fortunate that Nature provided such a beautiful site to develop – one that is unequalled in Nottinghamshire. The preservation of these cliffs and woods, from which Radcliffe takes its name, appealed to me as a memorial which would endure, be worthy of the sacrifices made and give joy to generations to come. The pleasure I feel in making the gift would be greatly enhanced if I thought it would be appreciated. I would like to thank everyone directly or indirectly involved with the scheme for the help I’ve received. I ask you to accept this gift with all the love and affection of my wife, my daughter and myself. The only condition that I attach is that it shall be used as a pleasure ground.’

The memorial plaque, unveiled in the pavilion by Viscount Galway, remains in place today. The words convey the message Mr Rockley wanted to give to present and future generations: ‘This Park and the adjoining Woodlands were presented to the parish council of Radcliffe on Trent by Lisle Rockley’. His name stands out in larger letters than the remainder of the
text, making it clear that the park and woodlands are his personal gift. The phrase is followed by recognition of public grief: ‘in honoured memory of the men of this village who fell in the Great War 1914-1918’. This sentiment reflects the national commitment to remember the dead – in this case the sixty-one men listed on the local war memorial. The plaque omits the contribution of over three hundred local servicemen who survived, many of whom were wounded. Local women who made significant contributions to the war effort are also omitted. The next clause referring to the ‘the dear memory of Lieut William Lisle Rockley MC 10th York and Lancaster Regiment killed in action October 11th 1917 at the Battle of Ypres in the 22nd year of his age’, displays, in the public domain, the private grief of a father for his son. The plaque ensured that the Rockley name would not be forgotten and that the park would carry Lisle and William’s names forward into the future. Mrs Rockley and William’s sister Janet are not mentioned on the plaque although the park held great significance for them. Mrs Rockley later referred to it as a ‘sacred place’ in a letter to the parish council and Janet’s ashes were scattered in the park by her daughter and granddaughter in the 1990s, following her wishes.

Mr. Rockley continued to be greatly involved with the park and paid for its upkeep for the first three years. In May 1928 the Parish Council asked him to consent to the park being called Rockley Memorial Park and he agreed. He disposed of his business assets during that year and retired from the British Posters Advertising Association in 1929. He died in 1932 and his ashes were scattered in the park by his wife and daughter.

Rockley Memorial Park today

Radcliffe Parish Council took over the costs of the park in 1930 and has maintained it since that time; it has carried out many improvements over the years. In April 2013 the council extended the public space it owned by purchasing the area known as the Lily Ponds, situated at the foot of the cliffs between Hallow Well and the weir and adjacent to the River Trent. The fifteen acre area is designated as a “Local Wildlife Site”. The council is working in partnership with the Canal and River Trust, Notts. Wildlife Trust, Rushcliffe and Nottinghamshire Councils and local volunteers to establish and manage the nature reserve. Conservation work in the area has included cutting back nettles to create a picnic area, improving access paths from the cliffs, clearing weeds in the ponds and pollarding waterside willows. Plans for community involvement include activities with local schools and other groups, such as moth trapping, bat surveys and nature walks. Wildlife experts have found a wide range of aquatic invertebrates and vertebrates in the Lily Ponds area; as well as many bat and bird species. Birds of conservation concern have been identified: kingfisher, willow warbler and swift among them and, in the last two years, a family of buzzards. Radcliffe Conservation Volunteer Group works at the cliffs and lily ponds on a regular basis.

On 15 October 2017 Radcliffe Parish Council organised a commemorative event at the park in conjunction with Radcliffe on Trent WW1 Group, which has carried out all the research on the park’s history. Mr Rockley’s great-granddaughter, great-great grandson and his children, tracked down by the WW1 Group, were present alongside military, ecclesiastical and civilian representatives from Nottinghamshire. The group mirrored, as closely as possible, the dignitaries who attended in 1927. Many local residents were present at the ceremony to remember the death of William Rockley and to give thanks for his father’s gift.

The Rockley Memorial Park, cliff walk and woodlands is a living memorial that changes with the seasons and over time. The park is a place full of memories as well as natural renewal and decay. Some descendants of those who lost relatives in the First World War still go to the park to remember them. Many people have personal memories of taking children and grandchildren to the play area, walking their dogs, meeting their friends, fishing by the river, working in the park as employees and volunteers or relaxing there on sunny days. The walk along the cliff top is particularly enjoyed by people of all ages and its many memorial benches are a testament to the number of Radcliffe residents who loved the park. Mr Rockley’s vision of a pleasurable place for villagers to enjoy for ever has been realised through his unique creation.

Directions: From Radcliffe on Trent village centre, turn at the mini roundabout by the Co-op store and travel up Shelford Road towards Shelford. The main entrance is from Park Road, fifth on the left after crossing the railway bridge. The park is open in daylight hours and entrance is free. Street parking only.

The research findings of Radcliffe-on-Trent WW1 group are published online at: www.radcliffeontrentww1.org.uk.

Commemorating ninety years of Rockley Memorial Park, October 2017

William Rockley’s date of death is contentious. It is given as 11 October on the plaque in Rockley Memorial Park but is listed as 10 October on his military records at the National Archives, Kew and in the York and Lancaster Regimental War Diary.

How to find Rockley Memorial Park and Cliff Walk

Directions: From Radcliffe on Trent village centre, turn at the mini roundabout by the Co-op store and travel up Shelford Road towards Shelford. The main entrance is from Park Road, fifth on the left after crossing the railway bridge. The park is open in daylight hours and entrance is free. Street parking only.

The research findings of Radcliffe-on-Trent WW1 group are published online at: www.radcliffeontrentww1.org.uk.
Commemorating ninety years of Rockley Memorial Park,
October 2017
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