The books in this series focus on the British Isles in the early modern period, as interpreted by eighteenth- and nineteenth-century historians, and show the shift to ‘scientific’ historiography. Several of them are devoted exclusively to the history of Ireland, while others cover topics including economic history, foreign and colonial policy, agriculture and the industrial revolution. There are also works in political thought and social theory, which address subjects such as human rights, the role of women, and criminal justice.

Three Seventeenth-Century Yorkshire Surveys

Originally founded in 1863 to promote interest in the history and archaeology of the Huddersfield area, the Yorkshire Archaeological Society expanded its purview in 1870 to cover the whole of Yorkshire. In 1884 it began publishing its Record Series, which aimed to make historical information available through the reprinting of original documents, diaries, letters and charters. First printed for the society in 1941, this work comprises three seventeenth-century surveys. The first, introduced and edited by Thomas Stuart Willan (1910–94), addresses the manor of Wensleydale, and the remaining two, introduced and edited by Ely Wilkinson Crossley (1863–1942), are concerned with the areas – then known as lordships – of Middleham and Richmond. Providing details of property and land ownership, tenancies, dispute resolution, and farming, this work remains a valuable resource for local historians as well as scholars of seventeenth-century British history and historical geography.
Cambridge University Press has long been a pioneer in the reissuing of out-of-print titles from its own backlist, producing digital reprints of books that are still sought after by scholars and students but could not be reprinted economically using traditional technology. The Cambridge Library Collection extends this activity to a wider range of books which are still of importance to researchers and professionals, either for the source material they contain, or as landmarks in the history of their academic discipline.

Drawing from the world-renowned collections in the Cambridge University Library and other partner libraries, and guided by the advice of experts in each subject area, Cambridge University Press is using state-of-the-art scanning machines in its own Printing House to capture the content of each book selected for inclusion. The files are processed to give a consistently clear, crisp image, and the books finished to the high quality standard for which the Press is recognised around the world. The latest print-on-demand technology ensures that the books will remain available indefinitely, and that orders for single or multiple copies can quickly be supplied.

The Cambridge Library Collection brings back to life books of enduring scholarly value (including out-of-copyright works originally issued by other publishers) across a wide range of disciplines in the humanities and social sciences and in science and technology.
The Anniversary Reissue of Volumes from the Record Series of the Yorkshire Archaeological Society

To celebrate the 150th anniversary of the foundation of the leading society for the study of the archaeology and history of England's largest historic county, Cambridge University Press has reissued a selection of the most notable of the publications in the Record Series of the Yorkshire Archaeological Society. Founded in 1863, the Society soon established itself as the major publisher in its field, and has remained so ever since. The Yorkshire Archaeological Journal has been published annually since 1869, and in 1885 the Society launched the Record Series, a succession of volumes containing transcriptions of diverse original records relating to the history of Yorkshire, edited by numerous distinguished scholars. In 1932 a special division of the Record Series was created which, up to 1965, published a considerable number of early medieval charters relating to Yorkshire. The vast majority of these publications have never been superseded, remaining an important primary source for historical scholarship.

Current volumes in the Record Series are published for the Society by Boydell and Brewer. The Society also publishes parish register transcripts; since 1897, over 180 volumes have appeared in print. In 1974, the Society established a programme to publish calendars of over 650 court rolls of the manor of Wakefield, the originals of which, dating from 1274 to 1925, have been in the safekeeping of the Society’s archives since 1943; by the end of 2012, fifteen volumes had appeared. In 2011, the importance of the Wakefield court rolls was formally acknowledged by the UK committee of UNESCO, which entered them on its National Register of the Memory of the World.

The Society possesses a library and archives which constitute a major resource for the study of the county; they are housed in its headquarters, a Georgian villa in Leeds. These facilities, initially provided solely for members, are now available to all researchers. Lists of the full range of the Society’s scholarly resources and publications can be found on its website, www.yas.org.uk.
Three Seventeenth-Century Yorkshire Surveys
(Record Series volume 104)

The first of three surveys in this volume focuses on the manor of Wensleydale in 1613–14. It was edited by T.S. Willan FBA (1910–94) during the early part of his career at the University of Manchester; he was later appointed professor of economic history and held the post from 1961 to 1973. The survey appears to have come to his attention through his cousin, W.H. Willan, a partner in a firm of solicitors in Hawes, North Yorkshire. The present whereabouts of the manuscript edited by Willan are not known. However, another version, which includes field names, is to be found among the records of the Office of the Auditors of Land Revenue at the National Archives, where it has the reference LR 2/195. Professor Willan also contributed an article on 'The parliamentary surveys for the North Riding of Yorkshire' to the Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, 31 (1934), 224–89.

The 1605 surveys of the lordships of Middleham and Richmond were edited by E.W. Crossley FSA (1863–1942), who was honorary secretary of the Yorkshire Archaeological Society from 1906 until his death. The provenance of the document is unknown, but it was presented to the Society in 1928 by the Yorkshire Tykes' Club, a dining club composed of the male members of the Society's council. The document has the archival reference MS509.
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PREFACE

MANOR OF WENSLEYDALE.

I am indebted to my cousin, Mr. W. H. Willan, for permission to print the Survey of Wensleydale, which is the property of Messrs. Willan and Metcalfe, Solicitors, Hawes, and to my brother, Mr. J. J. Willan, for permission to consult the Broderick valuation which is in his custody as Clerk to the Aysgarth Rural District Council.

While this work was in the press Mr. C. T. Clay kindly drew my attention to the fact that Christopher, second son of John Colby of Bowbridge (Introduction, p. xv), by his wife Jane, daughter of Alexander Moore, was Dean of Middleham from 1681 to his death in 1727 (Dugdale, Visitation of Yorkshire, ed. J. W. Clay, iii, 434).

T.S.W.

THE LORDSHIPS OF MIDDLEHAM AND RICHMOND.

The MS. Survey of these two lordships is the property of the Yorkshire Archæological Society, having been presented to that body in 1928 by members of the Yorkshire Tykes’ Club. Mr. Willan has subjected the Survey of Wensleydale to a painstaking and intensive analysis. Those of Middleham and Richmond are, however, published only as a record, but it is hoped that they will be useful as a basis for closer examination by students of social and economic history.

The term “lordship of Richmond” is here used in a very restricted sense as compared with the area covered, at an early date by the honor which included not only the whole of Richmondshire but lands in other counties as well.

When Mr. Willan offered his paper on the Survey of Wensleydale to the Society for publication it was thought that the three Surveys covering districts which were contiguous to each other might well be printed together, and that they would make a suitable volume for our Record Series.

A separate index of field names is printed at the end of the book.

E.W.C.
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A Seventeenth-Century Survey of the Manor of Wensleydale.

Edited by T. S. Willan.

(i) The Manor of Wensleydale.

The manor of Wensleydale "consisted of the possessions of the abbey of Jervaulx in the forest of Wensleydale north of the Ure. In 1086 4 carucates in the place known as Fors were held of Count Alan by Bodin. His nephew Acharis son of Bardolf granted 1½ carucates here to found the abbey of Charity. Hugh son of Gernagan, probably a tenant of Acharis, granted a like amount. This was the nucleus of the abbot's possessions on this side of the river. The monks removed to East Witton in the time of Hervey son of Acharis, and founded there the abbey of Jervaulx. The old building was known as Dale Grange, and in 1301–2 the abbot paid subsidy for it and for the hamlets of Skelgill, Cams House, Simonstone, Cotterdale and others. The whole estate now began to be known as the Manor of Wensleydale, the alternative name (i.e. the manor of Dale Grange) being due to the fact that the courts were held by the steward of the abbey at Dale Grange."

At the dissolution of the monasteries and the attainder of the abbot of Jervaulx, the manor of Wensleydale was worth £68 13s. 4d. p.a. It was granted by Henry VIII in 1544 to Matthew Earl of Lennox and Margaret his wife, but returned to the Crown in the person of James I, their grandson.¹ On 6 August 1603 it was granted to Ludovick Stuart, Duke of Lennox, together with the manors of Settrington and Temple Newsam.² In Elizabeth's reign there had been disputes between the Crown and the

¹ Victoria County History, North Riding, i, 207. For a more recent account of the founding of the abbey, with the relevant documents, see Early Yorkshire Charters, vol. IV (The Honour of Richmond, Part I, ed. C. T. Clay), Yorkshire Archæological Society Record Series, Extra Series, i, 23–36.
² V.C.H., N.R., i, 207. For the career of Matthew Earl of Lennox see the Dictionary of National Biography.
³ Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1603–10, p. 28; D.N.B.
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tenants in 1570,¹ and between the Crown and the Countess of Lennox in 1573, over the title to the manor.² Now the Duke of Lennox found himself in conflict, not with the Crown, but with his new tenants. This interesting conflict, which developed within three years of the grant of the manor to the Duke, can be unravelled from the Exchequer Depositions.³ In the course of it the very existence of the manor was disputed, although Thomas Ascoughe, deputy steward, claimed that he knew the lands “on the Abbotside Called (as he hath sene and read in the book called Domesdale) by the name of the manor or Lordship of Wensdale.” Ascoughe appealed to Domesday Book with all the fervour that Parliamentarians were to appeal to Magna Carta forty years later, but with less justification, for the manor was not mentioned in the Book. The real cause of the conflict was the unfavourable terms upon which the tenants had taken their leases from their new landlord. Under the late Countess of Lennox they had paid fines value 9–10 years’ rent for leases of 21 years. Now, for leases of the same term of years, they were paying fines of 30 years’ rent to the Duke. Apparently some 16–20 tenants, described by one deponent as “the duke’s favourites,” took leases on these conditions and paid the first instalment of their fines. They, and probably others, attended the court and acknowledged themselves to be tenants. Early in 1606, however, the tenants who had taken leases met at Hardrow and decided to ask Lennox to mitigate their fines. If he refused they would complain to the King. In the meantime they collected money for the necessary charges and put the matter in the hands of Peter Metcalfe (“Peter of the bowebrigge”). He, and apparently others, interviewed Lennox’s commissioners and were sharply reproved as “but busy fellows,” who “came not in the business of their neighbours.” This was the story Metcalfe brought back and told to a further meeting of tenants at Holehouses. The tenants thereupon assigned a letter of attorney to Peter Metcalfe and Edmond Pratt to solicit their cause.

There is no evidence of either Metcalfe or Pratt acting under the letter of attorney, for at this stage the movement among the tenants passed into the hands of Anthony Besson of Gray’s Inn,

¹ Whaley, Ashbrigg, p. 63.
² Exchequer Depositions, 16 Eliz., Est. no. 4.
³ Exchequer Depositions, 5 Jas. I, Mich. no. 8.
the founder of Yorebridge Grammar School near Askrigg.\textsuperscript{1} He, more than Metcalfe, was looked upon as the leader of the tenants against the Duke.\textsuperscript{2} Ascoughe, for example, declared that the reasons for the discontent were the greatness of the fines and "Mr Besson's persuasion." At the third meeting of tenants, held at Askrigg Church, Besson declared that "they were about a Course which would be very Chargeable," and persuaded the tenants to bind themselves "for the Securitie of him or those that should prosecute the Cause." According to Tristan Janson, clerk of Aysgarth, Thomas Metcalfe and Richard Metcalfe, his father, had consulted him about becoming bound to Anthony Besson in £70. The condition was that they should contribute according to their tenement in support of the suit against the Duke. Janson urged caution as there was apparently no corresponding obligation on Besson's part; but others had already entered into such bonds. Anthony Besson himself spoke his mind freely on the whole subject to John Lambert of Marsett, yeoman, whom he met in London. The grant of land to the Duke, he said, "was nothing worth and merelie mistaken," and he, Besson, had said as much to the Duke himself. "If the tenants wolde be ruled and guided by him, they should not paie the dukes grace any rente or fines hereafter, or doe him any suite or service at his Couerte," but for those who had taken up leases and paid fines "it was lost money." If the tenants would stand by him according to their agreement, Besson declared, he would discharge them at law against the Duke's title to the lands "for an Ascrigge shott."

In the spring, apparently of 1606, on a Sunday before the customary court was due to meet, Anthony Besson and a great part of the tenants of the land in variance met at Hawes Chapel "without the Lordship." There they attended a "preaching then and there made by Mr Leak," who was himself a tenant of Cotterdale. After the sermon Anthony Besson and the tenants held a long private discussion at which it was agreed that the tenants should not appear at the court. At this point Anthony Besson, who was not even a tenant, fell into the background

\textsuperscript{1} In 1600 he gave two houses in York to maintain a master to teach in a free grammar school in Askrigg (\textit{V.C.H. Yorks.}, i, 480).

\textsuperscript{2} As early as 1585 he had been concerned in a case of a disputed lease of Cams House (Exch. Dep., 27 Eliz., East. no. 17—partly illegible; \textit{ibid.}, 29 Eliz., East. no. 2).
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and his place was taken by Richard Besson. There seems to be no evidence of the relationship between the two, though they may have been brothers. Richard appears to have been a man of some local importance. He had a farm at Litherskew and was, in 1606, charged with shooting two hares in the forest of Wensleydale with a gun. At the end of Elizabeth’s reign he apparently collected the rents for the manor of Wensleydale and in consequence became involved in a not unusual case concerning a certain discrepancy between the rents collected and the rents paid in. In 1603 he was granted the bailiwick of Wensleydale for life, and in the following year received a number of offices, including those of Forester of Kettlewell, Parker of Woodhall Park, Bow-bearer of Wensleydale and collector of rents of Bainbridge and Worton. These grants did not go unchallenged.

It was left for Richard Besson to challenge openly the Duke’s authority. On the day following the meeting at Hawes Chapel he came into the room at Dale Grange, where Thomas Ascough was sitting as deputy steward to hold the court, and said, ‘‘ verie contemptuouslie, without any reverence or regard, ‘ Howe noe my maisters, for whome doe you kepe a Courte here?’ ’’ To this the deputy steward answered ‘‘ For the Duke’s grace,’’ and Besson replied that the Duke had no authority to keep a court there ‘‘ and they are fooles that doe appeare here at this tyme.’’ As a result those who were indifferent withdrew, ‘‘ so as there could not be a Jurie had at that tyme,’’ and ‘‘ used verie hard speaches to the deputie steward and David Balie the duke’s bailife, such as had bene sufficient to have drawne on further inconveniences.’’

There, for want of further evidence, the story ends; but it would appear that the tenants were unsuccessful, at least temporarily, in their struggle with their landlord. Whatever the issue, the conflict is not without interest, for it illustrates the impact of

1 North Riding Q.S. Records, i, 45.
2 Exch. Depositions, Special Commission, 11 Jas. I, 4861.
4 Ibid., p. 188.
5 Exch. Dep., 6 Jas. I, Hilary, no. 3. This unfortunately contains only the list of questions, the actual depositions being missing. The grants were challenged by Thomas Lord Scrope, Sir Thomas Metcalfe, Christopher, John and Thomas Metcalfe, and George Dodsworth.
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economic forces on a conservative community. The new commercial spirit that was abroad, and especially the general rise in prices of this period, led landlords to try to get more revenue out of their lands. A fine of 9–10 years’ rent may have satisfied the ‘late Countess’, but apparently it did not satisfy the Duke. Hence the increase in fines which precipitated a conflict so characteristic of the agrarian problem of the seventeenth century.

In 1614 Lennox leased the manor for 21 years to Sir John Leedes, John Colby and Henry Goodreeke.1 Little is known of these men. A Sir John Leedes was in constant trouble at this time for making disrespectful remarks about the King.2 John Colby was probably the John Colby of Nappa who died in 16163 and whose widow, Mary, later acquired a share of the manor. Henry Goodreeke was perhaps the Henry Goodricke who was a Deputy Lieutenant of Yorkshire in 1638–9.4 Later in the same year Lennox sold the entire manor to Sir Francis Baildon of Kippax, Thomas Roockwood of London and Edward Rolte of Gray’s Inn for £10,000.5 It then passed quickly through the hands of a number of men who were probably merely speculators. In May 1616 Baildon, Roockwood and Rolte sold one third of the manor for a “competent sum” to Sir Thomas Smith of Kent and David Watkins of London, who in turn sold it for £4,750 to George and Thomas Cole. Another third part was sold by Baildon, Roockwood and Rolte to John Goodman and his son John, who in turn sold it to George Cole. The final third was acquired by Mary Colby,6 who leased it to George Cole for ten years at a rent of £220 per annum.7 Eight commissioners were appointed, four named by George and Thomas Cole and four by Mary Colby, to survey the manor and divide it into three equal parts, two of

1 Survey, p. 1.
3 Dugdale, Visitation of the County of York (Surtees Soc.), xxxvi, 47.
4 Hist. MSS. Cam. C. 205, p. 208.
5 Exch. Dep., Spec. Com., 16 January, no. 4894; Close, 16 January, pt. ii, no. 25, G. V. C. H., N. R., ii, 208, where it is said that Lennox sold the manor in 1618 and where the various sales between 1614 and 1618 are completely ignored.
6 Not as Whaley says (Ashridge, p. 40), John Colby. John Colby, Mary’s husband, died in 1616 (Dugdale, Visitation, Surtees Soc., xxxvi, 47).
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which were to go to the Coles and one to Mary Colby. George Cole was to get the schedule of Mary's share so that he could give leases to the under-tenants. This survey was carried out by Robert Saxton, gentleman, aged 33, of Dunningley (?), Yorks. He was probably the Robert Saxton, son of the more famous Christopher, who was assisting his father in making surveys of property in the West Riding in 1601.¹ Robert Saxton made use of the plot or map which Samuel Peirse had drawn up for the survey of 1614.² He seems to have surveyed 3,003 acres of common, which may have been meant to represent a third of Stags Fell, but unfortunately the actual award is largely illegible.³ From some later additions to the survey of 1614 it appears that the Colby share of the manor comprised Dale Grange, Helm, Skelgill, Yorescot, Brockillcote, and, except for one tenement, Shawcote and Holehouses.⁴

George Cole (for little more is heard of Thomas) was left in anything but quiet enjoyment of the manor. His position seems to have been challenged on the one side by those from whom he had bought part of the manor and on the other side by the tenants, who seem to have kept up a running fight with successive owners.⁵ On 25 June 1623 provisional agreement was reached between Cole and his tenants. It was stated that for twenty years suits had been depending between the tenants of that part of Wensleydale north of the Ure and those that claimed from His Majesty, and between Sir Thomas Smith, Sir William Smith, John Goodman and John Colby on the one hand and George Cole on the other, concerning the conveyance of two thirds of the manor from the Smiths and Goodman. The suits had spent and wasted a great part of the tenants' estates, for they were "notable to contend in Law with the said George Cole fore redresse of their wronges." The tenants petitioned the King on 9 June 1621, and they and Cole appeared before the Assizes at Lancaster, where it was decreed that they should quietly enjoy their houses and garths

¹ Geographical Journal, xiii (1880), 180.
² Survey, f. 2.
⁴ Survey, f. 28d.
⁵ See, e.g., Exch. Spec. Com., 16 Jas. I, no. 4894, which shows that the tenants challenged the claims to ownership of the Smiths, John Goodman and Mary Colby.
and one third of their lands with rights of common, Cole keeping two thirds.¹

Immediately after this decree Cole began to lease some of the land for 2,000 years for a capital sum and a nominal rent per annum. Thus on 1 November 1624 George Cole of the Inner Temple leased to Thomas Tinkard of Sedbusk, yeoman, for 2,000 years, for 20s. in cash and 1s. 6d. per annum, a dwelling-house, garths, a parcel of ground called Rush Dale and two cattlegates in the High Pasture, all in the occupation of Tinkard. The lessor retained all the mineral rights and the right of carriage of coal and turf through the premises. The lessee agreed to give two days mowing and two days haymaking per annum “in Mowing tyme and Haytime”; in default of a day’s mowing he was to pay 12d. and of a day’s haymaking 6d. He was also to give one day’s labour with a horse to fetch coals from any place in the manor to Cole’s mansion; on default he was to pay 8d. The lessee also agreed to pay the “Rateable contribution towards the Reparation of the Chappell of Hardrowe” and to grind his corn at Cole’s mill in Hardrow, provided he was “used as well at the said Mill as . . . . at any other Mill or mills whatsoever.” Finally he was to do suit and service at the court yearly, to procure the good and welfare of Cole, and not to be a party to plots and practices against him. Other houses, land and cattlegates in Sedbusk were leased on the same conditions.²

These conditions may have been considered too onerous or Cole may have refused to carry out the decree of 1623, for a final settlement between himself and his tenants was only reached in 1632. On 11 July 1632 it was stated that “whereas George Sadler, George Thwaites, Bartholomew Thwaites, George Wynne the elder, Thomas Tynkard, Charles Atkinson, Thomas Todd, George Wynne the younger, George Thwaites, Thomas Thompson, George Todd, Michael Metcalfe, John Metcalfe, Martin Thwaites, John Kettleywell, Michael and Henry Dent, John Wynne, Wilford Moore, John Blencarne have exhibited their Bill of Complaint into his Maiesties Court of Whitehall against George Cole, esquire, defendant their Landlord for and concerning the better and more firm establishing of their houses and garthes and a third part

¹ MS. in my possession, unfortunately in very bad condition.
² MSS. in my possession.
of their tenements unto them and their heires,” the Lord Privy Seal and the rest of His Majesty's Council decreed that the complainants "shall severally and respectively have hold and enjoy their houses and garthes and such landes or tenements as were devided and sett out by the said defendant or his assignees with common of pasture proportional thereunto, unto them . . . . for and during the whole and full Term of two thousand years. Paying yearly at everie Martinmas hereafter the third part of their old rent which belonged to their whole farme when it was entire and one boone day yearly in hay time.” Although this judgment seems to have affected only a limited number of tenants, largely those of Sedbusk, it was favourable to those whom it did concern, which was a not unusual feature of judgments made by the central authorities during the years of the personal rule of Charles I.

After 1632 land in and around Sedbusk changed hands freely, being granted for the remainder of the term of 2,000 years on payment of capital sums together with a nominal rent to the “chief lord of the soil,” who was Sir John Lowther of Lowther, although it is uncertain when he acquired an interest in the manor. A small part of Cole’s share of the manor also passed to Sir Robert Bindloss of Borwick, Lancashire. This was the Cams House portion, for on 31 January 1632 Sir Robert sold to Bernard Smith of Cams House all the lands, messuages, etc., known by the name of Cams House. The whole comprised 333 acres, with two messuages, and the price was £1,125. The land was said to be late in the tenure of George Thwaite and now in the tenure of Bernard Smith. Smith, who was chief constable of Hang West in 1685, had married George Thwaite’s widow sometime before 1635, and in that year he and his wife sold property in Sedbusk to Augustine Metcalfe and Henry, his son, for £135.

In the second half of the seventeenth century a new dispute

1 MS. in my possession.
2 There are in my possession some twenty deeds relating to the transfe of land in and around Sedbusk in the seventeenth century.
3 Survey, f. 27.
4 There is a copy of this conveyance on a loose sheet in the survey.
5 North Riding Q.S. Records, vi, 96.
6 MS. in my possession.
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arose, this time concerning the third part of the manor held by Mary Colby. This was inherited by John Colby,¹ Mary's son, who sold it in 1678 to Alexander Smith.² The purchase price was £4,300, of which £1,300 was paid and the remainder secured. Anthony Fothergill³ and Thomas Lambert were to have proportions of Smith's purchase "on good consideration." After John Colby's death his son and heir, Alexander, sued Smith, Lambert and Fothergill in Chancery to have the purchase set aside. According to Alexander Colby's story the purchase, conveyance and fine were obtained from his father by fraud. The purchase money was to be paid in instalments spread over seven years and was therefore not really more than one third of the value of the premises. The Court of Chancery agreed with Alexander Colby and ordered the property to be re-conveyed to him. He took possession and tendered £2,800 in repayment as decreed by the Court, but Smith refused it. According to the writer in the Victoria County History, "Alexander Colby tried to set aside the sale . . . . but apparently without success."⁴ Actually the case went to the House of Lords, which on 18 November 1685 dismissed the appeal of Smith, Fothergill and Lambert and affirmed the decree made in the Court of Chancery.⁵

After the seventeenth century the history of the manor is uneventful. In 1717 the whole manor was in the hands of Lord Lonsdale, who sold it in 1723 to Edward Wortley. As part of the Wortley estates it appears under a new name, that of the manors of High and Low Abbotside. It passed from Edward Wortley to his descendants, the Earls of Wharncliffe. About 1885 part of the estate which had belonged to John Colby was sold to the Hon. William Lowther, and in 1913 the remainder was broken

¹ He is usually described as the builder of Colby Hall (Whaley, Ashbrig, p. 50), but the Hall was built in 1633 when he was only 19 (Dugdale, Visitatiion, Surtees Soc., xxxvi, 47). It seems more probable that it was built by his mother.

² He may have been, as Whaley says (Ashbrig, p. 50), of the family of Smith of Cams House. An Alexander Smith of Cams House was one of the Lords Trustees of the manor of Bainbridge in 1705 (ibid., p. 83).

³ Probably the Anthony Fothergill who was one of the original Lords Trustees of the manor of Bainbridge (Whaley, Ashbrig, p. 64).

⁴ N.R., i, 208.

⁵ Hist. MSS. Com. xi (House of Lords, 1678–88), App. ii, p. 299; Journals of the House of Lords, xiv, 75, 86. The final verdict, which has been overlooked by the writer in the V.C.H., is in the Journals.
up and disposed of in lots.\(^1\) The lordship of the manor is now held jointly by S. H. Willan, esquire, and C. M. Fawcett, esquire.

(ii) The Land.

The survey of 1614 is written on paper and consists of 88 folios, \(7\frac{3}{4} \times 9\frac{1}{8}\), bound in contemporary vellum. The survey itself takes up ff. 1–80, the remaining folios being either blank or covered with notes and scribbles of a later date. Originally a map accompanied the survey, upon which the holdings were marked with letters or symbols, but unfortunately the map can no longer be traced. The whole was apparently the work of Samuel Peirse of Maidstone in Kent. The surveyor’s county of origin has left its mark on the survey, for all the land measurements are given in acres, roods, day’s works and perches. The day’s work was “the smallest Kentish unit of superficial land measure”\(^2\) and was equal to four perches.\(^3\) Its appearance in the survey suggests that attention should be paid to the county of origin of surveyors before using land measures as evidence of a particular field system.\(^4\) Peirse’s arithmetic was not infallible, and a succession of minor errors in addition seems to justify the giving of two sets of figures, one obtained by adding particular items, the other comprising the surveyor’s totals. The following two tables summarize the area and yearly value of the manor as revealed by the survey. The discrepancy between the value and the rent was probably covered by the fines, but there is no evidence in the survey itself of the value of such fines.

The manor was a well-defined area bounded on the east by Merbeck,\(^5\) on the west by Hell Gill Beck, on the south by the Ure, and on the north, as a deponent\(^6\) picturesquely described it, “as heaven water deales and divides the commons moores and waste from Swaledale,” or more prosaically, by the watershed of

---

\(^1\) V.C.H., N.R., i, 208. A schedule of the 1913 sale is in my possession.


\(^4\) Gray, for example, says (op. cit.) that the appearance outside Kent of the sulung, the iugum and the day’s work “will suggest the Kentish system.” He admits that this “is less true of the day’s work,” but pays no attention to the question of where the surveyor using the terms came from.

\(^5\) Merbeck or Meer Beck—i.e. ‘boundary beck’—is near the site of Fors abbey.

\(^6\) John Lambert in 1607 (Exch. Dep., 5 Jas. I, Mich. no. 8).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Meadow and Pasture</th>
<th>Value per annum</th>
<th>Rent per annum</th>
<th>Cowpasture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>B&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>A&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>B&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Grange</td>
<td>220 0 8</td>
<td>220 0 9</td>
<td>121 3 12</td>
<td>121 9 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helm</td>
<td>150 2 18</td>
<td>163 2 18</td>
<td>40 4 8</td>
<td>40 4 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skelgill</td>
<td>70 2 17</td>
<td>79 1 37</td>
<td>38 7 9</td>
<td>37 8 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorescot</td>
<td>47 2 30</td>
<td>46 3 18</td>
<td>24 12 7</td>
<td>24 13 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockcullot</td>
<td>70 2 17</td>
<td>79 1 37</td>
<td>38 7 9</td>
<td>37 8 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaweate</td>
<td>101 1 30</td>
<td>100 3 30</td>
<td>44 15 0</td>
<td>45 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam's House</td>
<td>281 0 32</td>
<td>281 2 32</td>
<td>92 13 6</td>
<td>92 13 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litherskew</td>
<td>280 0 33</td>
<td>280 2 23</td>
<td>92 13 6</td>
<td>92 13 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedbusk</td>
<td>163 1 6</td>
<td>163 2 17</td>
<td>88 1 8</td>
<td>87 18 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simonstone</td>
<td>229 2 26</td>
<td>229 1 14</td>
<td>93 1 7</td>
<td>93 0 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handrow</td>
<td>235 3 3</td>
<td>235 3 35</td>
<td>82 10 2</td>
<td>82 10 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossedale</td>
<td>528 0 23</td>
<td>528 0 23</td>
<td>41 6 2</td>
<td>41 6 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhouse...</td>
<td>114 1 8</td>
<td>114 1 8</td>
<td>26 0 8</td>
<td>25 2 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riggs Close</td>
<td>20 1 2</td>
<td>20 1 2</td>
<td>3 6 7</td>
<td>3 7 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotterdale...</td>
<td>375 2 38</td>
<td>375 3 38</td>
<td>97 18 10</td>
<td>98 0 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotterend...</td>
<td>820 1 30</td>
<td>820 1 30</td>
<td>25 17 6</td>
<td>25 17 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunds...</td>
<td>764 0 38</td>
<td>764 0 34</td>
<td>88 8 5</td>
<td>88 12 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargill Park</td>
<td>496 1 20</td>
<td>496 1 20</td>
<td>25 0 0</td>
<td>25 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stags Fell...</td>
<td>9422 0 0</td>
<td>9422 0 0</td>
<td>167 0 8</td>
<td>167 0 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals...</td>
<td>14502 1 18</td>
<td>14508 1 35</td>
<td>1290 12 03</td>
<td>1292 2 53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 These are the figures obtained by the addition of particulars.  
2 These are the figures given by the surveyor.  
3 Including Cotterdale Banks.  
4 Including £5 for Cotterdale Banks.  
5 Excluding Cotterdale Banks.
Table II.

Summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>r.</th>
<th>p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houses and premises</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow</td>
<td></td>
<td>228</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow and pasture</td>
<td></td>
<td>4329</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargill Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>496</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowpastures</td>
<td></td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stags Fell</td>
<td></td>
<td>9422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10407</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stags Fell. Outside these well-defined natural boundaries were the cottages in Askrigg, which were included in the survey but were "no parte of the landes of the Abby of Jarvax," and some land in Lunds, including part of the cowpasture. The monks of Jervaulx had also had rights of pasture south of the Ure granted to them by Conan, duke of Brittany and earl of Richmond, in the twelfth century, and confirmed by Ranulph son of Robert in 1218. In the sixteenth century the abbot had paid £6 per annum and the tenants £10 for an agiment south of the river. Towards the £10 the tenants of Thwaite in Swaledale had paid 6s. 8d. "for the pasture of their cattell when they come on the Fell." None of these rights of pasture is mentioned in the survey and it is possible that they lapsed in the course of the sixteenth century.

There is one preliminary problem concerning the manor and the survey which requires at least an attempted solution. It is the problem whether all the land within the boundaries given above was included in the survey. It can only be solved by comparing the area of land included in the survey with the total area of land within the rough rectangle formed by the boundaries.

---

1 Including two gardens valued separately.
2 Survey, f. 77.
3 Ibid., f. 67, 67a.
4 Early Yorkshire Charters, IV (Honour of Richmond, Pt. I), p. 64.
5 Feet of Fines, 1218–31, ed. J. Parker, Y.A.S. Record Series, lxii, 2–3. Ranulph, lord of Middelham, was hereditary forester of Wensleydale.
6 Exch. Dep., 15 Eliz., Enst. no. 4.
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This rough rectangle became later the townships of Low and High Abbotside, the former comprising Dale Grange, Helm, Skelgill, Brockillcote and Shawcote, the latter comprising the area from Cams House to Lunds. Low Abbotside had an area of 4,738 acres, of which 2,722 were unenclosed moor. Thus the enclosed portion comprised 2,016 acres, and this included Sargill Park. The area of this enclosed portion which is included in the survey was 1,974 acres 3 roods 3 perches. Thus as regards the eastern end of the manor, which later became the township of Low Abbotside, the survey comprises practically all the enclosed land. The township of High Abbotside had an area of 13,229 acres, of which 6,900 acres were open moor. The enclosed land therefore comprised 6,329 acres, but the enclosed land, including the cowpastures, comprised within this area and given in the survey consisted of only 5,010 acres 1 rood 3 perches. Thus some 1,310 acres of enclosed land in the area of the later township of High Abbotside were apparently not included in the survey. This discrepancy cannot be accounted for by a difference in the size between the acre of 1614 and the acre of the nineteenth century, for they seem to have comprised the same area. Nor can it be accounted for by a difference between the boundaries of the townships and the boundaries of the area within which the manor lay. These boundaries were the same on the east, south and west. The northern boundary is vague, but that is scarcely important, as it affects only the area of moorland and not of enclosed land. Nor can the discrepancy be accounted for by later enclosure of moorland, which would have helped to swell the nineteenth-century total of 6,329 acres. It would seem, therefore, that some 1,300 acres of enclosed land in what was later the township of High Abbotside were not included in the survey. If they were

1 Bulmer’s History and Directory of North Yorkshire (1800), p. 338; Whaley, Ashrigg, p. 43. The Broderick valuation gives the total as 4,738 acres 1r. 11p., of which 1,986a. 1r. 11p. were enclosed, and shows that the enclosed included Sargill Park, which had been divided into allotments.

2 I.e., Sargill Park 496a. 1r. 20p., cowpastures 707a. 2r. 24p., land held in severalty 770a. 2r. 30p.

3 Bulmer’s History and Directory of N.Y. (1806), pp. 334–36. The Broderick valuation gives the total as 13,229a. 2r. 34p., of which 6,249a. 2r. 23p. were enclosed.

4 I.e., cowpastures 1,197a. 4p., land held in severalty 3,813a. 39p.

5 This is shown by the maps of the Broderick valuation, but there may have been some small enclosures of moorland between 1614 and 1872. The nineteenth-century total for moorland, 9,422 acres, compares fairly closely with the 0,422 acres (Stags Fell) of the survey.
part of the manor of Wensleydale they must have been held in freehold, which seems the most reasonable explanation.

The general lay-out of the manor and the type of agriculture employed are fairly clear from the survey. It was a pastoral manor with no arable land, and it was enclosed, only the moor and the cowpastures being held in common, and the latter were "for the most parte enclosed too." Thus there is no question of open field cultivation, of scattered strips, or of two- or three-field systems. Thus, perhaps, there is no need for controversy. All the land outside the moor and the cowpastures was described as meadow and pasture. It is often impossible to distinguish the two, but the following table shows what were probably their relative values, the meadow being, as might be expected, much the more valuable of the two.

**Table III.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Value Per Annum (excluding Stags Fell)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meadow</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>105 9 7 9s. 2½d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow &amp; pasture</td>
<td>4826</td>
<td>802 16 11½ 3s. 4d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is little evidence of even former arable land. It is true that George Cole had his mill at Hardrow at which the tenants had to grind their corn, but the corn must have come from outside the manor, probably from lower down the dale. Only in a few field-names, 'Stubledayle' and Reaper's close at Sedbusk and corn closes at Dale Grange, Sedbusk, LITHERSKIL and Cams House, is there an echo of former arable cultivation.

In such a manor, rights of common were obviously important. On the Out Moor, which lay on Stags Fell, all tenants had "common of pasture as appertinent to their Tenements without stinte or rate," and there, too, they had rights of common of turbary. Before the dissolution the abbot had depasturage at 'Came' (? Cams House) for "a great flocke of weathers" which were

1 Survey, f. 79.
2 Part of Cotterend, equal in value to Stags Fell.
3 Survey, f. 88. The abbots of Jervaulx had had pasture for their sheep there (Exch. Dep., 15 Eliz., East. no. 4).
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wintered at Simonstone. Cattle from the abbey had also mixed with those of the tenants in Sargill Park, Spen and Abbots Close, “wherin hay was gotten for the cattell and shepe of the Abbey.”1 By 1614 Abbots Close was no longer held in common.2 The abbot had also had pasturage for a “stone horse and certen mares” in Cotterdale Bank and for “two stoned horses and certen amblinge mares” in “a place called Rigge under Cotterend,” and here all the tenants’ cattle had pasturage.3 By the time of the survey the common pasturage for cattle was well defined in the stinted cowpastures. Various places had no cowpastures. This is true of Yorescot (which is rather surprisingly given as all meadow), of Liverskew, Abbots Close, Forsdale, Newhouses, Riggs Close and Thwaiate. Yorescot, Abbots Close and Thwaiate were single holdings, the last being very large with presumably enough pasture of its own. Newhouses, Riggs Close and Forsdale consisted of two holdings each. One tenant of Newhouses had six cattlegates in Simonstone pasture,4 and Charles Atkinson of Forsdale had gates in Hardrow and Simonstone pastures.5 At Liverskew it is possible that the cowpasture had been divided up even by 1614, for three tenants held parts of Liverskew Slights,6 which may at one time have been a common pasture. Similarly at Shaw-cote the Little Cow Close, which had once been a cowpasture, was in 1614 divided into four parts, which were no longer held in common.7 At Cams House, too, where the cowpasture was only 52 acres 39 perches in extent, earlier cowpastures appear to have been divided out.8 The following table summarizes the number and value of the cattlegates. They seem to have varied in value not in accordance with the relation between the size of the pasture and the number of gates, but according to the fertility of the land.

The fact that the manor was enclosed by 1614 suggests some inquiry into when it was enclosed. Unfortunately there is not much evidence in the survey or elsewhere of recent enclosure. It seems fairly clear, however, that considerable enclosure was going on in the sixteenth century. In 1573 it was said that the late

1 Exch. Dep., 15 Eliz., East. no. 4.
2 Survey, f. 46d.
3 Exch. Dep., 15 Eliz., East. no. 4.
4 Survey, ff. 73d, 74d.
5 Ibid, ff. 30d–31d.
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Table IV. Cattlegates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pasture</th>
<th>Number of cattlegates</th>
<th>@</th>
<th>Value £ s. d.</th>
<th>Area of pasture acres r. p.</th>
<th>Acres per gate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spen and Grange Gill</td>
<td>28½ [28½ ?]³</td>
<td>0/</td>
<td>8 9 0</td>
<td>51 1 24</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helm Pasture</td>
<td>32½</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>5 9 2</td>
<td>124 0 20</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cote Moor and Little Fell Meaves</td>
<td>218½ [218½ ?]</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>25 8 11½</td>
<td>522 0 20</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cams House</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>11 1 6</td>
<td>52 0 36</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedbusk Slight</td>
<td>70 [70½ ?]</td>
<td>6/8</td>
<td>23 6 8</td>
<td>128 0 20</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedbusk Upper Pasture</td>
<td>52 [48½ ?]</td>
<td>3/–</td>
<td>7 16 0</td>
<td>141 0 20</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simonstone</td>
<td>100 [100½ ?]</td>
<td>6/–</td>
<td>30 0 0</td>
<td>254 1 0</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardrow Slight</td>
<td>35½ [34½ ?]</td>
<td>10/–</td>
<td>17 13 4</td>
<td>61 3 20</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotterdale</td>
<td>82½</td>
<td>5/–</td>
<td>20 12 6</td>
<td>468 3 0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunds</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4/–</td>
<td>5 12 0</td>
<td>90 2 28</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 667½                     | 4/4 Average          | 145 10 1½     | 1904 2 28                | 3.9            |

The abbot had made some enclosures at Dale Grange, Litherskew, Sedbusk, Simonstone, and Hardrow. At Hardrow he had enclosed Broad Carr, which in the survey (f. 48) is given as containing 25 acres 2 roods 3 perches. A deponent, William Metcalfe, in the same year declared that Lord William Conyers, "called lame Conyers," Steward of Middleham, had appointed a parcel of common to be enclosed "for their (i.e. the tenants') commodities," and the abbot also appointed a parcel "of livij yeres sinz for it was shortlie after Floden feld where the tenants had lost all their horses." The abbot had also taken off the common a piece of ground called "Ryggge fote and Cotterfosse," and by appointment of Conyers the tenants had taken a parcel of the said common "unto their commodities." The abbot had also begun to enclose a piece of ground called 'Jeprake' (?), but the steward and tenants of certain of the grounds "would not suffer the same to proceed, but cast downe that which was begun and so it was not inclosed." Metcalfe "being yonge was present at the castinge downe thereof," which was about 50 years since

³ The queried figures are those obtained by an addition of particulars.

² It is possible that more gates were held by freeholders within the manor.
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(i.e. about 1523). Some thirty years later, in 1607, another deponent, John Lambert, declared that there had been improvements "taken of the commons and moorcs" and that divers houses had been built on the commons by the tenants of the late Countess. There is little reflection of this in the survey, which does, however, record two houses in Cotterdale "lately erected upon the Out Moore." Two other houses, one in Skellig and one at Hardraw, were also "lately erected." In two cases houses had been divided into two, and in a third case a turthouse had been converted into a dwelling-house. These changes may mean little, and on the wider question of enclosure the survey is silent.

The holdings of which the manor was composed varied greatly in size, as the following table shows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Holding</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Total Area of Class acres</th>
<th>r. p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 100 acres</td>
<td></td>
<td>2054</td>
<td>3 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 acres and over but under 100</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>1 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 .. .. .. 50</td>
<td></td>
<td>401</td>
<td>2 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 .. .. .. 40</td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 .. .. .. 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>329</td>
<td>3 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 .. .. .. 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 .. .. .. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>235</td>
<td>2 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 .. .. .. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 acre .. .. .. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 1 acre</td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total .. .. ..</td>
<td></td>
<td>4543</td>
<td>3 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Exch. Dep., 15 Eliz., East. no. 4.
3 Survey, ff. 57d, 60d.
4 Ibid., ff. 13, 51.
5 Ibid., ff. 41, 58d.
6 Ibid., f. 53.
7 Not including Stags Fell or Sargill Park.
8 The queries are due to the uncertainty whether "the widdowe of Edward Guy" of Dale Grange was the same person as Widow Guy of Brockbecute. The queried figures are based on the assumption that they were one and the same person.
9 Includes 13 cottages in Askirigg.
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Omitting holdings of under one acre, which were actually houses or cottages without land, simple division reveals that fictitious entity, the average farm, as comprising 43 acres. The range in size of the farms was very great—from just over one acre, if such can be dignified with the name of farm, to just over 800 acres. It is some indication of large-scale farming that 45% of the land (omitting Stags Fell, Sargill Park and the cow pastures) was occupied by only six farms. The farms themselves seem to have had an appearance similar to the present day, with the garths and closes round the house and the barns in the fields. Many had turf-houses for peat and the large number of gardens is rather noteworthy. Ten houses had no gardens, sixty-two had one garden each, twenty-five had two gardens each, six had three each, four had ‘ several,’ and one house had four gardens.

In the course of the next three centuries the land and its uses do not seem to have altered much. There is a continuity in agrarian history which is too often ignored. Parts of England may have experienced an agrarian revolution, but there seems to have been nothing revolutionary in the changes which took place on enclosed pastoral manors. Changes there were, in the case of the manor of Wensleydale, both in ownership and structure. The estate changed hands and was finally divided up, in this assisting in the emergence of the twentieth-century yeoman. In the nineteenth century the cow pastures were divided and allotted among the owners of cattlegates, but this occasioned no upheaval comparable to the enclosure of open arable field manors. Similarly the “several moors, commons and waste lands” over which the tenants had rights of common were converted into stinted pasture. Some 8,000 sheep-gates were created and distributed among the holdings. Communal shepherds are still kept to look after the ‘gated’ sheep on the fells. Holdings have decayed and many of the farm-houses of the survey are in ruins or have become barns or have disappeared altogether. Such changes, spread over three hundred years, are as inevitable as they are evolutionary. The fields, and with them the field-names, remain—bound, as it were for ever, within their grey stone walls.

In May 1751 Dr. Richard Pococke travelled up Wensleydale, “generally esteem’d one of the most beautiful spots in the world.”

Not counting the Askrigg cottages.