Stallingborough — Earthwork Survey

Paul Everson

The village of Stallingborough lies five miles (8 km) north-west of Grimsby in modern South Humberside, formerly Lincolnshire. Its large parish lies on chalky boulder clay for its western half, while eastwards the former salt marshes stretch for some four kilometres to the Humber bank. The village is situated at the junction of these two soils, its western parts generally just above the 25 feet OD contour. The shape of the modern village is notable, with the parish church of SS Peter and Paul standing almost isolated on a marked hill (over 25 feet OD) at the north-west, a block of village properties south-east of it along Church Lane (now being infilled by modern building), and an elongated strip of properties stretching away over a kilometre eastwards along a single street, Station Road, to and beyond the railway station (Fig. 1). Indeed, at first sight this last element looks to be a creation of the advent of the railway, but that proves not to be the case.

The fields around the church, and particularly those to the south and south-west were formerly full of earthworks, covering at least seventy acres (28.5 ha). They were recognised as long ago as 1929 as archaeologically significant and likely to be medieval village remains. Minor disturbances from time to time have produced medieval and post-medieval finds. The whole of the western field was levelled and brought into arable cultivation in the spring of 1978: the sketch plot of the earthworks (Fig. 2) is based upon excellent aerial photographs taken before that happened. The surviving earthworks around and to the south of the church were surveyed in autumn 1978, after they had been recently rotary-rotivated, at a time when there seemed a real danger of their being levelled and ploughed in the short term and built upon by a roadway and housing thereafter (Fig. 3). The combination of evidence allows rather more to be understood of the detail of the medieval village plan, and raises questions about the significance of the overall layout of Stallingborough, whose total settlement area covers an estimated 100 ha or more. This is an exceptional size even by Lincolnshire standards.

THE EARTHWORKS

The earthworks surveyed and sketch plotted fall into two easily distinguishable principal categories. The majority are medieval and later village remains; these are generally of rather slight (less than one metre) elevation, but overall form a coherent pattern of streets, house sites and closes. Immediately to the west and north of the church, the earthworks are of a much larger size, up to two metres in elevation, and more amorphous configuration; these are the remains of a post-medieval manor house (or houses) of aristocratic pretensions and an extensive formal garden layout.

Village Remains (Fig. 3)

The village remains that were surveyed as earthworks
comprised the usual sorts of holloways of streets and property divisions, which divide the village into approximately rectangular and relatively raised platforms characteristic of medieval village sites. At several points, the main earthwork streets appear to continue the line of the roads of the modern village. In particular, a marked holloway (a-b) some 18 m broad at its western end, though narrower and perhaps partially disturbed at the east, continues the line of Pinfold Lane westwards. It formerly continued across the field west again (Fig. 2) as a broad holloway of similar dimensions, and its alignment throughout is perpetuated in a public footpath shown on printed Ordnance Survey sheets. At b, a further main holloway goes off northwards at right angles. Only the eastern side of it lay in the surveyed area, but the western side appears clearly on aerial photographs (Fig. 2) and indicates a width of approximately 20 m and more. At c, a holloway (c-d) swings off north-east, narrowing up the slope to the church. A second branch may formerly have continued north to link up with both the more northerly holloway in the field to the west (Fig. 2) and an established footpath leading west to Little London. The earthworks in this area are obscured by dumped material from dyke cleaning and perhaps by the later remains associated with the manor house. A further street (d-c) runs eastward at right angles to b-c to join the line of Church Lane as it turns along the south side of the former rectory (see also Appendix below).

Both the main east-west street (a-b and its continuation into the field to the west) and the main north-south street (b-c and Fig. 3) are clearly lined on both sides with house sites. At g, h, j, k, the remains of buildings are visible, and in the latter two cases at least foundations presumably of the principal domestic buildings indicate structures of approximately 17 by 6.5 m with an internal division into two rooms. At g and h, brick has been turned up in rotovating, and it seems possible that all of these are post-medieval or rather early modern buildings. Buildings on the west side of b-c appear to have survived into the eighteenth century, if not later. The streets d-e and c-f, too, have properties flanking them but no similar obvious house foundations. Many of the building platforms contain substantial ponds or depressions; while some are obviously post-desertion cattle ponds, others that are more shallow may be the visible traces of crew-yards like those encountered on other midland clayland sites. In the field to the west, collection of pottery and other finds after levelling and ploughing revealed a concentration in just those areas, namely the east and south of the field, where house sites are indicated on aerial photographs. Four house sites, groups of house sites or farm complexes were identified (Fig. 2, 1-4). Sites 1-3 produced both medieval and post-medieval pottery together with building debris in the form of padstones, limestone and chalk rubble, flints and cobbles, brick and roof tile. Site 4 produced only medieval pottery, with cobbles and clay areas. The earliest pottery recovered comprises one or two late Saxon or Saxo-Norman cooking pots with shoulder rouletting from site 1 and twelfth-century forms from all four sites. The post-medieval pottery includes seventeenth and eighteenth century material in some quantity, including Staffordshire slipware.\(^\text{1}\)

Rectangular closes on the periphery of the earthworks contain traces of ridge-and-furrow. It is particularly clear to the south that these mark land being taken out of arable use. In the ploughed field to the west, it is possible that the opposite process, converting former occupation closes to cultivation, took place at some stage.
Fig. 3 Stafflingborough: measured survey of earthworks.
Manor House and Formal Gardens

Immediately west of the church and sharing its elevated location stood the principal manor house of the village. Its site is marked by a substantial east-west north facing scarpe (1 - n) up to two metres in height, that artificially improves the natural topography. On the west end of this terrace a massive rectangular depression (p), approximately 35 by 20 metres and orientated north-south, indicates a cellared west wing of a grand house. Limited excavation has shown this to have brick wall footings with stone dressings and to be accompanied by substantial brick culverts from which large quantities of eighteenth-century finds, predominantly bottles, have been recovered. Further unevenness to the east on the terrace, though too smoothed out by the use of a modern grave yard extension to be plotted, indicates the full extent of the house. On the lower ground to the north and north-east of the house lay formal gardens. Though they formerly occupied an area of approximately 320 metres east-west by 80 metres north-south, the railway and modern ploughing have destroyed the greater part and only on their southern fringe do earthworks traces remain. These comprise principally two long ponds (n and o) at right angles to either end of the house terrace, that may have been ornamental ponds in the garden layout, and an irregular curving hollow up to two metres deep and six wide to the east, that appears to be a boundary feature. Some further details of the internal layout of the gardens may be gleaned from soil-marks on vertical aerial photographs, in particular a system of ornamental ponds and channels corresponding to those shown on the two mid nineteenth century diagrams of the gardens (Figs 4 and 5, and see below).

DISCUSSION

The Village: (a) Desertion

Stallingborough appears as a large village from as early in the middle ages as a reliable index exists. In the Domesday Survey its recorded population of 47 is the third largest in Yarborough wapentake, and indeed of all settlements in modern South Humberside, after only Barton and Grimby. Domesday, too, records three post-Conquest manors there. The largest of them was held at that time by Norman de Arci, and subsequently passed through the Tailbois family to the Ayscoughs and Boucherets, whose manor house stood adjacent to the church. In the reign of Henry III Norman de Arci was granted a weekly market and annual fair for this manor, which were confirmed to Sir William Ayscough by letters patent of Henry VIII in 1529. The subsidy rolls of 1327-8 and 1332-3 both record 38 taxpayers, who paid 109s. 11d. and £7 0s. 7d. on the respective occasions. This may indicate a total population of perhaps 50 or 60 households: certainly there was no fall from the eleventh century. In the 1334 lay subsidy, Stallingborough's assessment was £8 8s. 1d., nearly twice (actually 172%) the average of £4 17s. 11d. for Yarborough wapentake. This was on a par with the similarly large neighbouring parishes of East Halton, Goxhill, Killingholme and Barrow on Humber, but only approximately half the assessment of Barton. The poll tax return of 1377 does not survive, but there is evidence from the later fourteenth and fifteenth century reliefs of the serious impact of the Black Death and of Stallingborough's gradual recovery from its effects. In 1352 relief of 118s. 8d. was allowed, or 70.6% of the figure of 1334. There were at least ten households in 1428 since Stallingborough appears without comment in the parish tax: but reliefs of 38s, 9d. (23.1%) and 30s. (17.9%) still appear in 1448 and 1463 respectively. Part of the effect of this set-back may be seen in the areas of the earthworks (for example, 4 on Fig. 2) shown by surface finds not to have been occupied after the medieval period. Other village properties round the south of the church may also have been abandoned at this time, since some of the large amorphous scoops in the earthworks in this area could possibly have been created by moving soil for the construction of the formal gardens. The early sixteenth century subsidy rolls record 72 people paying £12 19s. 8d. in 1522-3, 78 people in 1542-3, and 67 people in 1544-5. Though these figures are not in themselves reliable because of the extent of evasion that was practised, they do suggest that the 150 households recorded in the diocesan survey of 1563 was correct. By the mid sixteenth century, therefore, Stallingborough had outstripped its rural neighbours, including those that were comparable in the early fourteenth century; the average population per settlement in the wapentake in 1563 was 50 and per parish only 60. The renewed concern with market rights in 1529 may be both a factor in and a reflection of this population increase.

The only references to Stallingborough in the 1607 returns of deep population are to one John Smyth farmer of two 'howses of husbandrie' making one into a cottage, and to Thomas Tyler who stopped a highway by enclosure. Both of these are small scale matters, such as are recorded for many Lindsey villages that suffered no substantial desertion. There is evidence in the third quarter of the seventeenth century of Sir Edward Ayscough collecting cottages and land into his hands: this may be set beside his father's agreement of 12 January 1648 with his tenants for enclosing of commons. And indeed, by the first quarter of the eighteenth century the population had fallen by a fifth. In the surveys of Bishops Wake and Gibson between 1705 and 1723, the number of families is recorded first as 122 and subsequently as 'nearly 120'. But it was the next quarter of the century that saw major changes. A survey entitled 'A collection of the yards, garths, homesteads and closes being all old inclosure' lists owners and occupiers for 128 parcels in 1758. Only 67 separate occupiers are named, plus Ayscough Boucherett. Of these, 27 were freeholders or owner-occupiers. The 40 leases belonged to Boucherett, as did a further 47 leasehold closes or part-loses. The extent of Boucherett's grip on the village is readily gauged from the fact that of the 526a. 2r. 18p. total of old enclosure, he held 462a. 1r. 22p., or 88%. The enclosure of the open and common fields of the lordship took place in 1736-7, and between 1730 and 1748 there is again direct evidence of Matthew Boucherett engaging land and premises.

The process of desertion was nevertheless not sudden, but probably continued in the later eighteenth century. The 1801 census records a population for the parish of 274 in 59 houses, which may by then have been rising again from a lower point: while the final disappearance of houses shown on the undated map (1830-50; Fig. 4) may have been a case of movement, with the final removal of the big house or the rural attraction of the village nucleus along Station Road. A marked rise in population in the first half of the century was followed in the second half by little change (516 persons in 97 occupied properties in 1851, 420 persons in 93 occupied properties in 1901), and it was 1951 before the parish again boasted 150 households.

The documented settlement history is therefore remarkably complex, and Stallingborough displays a notable resilience not shared by some of its neighbours. Though the date of this later phase of desertion is clear, its causes are uncertain. It is difficult whether the chronological relationship with enclosure of the open fields is more than incidental, for there is little evidence elsewhere in northern Lincolnshire of parliamentary enclosure causing such a marked fall in population or such
a localised impact on the settlement area. The Boucherets' activities, in fact, are very similar to well documented instances elsewhere in the country of preparations for emarking, such as the well-known example at Milton Abbas in Dorset.22 The fact that it was just those areas to the south and south-west of the great house, within its view, that were affected may support this suggestion. It may be that, had the Boucherets not decided on the move to North Willingham, Stallingsborough would have not only retained a great house but also acquired a suitable parkland setting for it. And, conversely, the removal of the direct attention of a resident landlord by the completion of Willingham House in 1790, may have provided the scope for the gradual regrowth of the village thereafter.

The pottery finds into the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in the ploughed village area, and the existence of house foundations in the earthworks, presumably brick on this clay site,23 both confirm the documentary evidence for the late abandonment of the properties.

The Village: (b) Morphology

The layout of Stallingsborough (Fig. 1) demands some explanation, though to a large extent it is only a range of possibilities that can be established at present. The earthworks show a T-shaped configuration with two main streets meeting at right angles and with the church and a manor house standing at the northern end of the north-south arm. Both streets develop sections of routes of communication between the marsh-edge villages and the Humber Bank. The east-west arm might be seen as a second-order development, though still of early medieval date on the pottery evidence. Indeed, the north-south street itself could possibly be part of an expansion from an early core, since the village earthworks around the church, though much disturbed by the later grand manorial buildings, appear as rather concentric on the church in comparison with the regular rectangular tofts associated with the main streets. That this regular development might be associated with the thirteenth century grant of market rights is discussed below, as part of an alternative hypothesis that suggests the settlement had more than one early focus.

The elongated street village extending eastwards along Station Road can be seen as a unit that appears to be a planned creation. It is attached to the eastern end of Pinfold Lane, but apparently did not grow up along the footpath that continues the east west earthwork street eastwards across the marshlands, for that runs along the northern boundary of the extension. The field evidence is not clear cut. It is uncertain whether properties in Station Road overlie ridge-and-furrow. To the north, ridge-and-furrow of reversed-S form terminates on the dyke that forms the northern edge of the properties: on the south, the furrows run east-west, parallel to the street. In some closes of the extension (especially at TA 123 117 next to the railway) there are earthworks of uncertain function and date. It may be significant, however, that Station Road does not run centrally through the extension, but the properties on the south side are noticeably cramped compared with their spacious neighbours to the north. The layout may therefore have been fitted into an existing defined area, such as a block of furrows of the open field. The alignment of hedgerows at the western end may support this possibility.

Planned village extensions are known in the early medieval period.24 But here, if the population figures are any guide, the fifteenth century or early Tudor period of striking population growth might appear the most likely occasion for its creation. In support, it may be thought that practically the whole village area would have been in contemporary occupation to accommodate 150 households in 1563. It may be that it is in this extension that one should look for signs of an open area for the markets re-established in the early sixteenth century.

A further possibility is that the extension was an eighteenth-century creation, the product of population shift, and constituted effectively an estate village. Station Road clearly was not created by the advent of the railway, since it is shown fully developed on the first edition of the Ordnance Survey 1" map of 1824 and on the pre-railway tithe award of 1844. On any interpretation, there may be an element of shift in the creation of this layout.

Church Lane too marks a development in the village plan. Properties on its north side appear to overlie medieval arable lands, whose alignment is fossilised in the hedgerows. The only building of any age is Daisy Cottage (see Appendix below), evidently of early seventeenth century date.

Instead of this picture of gradual expansion, it is tempting to seek in such an extensive spread of settlement remains, that clearly has a complex development, distinct early medieval foci such as Christopher Taylor has identified elsewhere in midland England within apparently classically nucleated villages.25

At neighbouring Keelby, for example, there are at least three distinct elements within the village, whose names survive on modern printed maps as North End, South End and Church End. At Stallingsborough there might be three such elements matching the manors. One is clearly marked by the church and adjacent manor house. Two others could be the core of the ploughed earthworks of Fig. 2 (approx. TA 193115) and an area centred on Pinfold Lane (approx. TA 197115). The pulling together of these elements by two very broad streets meeting at right angles might plausibly be associated with the grant of market rights in the thirteenth century. It is noticeable that rectangular closes attached to properties fronting the T-junction appear to contain traces of the arable ploughing over which they were laid out. Alternatively, but perhaps less convincingly, the group of houses called Little London may merit attention as a possible focus; and the Station Road extension might contain within itself an earlier nucleus perhaps marked by the nineteenth century so-called Manor House, whose claim to that title and earlier history are uncertain.

The Manor House and Formal Gardens

The site of the manor house is clearly identified in the earthworks west of the church, but the visible remains relate only to the later history of the site, the houses of the Ayscough and Boucherett families.

The eminent Yorkshire family of Ayscough acquired Stallingsborough in the fifteenth century.26 Sir William Ayscough (d. 1456 and buried at Bedale, North Yorkshire) rose high in the King's service as a lawyer, and his son John married Margaret, daughter and sole heir of John Tailbois of Stallingsborough. Stallingsborough became the family's principal seat in Lincolnshire, and John's second marriage to Eleanor, daughter and heiress of Richard Tunstall, consolidated his position. A further characteristic marriage alliance by John's grandson William to Elizabeth, widow of Sir William Hansard of South Kelsey (d. 1521), brought a second major residence into the family to rival Stallingsborough.27 But the latter continued in use; among others, family and outside tradition asserted that Anne Askew (to give her conventional spelling) the martyr was born there, and of successive generations as many were baptised and buried in the church there at St Mary, South Kelsey.

At the end of the seventeenth century the male line failed with the death of Sir Edward Ayscough in 1699, and
Stallingborough passed with the marriage of the co-heiress Isabella to the Boucherett family of North Willingham. Matthew Boucherett was the descendent of a Huguenot settler and apothecary in London of the same name, who was granted naturalisation by letters patent of Lord Protector Cromwell in 1655. The Boucheretts used Stallingborough as a major residence until their new mansion, North Willingham House, was built in 1790.

Little evidence is available about the Ayscoughs' house. It is reported that, 'The old mansion of the Ayscoughs in this place was demolished about the same time as the church was rebuilt and much of the stone and timber of both structures were used for rebuilding the hall at Willingham, the present seat of the Boucheretts... the mansion stood a little way to the west of the church'.

Though substantial parts of the church, including tower and nave, fell down in 1746, it was not rebuilt in brick until 1780, so the chronology implied by this report is reasonable and a context is provided by the decision to rebuild at Willingham. It seems certain that this house stood centrally on the earthwork terrace west of the church, that is mainly under the present churchyard extension. It was evidently wholly or partly of stone. Such a position associates it with the formal garden to the north, and one might perhaps anticipate that a substantial remodelling of an earlier manor house, if not a total rebuilding, had accompanied the creation of the garden.

Any of the Ayscoughs of the latter part of the sixteenth or early seventeenth centuries are candidates for this work in respect of their social pretentions and family connections. Francis (d. 1564) was born at Stallingborough and was sheriff of Lincolnshire on three occasions; his son William (d. 1585) married Anne, daughter of Edward Clinton, earl of Lincoln; William's brother and successor, Edward (d. 1611-12) was sheriff of the county in 1587 and married Hester, daughter of Thomas Grantham of Goltho, whose mansion was embellished with similar gardens; and his son William (d. 1610-11) married successively Elizabeth, daughter of Thomas Taylor of Doddington, who was responsible for the splendid Smythsonian hall of 1595, and Katherine, daughter of William Heneage of Hainton, but died before his father. Circumstances thereby conspired to give his son Edward possession of the family property for a span of some forty years until his death in 1654, and he evidently had time, despite a busy public life, as sheriff of Lincolnshire in 1632, and MP for the city of Lincoln in 1621-2 and 1628-9, and for the county in 1640, to give attention to the management and perhaps fashionable improvement of Stallingborough (see above).

The Ayscough house acquired a west wing of rectangular plan and north-south orientation, whose cellared foundation forms such a notable feature of the earthworks (on Fig. 3, see above). This wing survived longer in use and as an abandoned shell than the earlier house, and a drawing of it by Claude Nattes in c. 1795 is preserved among the collection of Banks' drawings in Lincoln Central Library (Plate 1). The drawing shows the wing's long western elevation, comprising nine bays and two main storeys, attics, and perhaps cellared offices extending beyond the west front below the paving of a terrace. David Roberts' assessment of the building (below, Appendix) places its construction in the early years of the eighteenth century and categorises it in size and architectural pretention as a great house. Such a date fits well with the acquisition of Stallingborough by Matthew Boucherett, who, as sheriff of Lincolnshire in 1706, might be expected to up-date his
new residence with fashionable accommodation suitable to his rising aspirations in county and national society. The cost of such a display of aristocratic privilege might perhaps best be met in circumstances of the union of the revenues of two estates.

Already in c. 1795, the building was showing signs of dilapidation, though it had been deserted only since 1790, when the Ayscough Boucheretts moved to North Willingham House, which was completed that year. For example, the north-western giant urn (and perhaps one on the north-east too) was missing, and the removal of the rainwater head and downpipe to just north of the door, leaving dripping cornices at the ends, was not conducive to the survival of rendering. Yet the building survived into the nineteenth century to be remarked on by the county historians and directories in the 1830s and as late as 1842, but no longer thereafter, and there is no sign of it on either the tithe award map of 1844 or its approximate contemporary map (Figs. 4 and 5). The final demolition seems not to have had anything to do with the advent of the railway, whose proximity would have made this unacceptable as an elegant residence, or with the sale of parts of the Boucherett estate at Stallingborough, but rather, like the demolition of the Whitchotes’ great house at Harpswell in the 1830s, was the final rational sentence on a structure that had long since passed recovery.

APPENDIX

Stallingborough House
by David Roberts

The drawing by C. Nattes in the Banks’ Collection (Plate I, dated 1795 in a different hand and again on the mount) shows the western elevation of a structure that was evidently an addition to the older Ayscough manor house. It is usually referred to as ‘the west wing’.

The elevation was of nine bays and two main storeys. Four semi-circular pedimented dormers appeared over the pierced attic parapet over bays 2, 4, 6 and 8; the piercing in the parapet had three full balusters and attached half balusters to each bay of building. The roof appears to have been slated, perhaps with yarkstone cappings to hips and ridge. The roof sloped down from four stone-dressed brick stacks, of which the southernmost appears unaltered, to a parapet gutter which discharged through rainwater heads at the north and south extremes of the façade. In front of the brick west front there seems to have been a paved terrace approached by centrally placed steps. The parapet to the terrace is drawn in single point perspective on the left as a coursed wall, presumably to prevent the north wind scouring the pavement. The articulation of the ramp or handrail to the steps is poor in relationship to the parapet cap itself. The west entrance appears to be an inserted case in stone of c. 1755-60 to what was a window opening. It seems, therefore, that the terrace was original, and that both door, perron and steps were cut through older work. The unique feature of the building, for Lincolnshire, was that the basement ‘offices’ extended beyond the west front below the paving of the terrace. This basement apparently had casements with leads and bars.

The windows of the west front are of an early sash type used at Little Grimsby (c. 1700) with two nine-panel lifts to each embrasure. The dressings to the windows and detailing, quoins and cornice are in stone but the ‘apron’ below the windows appears to be in cut or moulded bricks. The giant urns, two of which survived in 1795, link the design with that of Brockley Park as first built (c. 1710), where such baroque elements define the parapet angles in an identical manner. The design appears related to a series
of houses of varying scale from that of Westborough Rectory of c. 1725 to Brocklesby and Little Grimsby. Stallingborough House is, by any standards, a great house, whose very size indicates aristocratic privilege: a date for erection c. 1705 is most likely. The terrace walk and offices below ground would tend to support such an early date.

South of the church in the drawing appears a seventeenth century two-storey house of stone with a main range probably of hall and parlour facing west. The wing extending eastwards presumably contained a kitchen, lobby entry and pantry. This house is akin to Corby Glen vicarage but of superior status, and the type of plan occurs in South Street, Bourne, after the great rebuilding following the fires of the early seventeenth century, as well as in Kingscliffe, Northants. The rather excessive design of ball finial and pedestal ornament may point to a date between 1635 and 1650, though earlier footings are possible. While this appears at first sight likely to be a clergy house, the parsonage at Stallingborough is described in 1647 as ‘built with timber and the covering of thatch, containing six bayes; the stables and outhouses containing eight bayes more, being of timber building, the walls of clay and covering of thatch’. The description is later quoted in a correspondence between the bishop of Lincoln and Messrs Boucherett and Monson in 1735-7 before enclosure. Boucherett was lessee of the glebe, and for some time before this the priest in charge had been resident at Healing, a mile off. The house may rather be the present Daisy Cottage on the east side of Church Lane, now very much altered, but of four irregular bays with formerly mullioned windows and a blocked doorway in the centre of the frontage. Date-stones of 1601 and the mid eighteenth century are visible in the south-east gable.
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FOOTNOTES

1 For the significance of the location of this and its neighbouring villages in relation to place-names and the presumed chronology of settlement foundation, see K. Cameron, Scandinavian Settlement in the Territory of the Five Boroughs, University of Nottingham Inaugural Lecture, 1965, map 8 and discussion.

2 C. W. Phillips’s note on Lincoln Museum record maps remarks ‘very broken ground here: looks like medieval work; CWP 14,viii.29’.

3 Cambridge University Collection, near verticals, K7-AB 252, 254, 256, 258, published in Stroma and Stonehouse Museum.

4 For a gazetteer of the archaeological evidence in the parish, see N. Loughlin and K. R. Miller, A Survey of Archaeological Sites in Humberside, Humberside, 1979, p.170 and plate II. The measured survey was completed with the help at different stages of B. Induni, Mrs J. R. Dock and J. Boden. We are grateful to the various landowners, and in particular Mr Strawson, for permitting access to the land.

5 I am very grateful to Mr and Mrs R. C. Russell for details of their finds, and to Mr C. Hayfield for his preliminary comments on the pottery. One hundred may be of Middle Saxon date, see Medieval Village Research Group, Twenty-sixth annual report, 1978, p.10.


7 The Lincolnshire Domesday and Lindsey Survey, ed. C. W. Foster and T. Longley, Lincoln Record Society Vol. 19, Lincoln, 1924, reprinted 1976, 2.5.7, 32/1. For the comparisons of size I am grateful to Mr G. S. Bryant.

8 Barne MSS, Ipswich and East Suffolk Record Office, typescript preliminary schedule, July 1953 (Lincolnshire Archives Office, MCD 104), B/1; see Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Vol. IV pt. III, 1529-30, 5815.3, and visitation of 1 August 1536 to Archdeacon de Areli [sic] a market and fair at this manor of Stallingby, Lincoln. The original appears not to survive among the Charter Rolls.


11 P.R.O., information taken from the records of the Medieval Village Research Group. See Martin Boucherett, The Lost Villages of England, Lincoln, 1954, pp. 158-166 for the broad area and use of these fourteenth and fifteenth century sources.


13 I owe this suggestion to discussion with Dr B. K. Roberts.


16 British Library Add. MS 11574, f.89 and f.93.

17 Barne MSS, B/8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, conveyances covering the period 1656-75 and B/23/1.


19 Lincoln Central Library, Library, UP 1940, (C.P./ST/ALL 333).

20 Barne MSS, D/c/3-30 and E/c/1-7.

21 Abstract of the Answers and Returns... Census, for the years cited.


23 Mrs Russell points out that there were very few bricks on the ploughed area and that the later houses could have had stone footings. A late sixteenth or early seventeenth century timber-framed house at Godshill has stone footings, and the ruins of Thornton Abbey nearby may have provided a ready source of materials.

24 For example, B. K. Roberts, Rural Settlement in Britain, London, 1977, paperback 1979, chapter 5, summarises much recent work.


27 The site is represented by a moated enclosure, now occupied by a later building, with an octagonal tower converted for use as a dovecote and a resets gateway arch, both of ashlar and of sixteenth century date. A drawing of the principal extent exists in the Gough Collection at the Bodleian Library, Oxford.

28 The exact date of this marriage is not clear. Jean Imray has suggested 1714 or 1715, in ‘The Boucherett Family Archives’, Lincolnshire Historian, Vol. 2, no 3, 1955-6, pp. 12-23, esp. p.15: but it seems to have been before 1711, since the elder daughter, Letitia, was baptised in August that year. The deed of partition of Sir Edward Ayscough’s co-heirs is dated 18 March 1719 (Barne MS, C/4/1), and the dispute over the partition went on, to be settled only through commissioners appointed under an Act of Parliament of 1765.

29 Barne MSS A/1/1. For further, see J. F. Billing, see J. W. F. Hill, Georgian Lincoln, Cambridge, 1966, pp. 256-7, 47n.


31 Conora N. Pesner and J. Harris, The Buildings of England: Lincolnshire, Harmondsworth, 1964, p.377, which is the date of collapse as also of that of rebuilding. See Associated Architectural Societies’ Reports and Papers, Vol. 14, 1978, p.162, followed by Green’s Lincolnshire Village Notes, Lincoln Central Library, Vol. 6, p. 156. ‘Church notes from Stallingborough, Lincs.’ The Times 17 April 1971, vol. 25, April 1971, p.238, appears to confirm this in reporting that ‘the chancel and a family burying place, built not long ago, remain’. The church was restored in 1874, when work concentrated on the chancel and tower, but also altered the fenestration. Some stone presumably from the medieval church is incorporated in upper parts of Daisy Cottage in Church Lane, particularly several sections of thirteenth-century navehead decoration.

32 Respectively Lincolnshire Archives Office (subsequently L. A. O.), B75 and 80B16: both are maps of the whole parish.

33 I owe this assessment to Christopher Taylor.

34 Ordnance Survey card TF71NW 10: Cambridge University
Collection air photographs, BFH 73-4, BMB 68-70.

35 Pevsner and Harris, *Lincolnshire*, pp.515-6, pl.40b; J. Summerson, *Architecture in Britain 1530-1830*, Harmondsworth, paperback 1970, pp.72-3. It may be indicative of a period of especially intensive residential use of Stallingborough by this eldest son that all of William's five children were baptised at Stallingborough, and that when his widow married a second time in 1612, the ceremony was there too.


38 L.A.O. 2CC/32/97437, parliamentary survey, later quoted in Monson 7/10/38.