

















LANCASHIRE AND CHESHIRE,

PAST AND PRESENT.





# LANCASHIRE AND CHESHIRE,

## PAST AND PRESENT:

A HISTORY AND A DESCRIPTION OF THE

PALATINE COUNTIES OF LANCASTER AND CHESTER. FORMING THE  
NORTH-WESTERN DIVISION OF ENGLAND,

FROM THE EARLIEST AGES TO THE PRESENT TIME (1867).

By THOMAS BAINES,

MEMBER OF THE HISTORIC SOCIETY OF LANCASHIRE AND CHESHIRE, AND AUTHOR OF "THE HISTORY OF LIVERPOOL

WITH AN ACCOUNT OF THE

RISE AND PROGRESS OF MANUFACTURES AND COMMERCE, AND CIVIL AND  
MECHANICAL ENGINEERING IN THESE DISTRICTS.

By WILLIAM FAIRBAIRN, LL.D., F.R.S.

CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE INSTITUTE OF FRANCE; EX-PRESID. OF THE LITERARY AND PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF MANCHESTER,  
ETC., ETC.

WITH NUMEROUS ILLUSTRATIONS FROM ORIGINAL DRAWINGS BY H. WARREN, R.A.,  
AND A SERIES OF PORTRAITS.

VOL. I.

WILLIAM MACKENZIE, 22 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON;  
LIVERPOOL, 14 GREAT GEORGE STREET; MANCHESTER, 59 DALE STREET;  
LEEDS, 27 PARK SQUARE; CARLISLE, 3 EARL STREET.



923987

DA  
670  
L2B33  
V. 1  
pt. 2









*Engraved by Hill (by Permission) from a Photograph by Mayall.*

THE RT. HON. WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE, M.P.













Reproduced by kind permission from a photograph by Royal.


THE RIGHT HON. LORD STANLEY.











J. B. ALLEN

Z. BECKER

WILSON'S ALBANY

WILLIAM WILSON'S LITHOGRAPH COMPANY, LONDON












Figure 10.10.10


Figure 10.10.10. The bridge over the river.











J. J. King.

B. M. Brown.

THE HOUSE OF THE A. L. L.

1890-1891

WILLIAM WALKER & COMPANY, ARCHITECTS & BUILDERS











L. H. B. 1874

THE GREAT WALL OF CHINA

THE GREAT WALL OF CHINA



force established by Ranulf, earl of Chester, for the preservation of the public peace. The order is as follows:—

“For the Earl de Ferrers. The king has granted to William de Ferrers, earl of Derby, one of the heirs of Ranulf, earl of Chester, that he may have his servants, for the preserving of the peace, between the Ribble and the Mersey, as the aforesaid Ranulf, formerly earl of Chester, was accustomed to have in his time. And the sheriff of Lancashire is commanded to grant him the same liberties, and to maintain and defend the said earl, in the same, and other liberties which Earl Ranulf used to enjoy in his time.”\*

There is another order on the subject of this early local police, which is somewhat fuller and more explanatory. It is as follows:—

“The king to the sheriff of Lancashire, greeting: Seeing that we have granted, by our charter, to our beloved and faithful William de Ferrers, earl of Derby, that he and his heirs may have their servants (or others), to preserve our peace between the Ribble and the Mersey, as Ranulf, earl of Chester, formerly had (to whom we gave the lands), of which earl he is one of the heirs, we order you to maintain the earl in the said liberty, and to compel the men of that county to supply to the said servants such victuals and other things as they were accustomed to supply in the time of the said earl of Chester. So conduct yourself in this matter, that the complaints of slackness may not be repeated.

“Witness myself, at Claverdon, 9th July.—By J. Maunsell.”

The king, in the thirty-sixth year of his reign, granted to William de Ferrers a charter of free warren, for himself and his heirs, in all his demesne lands throughout his lordships in Lancashire and elsewhere. This curious and ample grant is as follows:—

“For William de Ferrers, earl of Derby. The king, &c., greeting: Know that we have granted, and by this our charter confirmed, to our beloved and faithful William de Ferrers, earl of Derby, that he may have free warren, in all the demesne lands of his manors of Liverpool, West Derby, Everton, Crosby, Wavertree, Salford, Boulton, Penelton (Pendleton), Butterlinton, Sweinhurst, Bourtonwood, and Chorley, in the county of Lancaster.”

The grant then gives similar privileges on his estates in other parts of England. After which it proceeds as follows:—

“So far only as those lands are not within the bounds of our forests; and so that no one may enter those lands, to hawk or to

\* Rot. Fin. 26 Hen. III.

take anything which pertains to warrenry, without the permission of the earl and his heirs, under penalty of ten pounds."

In addition to the charter of free warren, the king granted to William de Ferrers the right to establish a market and fair at Bolton in Lancashire, and at Hattoakes in Staffordshire.\*

The king further granted to the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, whose diocese then extended over the whole of South Lancashire, permission to establish a market and fair at Heywood (Heywode), provided that market and fair should not prove injurious to any other market and fair in the same neighbourhood.

William de Ferrers, the second earl of Derby who held the lands between the Ribble and the Mersey, died in the reign of Henry III., 1254, after a very short enjoyment of his extensive estates. "At this time," says Matthew Paris, "died the Earl de Ferrers, William, the son of William, a discreet man, skilful in the laws of the land. He, suffering from the gout in his feet from his earliest years, as his father had done, was accustomed to be carried about from place to place on a bed or litter; and one day, travelling in this manner, his bearers, carrying the litter incautiously across a bridge, threw him out. Though injured, he did not die on the spot, but never thoroughly recovered, and soon after went the way of all flesh."

Earl William was succeeded by his son Robert, then a boy about fourteen years of age, whom the king, in order to secure his great estates to the relatives of the queen, caused to be married or betrothed to his niece, a girl of seven years of age, as appears from the following extract from the Annals of Burton:—"This year Robert de Ferrers, the son of William de Ferrers, earl of Derby, a boy about eleven years of age, was married at Westminster to Maria, a girl of seven years old, the niece of the king, and the daughter of his brother (in-law) the earl of Angoulême and March."

Whilst the young earl's hand was thus disposed of, his estates, which were held and enjoyed by the king during a minority of twelve years, were treated with just as little ceremony—being granted, during his minority, to Edward the king's eldest son, who sold them to the queen and her brother, Peter of Savoy, the most greedy and rapacious of all the members of her family, who followed her to England.

\* Rot. Pat. 36 Hen. III. m. 11.



These grants are curious, as showing the manner in which the estates of the wards of the crown were treated:—

“The king has granted to Edward, his eldest son and heir, the keeping of all the lands which belonged to William de Ferrers, formerly earl of Derby, on the day on which he died, to be held to the full age of the heir of the said earl, in part payment of the deficiency in the payment of the 15,000 marks in land, which in addition to the lands given to him in England and Ireland, we then agreed to grant to him—he allowing the widow of the late earl a reasonable dower. And it is ordered to William de Wilton, that he take the allegiance of all the tenants of the said lands to the same son of the king, as keeper of the same; and that he cause a reasonable tallage to be laid on the said lands, and to be collected without delay.

“Witness—Alianora the queen, and Ric., earl of Cornwall, at Windeshores, the 15th day of April. By the queen and H. de Mara.”

In the same year Prince Edward sold to his mother, Queen Alianor, and to Peter de Savoy his uncle, for the sum of 6000 marks (fully equal to £60,000 of our money), the custody and wardship of Robert de Ferrers' estates. This large sum, and as much more as could be extracted from the estates and the tenants, had to be drawn from them in about eleven years; so that Robert, earl of Derby, on coming into possession of his estates, no doubt found them thoroughly exhausted.

The circumstances of the times in which Robert de Ferrers lived, afforded him opportunity for the gratification of every feeling of dislike which he might entertain against King Henry and his son, Prince Edward, and the adherents of the court. He obtained possession of his estates in the year 1259, at a time when the great barons of the kingdom, led by Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, were about to take up arms against King Henry III., for the purpose of putting an end to a system of rapacity and extravagance which had exhausted the kingdom; and of obtaining guarantees, by means of a parliament representing the barons, the freeholders, and the burgesses of England, against the recurrence of similar abuses. Such a parliament was actually assembled by Simon de Montfort, when the party of the barons was in the ascendant; and though it fell, with the overthrow of the barons, it was only to rise again, with all the attributes of legality, in the succeeding reign.

Robert de Ferrers, earl of Derby, plunged into this conflict almost as soon as he came into possession of his estates, but he gained neither honour nor profit from his share in these transactions. Matthew Paris, in his account of the events of the year 1263, when the war between the king and the barons broke forth with all its violence, says :—"Through this time Robert de Ferrers, earl of Derby, faithful neither to the king nor the barons, and not counted in the number of the barons, did much evil. Leading a powerful army to Worcester, he took and entered the city, and destroyed the quarter of the Jews (the moneyed capitalists of the age), at the same time plundering both priests and laymen, wasting the king's parks, and perpetrating other crimes, for which he was afterwards tried for his life, and thrown into prison in London." The result of this offensive and equivocal policy was, that Robert de Ferrers was in turn assailed by both parties. In the early part of the year, when the king had gained a great victory over the barons at Northampton, having taken the castles of Northampton and Leicester, he sent his son, Prince Edward, and a great part of his army into Derbyshire, where the prince laid waste the lands of Robert de Ferrers, and took his strong castle of Tutbury, which he rased to the ground. In the latter part of the same year, when the king and Prince Edward had been defeated by the barons, at Lewes in Sussex, Robert de Ferrers was called by Simon de Montfort and his associates, in a great assembly of the nobles held in London, to account for diverse "mischiefs and burnings of towns," which he was said to have committed both before and after the battle of Lewes. In the autumn of the same year, when the king was again triumphant, and when the power of the barons was completely broken, Robert de Ferrers was once more denounced as a traitor against the king. Rendered desperate by this fresh denunciation, the unfortunate earl raised an army, on his estates in Derbyshire, and broke out into open rebellion against the king. In this rising he was joined by Baldwin de Wake, John Dayvil, and a great number of barons and knights, who, like himself, despaired of pardon, or hoped to extort better terms from the king. The head-quarters of the army were in a great forest around Suffeld Frith, near Chesterfield in Derbyshire. A strong body of nobles and knights, sent against them by the king, under the command of his nephew, Prince Henry, surprised Robert de Ferrers and his army in the town of Chesterfield, on Whitsun eve, and

after a sharp fight, killed or captured the greater part of them. The earl escaped from the field of battle, and took refuge in a church. There he was discovered and betrayed by a woman. Being taken, he was immediately sent off to Windsor castle, where he was long imprisoned.

The defeat of the barons and of Robert de Ferrers caused both the earldom of Chester and the honour of Lancaster to pass into other hands. Simon de Montfort, who had caused himself to be made earl of Chester after the battle of Lewes, was killed at the battle of Evesham. At his death the earldom of Chester reverted to the king. At the same time, Simon de Montfort's earldom of Leicester was given to Edmund Plantagenet, the king's second son; and the earldom of Derby, with all the immense estates of the de Ferrers family in Derbyshire, Staffordshire, and Lancashire, were also given to him. This same Edmund soon after received the formal title of Earl of Lancaster, and became the founder of that great House of Lancaster, whose wealth and power soon rivalled those of the kings of England, and enabled them at last to seize upon the throne itself.

On the 24th of August, 1266, after the death of Simon de Montfort, and the defeat and capture of Robert de Ferrers, the king held a parliament of his nobles at Kenilworth Castle, then one of the strongest castles in the kingdom, and which had just surrendered, after a long and obstinate siege. On that occasion was signed the dictum or decree of Kenilworth, which assigned different degrees of punishment to the barons who had been in arms against the king. The less formidable of the number were allowed to redeem their estates by paying moderate fines. With regard to Robert de Ferrers, the dictum of Kenilworth imposed on him a fine equal to seven years' rents of his estates. That decree further declared, that if the parties thus fined did not pay the penalties imposed upon them, within periods of two, five, and seven years, as fixed in the dictum, their lands should remain in the hands of those to whom the king had given them. The lands of Robert de Ferrers, as already mentioned, were granted by the king to his own son Edmund Plantagenet, whom he soon after created Earl of Lancaster; and Robert de Ferrers having failed to redeem them, they were soon after granted to Earl Edmund and his heirs, along with the estates of the deceased earl of Leicester.

The following are copies and extracts of some of the deeds by

which the estates of Robert de Ferrers were transferred to Edmund Plantagenet, earl of Lancaster :—

“Charter respecting the lands and tenements which were formerly of R. de Ferrers, earl of Derby.

“Henry, by the grace of God, king of England, &c.—Know that we have given, granted, and by this our charter confirm to Edmund our dearest son, the castles and all the lands, with their appurtenances, which were formerly held by Rob. de Ferrers, late earl of Derby, who took part with Simon de Montfort, formerly earl of Leicester, an enemy and traitor, in enterprises in the war which was recently carried on in our kingdom, by the said Simon, to destroy and deprive us of our crown; and which lands of the said rebels and enemies have been declared forfeited by the common consent and counsel of our nobles and faithful subjects,” &c.\*

On the same day by letters patent, the king commanded the lands and castles of Robert de Ferrers to be delivered to his son, Edmund :—

“For Edmund, the king’s son: The king to all greeting, &c. Know that of our especial favour, we have granted to our dearest son Edmund, all the goods and chattels which belonged to Robert de Ferrers, earl of Derby, on the day of the battle at Chesterfield, so that he may answer to us for the same at our command. Witness the king, at Kenilworth, the 28th day of June. And it is commanded to Adam de Gesemuth, the keeper of the lands of the said Robert, that the said goods and chattels be delivered to him as commanded.”

On the 11th July following, the king issued an order to his niece Maria, countess of Derby, commanding her to deliver up the castle of Liverpool, part of the possessions of her unfortunate husband, to Adam de Gesemuth :—

“On delivering up the castle: The king to his beloved niece, Maria de Ferrers, countess of Derby, greeting—As we have committed to our beloved and faithful Adam de Gesemuth, the castles and all the tenements of Robert de Ferrers, earl of Derby, to be kept, so that he may render account of them to us, we command you, that you deliver up the castle of Liverpool to the said Adam, or to William Syleby, on his presenting these letters to you.—Witness the king, at Kenilworth, the 11th day of July.”

On the 5th and 15th of August, in the same year, the king

\* Rot. Chart. 50 Hen. III.



issued two other decrees with regard to the estates of Robert de Ferrers; by the first of which he granted those estates to his son Edmund, to be held as long as the king pleased; and by the second, to be held by him and his heirs for ever. The first of these is as follows:—

“For Edmund, the king’s son: The king to all, &c., greeting— Know that we have granted to our dearest son, Edmund, all the lands and tenements of Robert de Ferrers, with their appurtenances, to be held as long as seems good to us.—Witness the king, at Kenilworth, the 5th August.

In addition to the extensive estates of Robert de Ferrers, earl of Derby, in South Lancashire and Derbyshire, and those of Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, in other parts of the kingdom, Edmund Plantagenet received from his father a grant of the earldom and honour of Lancaster, with the castle of Lancaster and the ancient possessions of the honour in North Lancashire.\* He thus became the founder of the great, aspiring, and ultimately royal house of Lancaster. This he still further enriched by his marriage with Avelina de Fortibus, the heiress of the earls of Albemarle, with whom he obtained great possessions in Yorkshire.

Edmund, the first earl of Lancaster of the Plantagenet family, retained the earldom to the year 1296, when he died at Bayonne, in command of one of the armies of his brother, Edward I.

Thomas, the second earl of Lancaster of that family, succeeded to the earldom on the death of his father, and added immensely to the wealth and power of the house of Lancaster, by his marriage with Alicia de Lacy, the only child and sole heiress of Henry de Lacy, constable of Chester and earl of Lincoln, and of Margaret d’Espee his wife, who was countess of Salisbury in her own right. By this marriage, and his paternal inheritance, the income of the earl of Lancaster was raised to more than £110,000 a year of present money, independent of receipts in kind and feudal services. He was able to raise an army of 20,000 men more than once, besides garrisoning his Lancashire castles of Lancaster, Clitheroe, and Liverpool; the castle of Halton in Cheshire; those of Pontefract, Driffild, and Tickhill in Yorkshire; Tutbury in Staffordshire; Kenilworth in Warwickshire; Leicester, Norwich, Reigate, and several other places, in the West of England. Strong feelings of rivalry and hatred existed between himself and his royal cousin

\* Rot. Cart. 51 Henry III. 1267.

Edward II., which ultimately led to the destruction of both of them.

In the several conflicts of that turbulent time the earl of Lancaster placed himself at the head of the ancient nobility of the kingdom, and in deadly hostility to Piers de Gaveston, and other unworthy favourites of the king. In the earlier conflicts the king was compelled to give way; and was unable to save his favourite Piers de Gaveston from the block. It was in the neighbourhood of Kenilworth castle, the powerful fortress of the earl of Lancaster, that Gaveston was put to death by his enemies.

The murder of Piers de Gaveston gave rise to feelings of the most deadly hatred between the king and the earl of Lancaster, which did not cease to rage until they had both perished by violent deaths. Every year afforded evidence of the malignant feelings with which they regarded each other.

In the year 1317 the Countess Alice, of Lancaster, eloped from her husband, with a lover to whom she had been attached previous to her marriage with the earl of Lancaster. She was taken by him to the castle of Reigate; and then her lover, with her assent, claimed her as his wife, pleading a contract of marriage with him prior to the marriage with the earl, and an actual cohabitation. He even went so far as to bring an action in the king's court at Westminster, demanding in her right the earldoms of Lincoln and Salisbury, of which she was heiress. The earl of Lancaster, suspecting the king to be a party to the plot against his honour and fortune, after demanding satisfaction in vain, assembled an army of 18,000 men, and compelled the surrender of his wife. By the interference of the papal legate another hollow reconciliation was effected, at a conference held at Leicester; after which the king and the earl proceeded to plot each other's destruction with redoubled fury.

The next few years were spent in intrigues and machinations, and in the year 1322 open war broke out between the king and the earl, the latter of whom was supported by a powerful confederacy of barons, hostile to the Despencers, who had taken the place of Piers de Gaveston as favourites of the king. At the commencement of the campaign the earl of Hereford, the head of the great house of Bohun, who was one of the allies of the house of Lancaster, laid siege to the strong castle of Tickhill, on the borders of Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire. The king having also a powerful

party amongst the barons, collected an army, and advanced to raise the siege. In the hope of resisting his advance the earl of Lancaster marched with his army to Burton-on-Trent, intending to defend the bridge across the river. This he did for three days, until the king succeeded in fording the river higher up the stream. The earl of Lancaster then advanced to give him battle; but finding that the king's army was much more powerful than his own, he retired hastily and in confusion towards Yorkshire. The earls of Kent and Surrey, the generals of the king, pursued him rapidly; cut off his communications with Pontefract castle, his chief stronghold, in the West Riding of Yorkshire; and occupied Boroughbridge, and the fords of the Eure and the Ouse, before the earls of Lancaster and Hereford could reach them. The earl of Hereford succeeded in crossing the river Ouse by a ford, but was killed before he could mount his horse, on the opposite side of the stream; and the earl of Lancaster, still more unfortunate, was driven back into Boroughbridge, where he was taken prisoner, with upwards of a hundred barons, knights, and gentlemen.

The king had now the opportunity of glutting his revenge on his most dangerous enemy; and did it without scruple or remorse. He proceeded to the earl of Lancaster's great and almost impregnable castle of Pontefract, which surrendered immediately after the capture of the earl. There he caused the earl of Lancaster to be brought before him, and after reproaching him for his perfidy, insolence, and treason, he ordered him to be tried by the earls of Kent, Richmond, Pembroke, Surrey, Arundel, Athol, and Angus. By them he was found guilty of taking arms against the king at Burton and Boroughbridge; and was condemned to be hung, drawn, and quartered as a traitor. From respect to the blood royal this sentence was changed for one of decapitation, and that sentence was immediately carried into effect. The earl was mounted on a half-starved horse, without saddle or bridle; was conveyed through the streets of Pontefract with a hood over his head, to an eminence about a mile from the town; was there compelled to stand with his face towards Scotland, with which country he was accused of having treasonable relations; and was afterwards beheaded by an executioner brought from London. Several of the knights and some of the barons whom he had led into the field were put to death shortly after, with all the penalties of high treason; but few of the Lancashire or Cheshire gentry were included in the number. Under the leader-

ship of Robert de Holland they had most of them separated themselves from the treasonable designs of their unfortunate lord ; and had refused to follow him to the field. Some of them, of whom Robert de Holland was the chief, had even opposed him openly, and received large rewards for their conduct from his confiscated estates.

Although there was nothing either in the public or the private life of Thomas, earl of Lancaster, to entitle him to much respect, yet his violent and unhappy death created a strong feeling of sympathy in his favour ; and soon after his death it began to be reported, that miracles had been performed by his statue or picture in St. Paul's Cathedral in London. The report of these miracles came to the ear of the king, Edward II., who addressed the following curious mandate on the subject to the bishop of London :—

“On the rumour that Thomas, earl of Lancaster, shines with miracles.—That the said Thomas shall not be worshipped as a saint :—The king to the venerable father in Christ, Stephen, bishop of London, greeting : It is loudly reported throughout the land, to our great indignation, that many of the people of God committed to your rule, deceived by a diabolical fraud, worship and adore as a sacred object a certain picture in your church of St. Paul's, in London, in which are sculptured the images of several persons, and amongst them that of Thomas, formerly earl of Lancaster, an enemy and rebel ; asserting without any authority from the Church of Rome that it works miracles. This is done to the opprobrium of the whole church ; to your and our disgrace ; and to the manifest peril of the souls of the said people. And yet we are told that, though you are acquainted with these abuses, you have connived at them, for the lucre of gain, at which we are greatly disturbed in mind. We therefore command you to look to the same matter, remembering that the said church stands under our patronage, which is an additional reason why you should look to the protection of our honour, and see that no one shall presume to approach the said picture with invocations, oblations, or other things pertaining to worship without the authority of the Church of Rome,” &c.\*

After the death of Thomas, earl of Lancaster, his vast estates escheated to the crown, and for some time the title of Lancaster was not heard of ; but in a few years Roger de Mortimer and Queen Isabella became as formidable to the king as the earl of Lancaster had ever been ; and their final triumph, in their contest with the

\* Rot. Rom. et Franc. 1 Edward III. m. 4 : Feb. 28, 1327.



king, was secured by the accession to their ranks of Henry, earl of Leicester, the younger brother of Thomas, earl of Lancaster and Leicester. After the dethronement and murder of Edward II., all the titles and honours of the house of Lancaster were restored to this Henry, who thus became the third earl of Lancaster.\*

The Countess Alice, whose character did not stand high at the time of her husband's death, was, however, allowed to enjoy a portion of his and her own estates. Amongst these was the beautiful castle of Halton, in Cheshire. In the year of her husband's death the following mandate was issued in her favour:—

“ For Alicia, who was the wife of Thomas, late earl of Lancaster, Edward the king, greeting: Know that we have given and granted to Alicia de Lasey, our dear kinswoman, countess of Lincoln and Salisbury, the castle, town, manor, and honour of Halton, with their appurtenances, in the county of Chester, to be held for the whole of her life, with knights' fees and all other liberties, as freely and entirely as Henry de Lasey, formerly earl of Lincoln, and father of the said countess, held it in the times of our ancestors, formerly kings of England. So, however, that after the death of the said countess, the said manor, &c., may revert to us. Witness, the king, at York, the 12th day of July, anno 16mo” (1323).

Some years after this the Countess Alice married a private gentleman, named Ebelo l'Estrange, without the king's licence, in consequence of which act all the lands which she held *in capite* were forfeited. An arrangement, however, was made in the 4th Edward III., by which a portion of them was restored to her for her life; but on her death, without issue, the whole were to pass, and did pass, to the house of Lancaster, which thus regained all that it had ever possessed, both in the counties of Lancaster and Chester, and in other parts of the kingdom.

Henry, the third earl of Lancaster, was naturally of a quieter temper than his brother, and he also took warning by his brother's fate. Moreover, he had to do with a very different king, in the person of Edward III. from the feeble, vacillating tyrant with whom his brother had to deal. He was satisfied with the rank and fortune of the first peer and the wealthiest nobleman of England; and lived and died in peace, leaving his immense possessions to his son Henry, the fourth earl and first duke of Lancaster.

The mandate of the king to the bishop of London perhaps checked

\* Rolls of Parliament, 2 & 3 Edward III.

the worship of Earl Thomas' memory during the reign of Edward II., but it broke out with increased vigour after his death. In the first Parliament of Edward III. the Commons petitioned the king to apply to the pope for the canonization of Thomas, earl of Lancaster;\* and in compliance with this request the young king addressed a long letter to the pope in conformity with the prayer of Parliament. No record appears of any reply to this letter, and it is certain that this victim of faction never was canonized. As the next best thing, letters patent, authorizing the building and endowment of a chapel, on the hill on which Thomas of Lancaster was beheaded, were issued by the king, and the custody of the chapel was given to Robert de Werington, priest, with power by himself and others to collect money for the building throughout the kingdom.

Some estimate may be formed of the wealth of the house of Lancaster in the life of Earl Thomas from the items of expenditure given in his cofferer's or steward's book for the year 1313. From this book it appears that his expenditure that year amounted to £7359, 13s. 0 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. of silver, a sum equal in weight to £22,000 of present money, and in its power of purchasing commodities to upwards of £100,000. In the following year the price of a fat ox was fixed at 24s., and the prices of all other articles were in the same proportion.

On the accession of Edward III., Henry, earl of Lancaster, was restored to all the honours and estates of his brother; and the person of the young king, then a boy of thirteen, was committed to his charge. On the 7th March, 1327, Parliament reversed the attainder of Earl Thomas, and declared the judgment passed on him at Pontefract illegal. By the same vote Earl Henry was adjudged to be his heir.† A similar act of restitution was passed in favour of the adherents of Earl Thomas.

In the 5th Edward III., Earl Henry of Lancaster obtained an exemplification of the grants of his grandfather, King Henry III., by which the lands of Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, and those of Robert de Ferrers, earl of Derby, were conferred on his father, Earl Edmund.

In the 7th Edward III. the king ordered a levy of men in the counties of Lancaster, Cumberland, and Westmoreland, to resist the attacks of the Scots on the northern counties; and in the 10th year of his reign he appointed Henry of Lancaster captain and

\* Rot. Pat. 1 Edward III. p. 2, m. 13: June 8, 1327.

† Rot. Pat. o. 2, p. 3.

leader of his army, about to march against the Scots, and in support of "his vassal, Edward de Baliol."

In the 11th Edward III., Henry Plantagenet, the son of Earl Henry of Lancaster, was raised to the rank of earl of Derby during the life of his father. That Henry, who succeeded his father in the earldom, and who was afterwards raised to the dukedom of Lancaster, was one of the greatest warriors of the warlike age of Edward III., and greatly distinguished himself in the wars which that monarch carried on in France and Flanders. In consequence of his valour and skill he was raised to the rank of earl of Derby in the year 1337-38 by the following order:—

"The king, greeting: Considering the magnanimity, valour, and skill of our dearest relative, Henry of Lancaster, and by the advice of our Parliament, at Westminster assembled, we have created the said Henry earl of Derby, and of the said county we have given him the name and title, by girding him with the sword of the said county, for him and his heirs."\*

At the same time the king made a grant to the new earl of 1000 marks.

In the following year, 1339, the king proceeded to Flanders, to plan with the Flemings his operations against France. Before his departure he appointed the earl of Lancaster associate of his young son Edward, duke of Cornwall and prince of Wales, whom he had appointed guardian of the kingdom in his absence. He took with him as one of his generals and advisers Henry, earl of Derby; and having in the course of the campaign occasion to borrow large sums of money from the Flemings, the earl of Derby consented to remain in their hands as a personal security for the sums borrowed. This appears from the following order to the officers appointed to collect the revenue from wool, which was at that time the principal commodity exported from the kingdom:—"The king to the sheriffs, collectors, and receivers of wools, and the bailiffs, greeting: Seeing that our beloved Matthew Canaceon and his companions, the merchants of the order of the Leopards, have undertaken to liberate our beloved relative and faithful subject, Henry de Lancaster, earl of Derby, who is detained prisoner in foreign parts on account of certain debts of ours, we for that favour conferred have granted to the said Matthew and his associates permission to export 1000 sacks of wool out of the kingdom, to the parts of Flanders."†

\* Rot. Pat. 5 Edward III. p. 2, m. 4.

† Rot. Pat. 11 Edward III. p. 3, m. 26.

In the month of May, 1345, Henry, earl of Derby, was appointed commander of the king's troops, and lieutenant of the king in the province of Guienne, in the south of France. This appointment was made in consequence of the earl's signal success in the previous campaign. In June, 1344, he had landed at Bayonne, and immediately attacked and defeated the French army at Bergere on the Dordogne. This able general also gained a great victory at Auberoche against greatly superior numbers. In the spring of the following year he again returned to Guienne, and was equally successful.

Henry, the third earl of Lancaster, died in the year 1345-46, the 19th Edward III., leaving his son Henry, earl of Derby, heir to his immense estates, and to the earldoms of Lancaster, Leicester, Derby, Lincoln, and Surrey.

After the death of his father, Henry assumed the title of earl of Lancaster, and again proceeded to France, where he fought with great success. Besides the soldiers furnished by the king, he had in his own pay 800 knights or men-at-arms, and 2000 archers, the flower of the youth of Lancashire, Cheshire, Derbyshire, and Leicestershire. In these wars he expended £17,000 of his own money, equal to at least ten times as much of the money of the present day, in addition to the sums received from the king.\*

The king being better able to reward the services of his kinsman with honours than with money, conferred on him the since famous title of duke of Lancaster. Up to the reign of Edward III. no English nobleman, not even the members of the royal family, had received the title of duke from the crown. Edward, the eldest son of Edward III., better known as the Black Prince, was the first English duke, by the title of duke of Cornwall; and Henry, duke of Lancaster, was the second.† And at the same time when Henry of Lancaster received the honour of dukedom, he also received the honours of an earl palatine. The following is a copy of the grant:—

“The king, with the assent of his Parliament, has created Henry, earl of Lancaster, duke of Lancaster, and has granted to the said duke, for the whole term of his own life, that he shall have within the said county his chancery and his writs, to be issued under his own seal, belonging to the office of chancellor, his justices likewise, as well for the pleas of the crown as for other pleas relating to the common law, to have cognizance of them, and to have power of making all executions whatsoever by his writs and officers; and

\* Rot. Pat. p. 2, m. 15.

† Rot. Pat. 11 Edward III. m. 7.



to have all other liberties of royalty of what kind soever appertaining to a county palatine, as freely and as fully as the earl of Chester within the said county is known to have."<sup>\*</sup>

Thus by one grant was the earl of Lancaster at once raised to the rank of duke of Lancaster, and gifted with full palatial powers. "Counties palatine," says Blackstone, "are so called a *palatio*, because the owners thereof, the earls of Chester, the bishop of Durham, and the duke of Lancaster, had in those counties *jura regalia*, as fully as the king hath in his palace—*regulum potestatem in omnibus*, as Bracton expresses it."

The first duke of Lancaster married Isabella, the daughter of the earl of Beaumont, by whom he had two daughters, Matilda and Blanche. The eldest of these daughters, Matilda, was married in the year 1352 to William, duke of Zealand and Bavaria; the younger, Blanche, to John of Gaunt, earl of Richmond, afterwards duke of Lancaster, the fourth son of Edward III. Henry, the first duke of Lancaster, died in the year 1361-62, the 34th Edward III., of the plague, which was then raging in England, leaving a high character for valour, liberality, and charity. He was buried at Leicester, according to his own directions, and his immense wealth devolved on his two daughters.

In the following year, Lady Matilda, the eldest daughter of Henry, duke of Lancaster, married to the duke of Bavaria, came to England to claim her share in the inheritance of her father. The estates were accordingly divided between her and her sister, Lady Blanche, the wife of John of Gaunt. The Lady Matilda's enjoyment of her estates was, however, very brief; for in the words of Knyghton, describing the events of the year 1362, this year "died Matilda, duchess of Zealand and Bavaria, countess of Lancaster, whom the opinion of the vulgar described as carried off by poison, that the inheritance of the house of Lancaster might again be united in one person."<sup>†</sup>

Whatever may have been the cause of the death of the Lady Matilda, the effect of her death was to render the Lady Blanche and her husband, John of Gaunt, the richest subjects in England. On the death of Matilda, John of Gaunt received the additional title of earl of Leicester, and with that title the other moiety of the duke of Lancaster's estates, in addition to the honour of Leicester and the Savoy palace.<sup>‡</sup>

<sup>\*</sup> Speed, 693.

<sup>†</sup> Knyghton, Col. 2642.

<sup>‡</sup> Rot. Pat. 25 Edward III. p. 1, m. 18.

In the following November John of Gaunt was raised to the rank of duke of Lancaster in full Parliament, by the following charter :—

“The king, greeting: Know that we, considering the distinguished valour and the noble deeds which we see to flourish in our dear son John, earl of Lancaster, and wishing to provide for his person according to the greatness of his race, and his own merits, that by his power and prudence the royal sceptre may shine more brightly, and his own honour may be exalted and continued, we give to the same earl the honour of a dukedom, and appoint him to the duchy of Lancaster, and invest him with the same name and honour, by the girding him with the sword and the placing of the coronet on his head, to have and to hold the said name and honour of duke of Lancaster, for him and his heirs for ever. Wherefore we will and command that our aforesaid son shall have and hold for himself and his heirs the name and honour of duke of Lancaster for ever, as above commanded. Witness, and given by our hand, in full Parliament, at Westminster, the 13th day of November, in the 36th year of our reign” (1362-63).\*

By another deed the king conferred palatial honours on John of Gaunt and his descendants within the duchy of Lancaster.

Neither of the daughters of Henry, duke of Lancaster, lived to enjoy her wealth and state for any considerable time. The Lady Blanche died in her youth, in the year 1366; having, however, first presented her husband with a son, Henry of Bolingbroke, who afterwards became king of England.

The death of the Lady Blanche did not deprive John of Gaunt of any part of the immense inheritance of the house of Lancaster. All that he had received he retained, and added to it numerous honours and possessions in England and on the continent. In consequence of his brilliant exploits in the French wars he received the title of duke of Aquitaine; and at a later period the still higher titles of king of Leon and Castile, but without being able to obtain the territories of those kingdoms. By the early and untimely death of his eldest brother, Edward, prince of Wales—the Black Prince—and by his great superiority in wealth and influence to his other brothers, he became the actual ruler of England, during the long minority of his unfortunate nephew, Richard II.

The first act of that weak and ill-advised prince was to quarrel with his uncle, John of Gaunt, and with Henry of Bolingbroke, his

\* Knyghton, Col. 2626, 1362.

son. But the power of the house of Lancaster had by this time become greater than that of the crown ; and the efforts of Richard to shake off the influence and destroy the power of that great family ended in his own dethronement and death.

Henry of Bolingbroke, the son of John of Gaunt by his marriage with the Lady Blanche Plantagenet, the heiress of the house of Lancaster, and the possessor of the great estates of the De Bohuns, earls of Hereford, by his own marriage with Maria de Bohun, heiress of that great house, was one of the ablest men and best soldiers of the age in which he lived. He soon became an object of hatred and jealousy to his cousin, the youthful king, Richard II. This jealousy was well founded, and might have been the means of securing the throne and life of the king had it rendered him more cautious and circumspect. Unfortunately it served only to render him more rash and violent. With very little regard to the law of the land, and in defiance of the respect felt by the people for the house of Lancaster, he sentenced Henry of Bolingbroke to banishment ; and on the death of John of Gaunt he seized on the estates of the house of Lancaster, in defiance of the rights of Henry of Bolingbroke. This illegal and despotic act ended in his own destruction.

About Whitsuntide, in the year 1399, Bolingbroke being still in banishment, King Richard embarked at Bristol for Ireland, to revenge the death of his cousin, the earl of Marche, lord-lieutenant of that country, who had been killed in a battle with the Irish. Richard was proceeding successfully in his first campaign, when he received the alarming news that his formidable rival, Bolingbroke, had landed in England. The banished duke being informed of the departure of the king for Ireland, hired three small vessels at Nantz, in which he embarked with the archbishop of Canterbury, who had also been banished by the rash young king, and with a retinue of about eighty persons. After touching at several places on the coast of England, and finding everywhere that the people were willing to rise in favour of the house of Lancaster, Henry Bolingbroke landed at Ravenspern, at the mouth of the Humber, a place long since swallowed up by the encroachments of the sea. There he was joined immediately by Percy, earl of Northumberland, who was closely connected with the house of Lancaster by marriage, and who possessed large estates in Yorkshire, as well as on the Scottish border. Thus strengthened by the aid of the Percys, and by his own Yorkshire and Lincolnshire followers, Bolingbroke advanced to

Doncaster, and was there joined by the adherents of his house from Lancashire, Cheshire, and Derbyshire. Advancing southward, the people everywhere rose in his favour, hoisting the chequered flag, then the emblem of Lancaster. The duke of York, the uncle both of Bolingbroke and the king, an old weak man, who had been left in charge of the kingdom, finding it impossible to resist the torrent of Lancaster's popularity, broke his staff of office and laid aside all thought of resistance. Bolingbroke's progress being thus turned into a triumph, he marched to London, at the head of an army of 60,000 men, and was there received as a deliverer.

Having secured the capital, Bolingbroke advanced on Bristol, and after a siege of a few days, captured the castle, which was the only place in the kingdom that offered any resistance to his arms.

The unfortunate and deserted king had in the meantime landed at Milford Haven, and had proceeded with a few followers first to Caermarthen, and then to Conway castle, in North Wales, then one of the strongest places in the kingdom. Bolingbroke had meantime advanced to Chester, and Richard, by the advice of the earl of Northumberland, proceeded towards Flint castle, where he had been invited to hold a conference with Bolingbroke. Whilst on the road to Flint he was seized by the soldiers of Northumberland, who had been placed in ambush for the purpose, and was carried a prisoner to Flint castle. From Flint, Richard was taken to Chester, and from Chester to London, where, after having been exposed to the insults of the populace, he was conveyed to the Tower. There he consented—probably in the hope of saving his life—to abdicate his throne, which was conferred with the assent of Parliament on Henry of Bolingbroke, duke of Lancaster, in defiance of the superior claims not only of the king, but of the house of Mortimer, the descendants, by the female line, of Lionel, duke of Clarence, the third son of Edward III. and the elder brother of John of Gaunt, through whom Bolingbroke claimed the throne. The rights of the house of Mortimer passed by marriage to the house of York, and became the cause of the wars of York and Lancaster, which desolated the kingdom for nearly 100 years. As for the unfortunate King Richard, he was conveyed from the Tower to the Lancastrian castle of Pontefract, in Yorkshire, where he was soon after murdered by the jailer or by hired assassins—a horrible crime, terribly avenged in after times by the destruction of all the princes of the house of Lancaster.

Henry IV. did not enjoy the crown, which he had wrested from his unfortunate cousin, either long or peacefully. He died at the age of forty-seven, and his reign was disturbed by frequent conspiracies, and more than one dangerous insurrection. The most formidable of these was the revolt of the Percys, who, after having done more than any other family to place him on the throne, and after having been most amply rewarded for their services, became suddenly discontented, on the refusal of further requests urged in the spirit of demands, and determined to set up Edward Mortimer, earl of Marche, the grandson of Lionel, duke of Clarence, as a claimant to the throne, in place of Henry Bolingbroke.

One effect of the insurrection of the Percys was to bring more prominently forward Sir John Stanley, the founder of the Lancashire branch of that distinguished family. This gallant knight, after acquiring great reputation in the wars of France, in the reign of Edward III., had married Isabel, the daughter and heiress of Sir Thomas Lathom, of Lathom House, the representative of the old Norman family of the Fitz Henrys. The estates which he acquired by this marriage were all situated in the duchy of Lancaster, and on the ill-advised attempt of Richard II. to seize on the estates of the house of Lancaster, he made common cause with Henry of Bolingbroke. Sir John Stanley long held the command of the forces in Ireland; and it was by his influence that that kingdom was brought over to the house of Lancaster.

Sir John Stanley, in consequence of numerous services, was appointed lieutenant of the king, in Ireland, in the first year of the reign of Henry IV., and also received the manor of Neston, in Cheshire, which had belonged to John Montague, earl of Salisbury, a resolute supporter of Richard II. About three years after the accession of Henry IV., the Percys rose against the king, and advancing from the north, with all the chivalry of the Northern border, attempted to join the forces of the house of Mortimer, whose estates were situated in Shropshire, Worcestershire, and Herefordshire, and the Welsh, under Owen Glendower. At this critical moment Sir John Stanley brought together the adherents of the king in Lancashire and Cheshire; and the king and his son, Henry, prince of Wales, advancing rapidly on Shrewsbury, compelled the Percys to fight a decisive battle at that place, before the Welsh and the greater part of the supporters of the house of Mortimer had time to join them. In this battle the Percys were defeated and destroyed. After the



death of Hotspur and the ruin of his cause, his estates, and those of his father and his uncle, were confiscated. From these the king made extensive grants to Sir John Stanley, and others of his adherents; granting to Sir John Stanley in fee the castle, peel, and lordship of the Isle of Man, and the dominion pertaining to it. He further granted, "that the heirs of Sir John Stanley might enter on the castle and lordship immediately after his death;" and also allowed him to build a fortified house at Liverpool, from which he could readily communicate with the island.

Henry IV., on his accession to the throne, very prudently decided to keep the great inheritance of the house of Lancaster separate from the crown lands, and the revenue derived from the *jura regalia*, both of which were liable for the expenses of the general government. He therefore conferred the title of Duke of Lancaster, along with the titles of Prince of Wales and Earl of Chester, on his eldest son Henry, afterwards Henry V., and induced Parliament to pass a law on the right of succession to the crown and kingdom, in which it was provided that the duchy of Lancaster should be held as a separate inheritance.\*

Henry IV. died in the fourteenth year of his reign, and the forty-sixth of his life, in the year 1413. It appears from the Parliamentary Rolls of 1 Henry V., that at the time of the death of Henry IV. his private income amounted to 25,000 marks per annum, equal to not less than £200,000 a year of our money. This was still further increased in the following year, by an arrangement which provided that on the death of the queen, who was one of the daughters and heirs of Humphrey de Bohun, earl of Hereford, the Bohun estates should be separated from the crown of England, and united to the duchy of Lancaster. The annual income of the Hereford property thus added to the duchy of Lancaster was £1190, equal to about £10,000 of our present money.†

Henry V. enjoyed the whole of the possessions of the house of Lancaster, together with those of the earldom of Chester, during his short and brilliant reign; and had under his command the principal knights and gentry of the two counties. The gallant yeomen of the two counties, whose arrows had decided so many battles, fought at Agincourt and Harfleur, under the command of their earl, duke, and king.

Henry V. died in his third expedition into France, in the year

\* Rolls of Par. 2 Henry 3, p. 26, m. 80.

† Rot. Par. 3, 580.

1422, leaving an infant son, of feeble mind and body, to succeed to a disputed throne in England, and to a ruinous war in France. On the death of Henry V., his brother Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, was appointed Protector of the king and kingdom, whilst the charge of the war in France was committed to his brother John, duke of Bedford. The duke of Gloucester was allowed the sum of 8000 marks to maintain the cost and dignity of his office; and it was arranged that 4000 marks of this sum should be taken from the revenues of the duchy of Lancaster, the inheritance of the infant king.\*

It is no part of the object of this work to trace, in detail, the history of the long and bloody wars of York and Lancaster. It has already been mentioned that the claim to the throne of the Mortimers, the descendants, by the female line, of Lionel, duke of Clarence, was superior to that of the house of Lancaster, according to the principles of succession long recognized in this country. These claims were now settled, in right of his mother, Lady Anne Mortimer, in the person of Richard Plantagenet, duke of York, an ambitious and able man, possessed of the ample estates of the Mortimers, and strengthened by marriage alliances with the Nevilles, the Stanleys, the Percys, and other powerful families. Still these claims would not have sufficed to overpower the title of the king, derived from long possession and the frequent recognition of Parliament, if Henry VI. had been a man of even average capacity, and if the public mind had not been soured by the losses and disgraces of a costly and unsuccessful war in France. Even these causes might not have proved fatal to the king, if his beautiful queen, Margaret of Anjou, had not been as imperious as she was beautiful, and if the waste of the public means, caused by the war with France, had not been attributed to the extravagance of the court. The popular insurrection, headed by Jack Cade, and arising out of the discontent of the populace, was the precursor of the wars of York and Lancaster.

In the eighteenth year of the reign of Henry VI. the whole revenues of the duchy of Lancaster were appropriated to pay the household expenses of the king. The order in the original language of the Act is as follows:—

“Quod proventus Ducatus Lancasterie applicatur ad expensas hospicii Regis.

“Item, for so much as the Kinge, our Sovereign Lord, havynge

\* Rymer's *Fœdera*, vol. 10, p. 268.

knoweliche of grete murmour and clamour that shold be in his Roiolme of England for non-paiment of the dispensis of his houshold, graunteth and ordaineth bi th' assente of the Lordes spiritu'll and temporel, and the Commones of the said Roiolme, in this present Parlement assembled, and bi auctorite of the same Parlement, that all the profits, issues, revenues, customes, and comoditees comyng or for to come of all the castles, honours, maners, lordships, landes, tenementes, rentes, reversions, services, fraunchises, libertees, views of francplege, hundredes, citis, countis, and all other inheritances, possessions of the duchie of Lancaster, remayning in his hands, and of his Duchie of Cornwaille, while the same duchie shall be in his hands, fro' the fest of Seint Michele, the Archangell, last passed, except all fees, wages, annaytes, reparations, and other charges necessary goinge out of the same, be ordeined, applied, and employed to the dispensis of the same houshold, and delyvered by th' receyvours generall of the said duchies for the tyme beinge, to the Treasurer of the said houshold for the tyme beinge, bi indentures therof betwene them to be made. And that the receyvours generall of the said duchies, upon theyr accompte alloweyes shall have allowance and discharge of thaire payments made by said indentures. And if the same receyvours make payement in any other wise than in forme aforesaid, that then therof they be disalowed upon there accompte. Saving to all the Kinge's Lieges, their title, right, and intereste that they have in the said duchies, or on any parcele therof, this Acte notwithstanding, and that this ordinance endure to the ende of five years next ensueinge."\*

Towards the close of the parliamentary proceedings of the same year, it appears that the revenue above named would not meet the expenses of the household, and that consequently there was great clamour and murmuring. The Commons therefore pray the king to take one-fourth part of the tenth and fifteenth, which had been imposed upon the country, for the current expenses, and to "pay redie money in hand for the expenses of your said housholde, as ferre as the said money will atteyn or stretch to."

At the opening of the Parliament in the 33 Henry VI., Richard, duke of York, was appointed Protector. As we have already mentioned, he was the lawful heir to the throne through his mother, who inherited the rights derived from Lionel Plantagenet, the third son of Edward III. In the following year, however, the Lancastrians

\* Rot. Par. vol. 5, p. 7.

held a Parliament at Coventry, at which Richard, duke of York, was impeached, together with his principal friends, and amongst them Thomas, Lord Stanley, who was committed to prison, "there to abide according to law." In the following year, 39 Henry VI., a Parliament of the Yorkists, held at Westminster, set aside all that had been done at Coventry.

In the thirty-fourth year of his reign, Henry VI. created his eldest son, Edward, Prince of Wales and Earl of Chester, with all formalities; that is, by a coronet on his head, a gold ring on his finger, and a golden wand. The grant of the county of Chester contains the words "as fully and entirely as our progenitor, Edward the Black Prince, or any other earl has held it."\*

In the 39th Henry VI., in the rolls of Parliament (5, p. 383), is a document noted as "Concerning Ducatum Lancastriæ," in which it is stated that special officers had been appointed for the management of the lands of the duchy, and that these officers had been in the habit of taking great and excessive fees and wages for exercising the same office. In consequence of these complaints the patents of the delinquent officers were declared to be void, and the ancient officers were reappointed, who are described as having "honourably, wisely, discreetly, and profitably ruled and governed."†

In the same year (5, p. 383) the Commons prayed that all profits arising from the duchy of Lancaster may be received by the proper officer of the duchy, and by him be delivered over to the treasurer of England "for the necessity and weal of the realm." To this the king agrees, "saving always that it extend not to anything of the said duchy, by his Highness put in feoffaint."

In the midst of all this popular discontent the wars of York and Lancaster broke out, and continued to rage at intervals for upwards of thirty years.

In the wars of York and Lancaster the force of Lancashire and Cheshire was chiefly used in favour of the House of York, except in the final conflict at Bosworth-field, when it was thrown with decisive effect on the side of the House of Lancaster. The principal reason why the influence of the two counties was so used was, that the house of Stanley, which had already become the most powerful of all the resident families of Lancashire and Cheshire, was closely connected with the Yorkists; Thomas, the second Lord Stanley, having married, as his first wife, Lady Eleanor Neville, daughter of Richard

\* Rot. Par. 5. 290.

† Rot. Par. 5. 383.

Neville, earl of Salisbury. This earl of Salisbury was also brother-in-law of Richard, duke of York, the claimant of the throne, and father of the famous Richard Neville, earl of Warwick, the king-maker. Lord Stanley was thus completely bound up by his family connections with the Yorkist branch of the Plantagenets, and with the Nevilles, their great allies and supporters.

The only battles in the wars of York and Lancashire which were particularly fatal to the two counties were those of Blore Heath and Bosworth-field. In these nearly all the leading families of Lancashire and Cheshire lost one or more of their members.

At the battle of Blore Heath, the Lancastrians again attempted to prevent a junction between the northern adherents of the house of York and the followers of the house of Mortimer on the Welsh border, as they had done at the battle of Shrewsbury; but in this case they were not equally successful.

In the spring and summer of the year 1459, the Yorkists having determined to claim the throne for Richard, duke of York, began to assemble in great force at Middleham castle, in the North Riding of Yorkshire, the principal residence of Richard Neville, earl of Salisbury, the great leader of their party. All the feudal retainers of the Nevilles, and all the partizans of the house of York in those northern parts, received an intimation to repair to Middleham as soon as the harvest should be over. Accordingly the end of August in the year 1459 saw nearly 4000 men assembled at Middleham, prepared to march southward under the command of the earl of Salisbury, and with him to try the fortune of war.\* They proceeded southward through Craven and the eastern part of Lancashire and Cheshire, and were joined on their march by Sir Richard Molyneux, of Sefton (who was the brother-in-law of Lord Stanley), by Sir Thomas Harrington of Hornby castle, and by other Lancashire gentlemen. But Lord Stanley stood aloof; and many of the knights and gentlemen of Lancashire and Cheshire joined the banner of the house of Lancaster.

Whilst Salisbury was still collecting his forces in the north, Margaret of Anjou, the heroic queen of the feeble-minded king, advanced boldly to Chester, bringing with her the young prince of Wales and earl of Chester, then a beautiful boy of only six years old. She was herself only thirty years of age, and one of the loveliest women of the time. In answer to her passionate appeals the greater part of the

\* The Battle of Blore Heath; by William Beamont, Esq.: Journal of Architectural, Archaeological, and Historic Society for the county city, and neighbourhood of Chester. Part II. p. 84.



gentlemen of Cheshire joined her cause, and received from her the emblem of the silver swan, which had been worn by Henry V., the conqueror of Agincourt, and the favourite hero of the house of Lancaster. By the influence of the queen a powerful army was collected in Cheshire and Staffordshire, and placed under the command of Lord Audley, a gallant Cheshire soldier, who had served with much reputation in the French wars, but who had survived the age of military vigour. At the head of this army Lord Audley threw himself across the line of march of the Yorkists, under the earl of Salisbury. The two armies met on Blore Heath, near Market Drayton, on the borders of Staffordshire and Shropshire, on the evening of the 22nd September, 1459.

On the arrival of the earl of Salisbury and the Yorkists near the town of Drayton, on the evening of that day, they took their position for the night on a commanding hill, which overlooks the river Tern, the boundary of the counties of Shropshire and Staffordshire. Their force was not more than 5000 men, and before them was drawn up the Lancastrian army under Lord Audley, 10,000 strong. Salisbury, who was much the abler general of the two, availed himself most skilfully of the advantages of the ground. Having in the night placed the mass of his army in a strong and thickly wooded position on the brow of a hill, he sent forward his archers at break of day, with orders to skirmish with the Lancastrians for a short time, and then to fall back on the position of the men-at-arms. At early dawn, therefore, on the 23rd September, the archers of Salisbury's army began to discharge their arrows into Audley's camp; but being resolutely met they retreated in apparent confusion across the river Tern, and up the hills towards Blore Heath. Deceived by this movement, and confident both in the number and the valour of his troops, Lord Audley ordered his soldiers to pursue the retreating Yorkists. The Lancastrians advanced eagerly, and with little precaution, up the heights; and on reaching the top were suddenly charged by the whole of Salisbury's army. Though surprised, the Lancastrians fought desperately for five hours, at the close of which time they were totally defeated, with a loss of 2400 of their best officers and bravest men. Lord Audley, the leader of the Lancastrians, was killed, fighting in the front rank, by Sir Roger Kynaston, a Shropshire knight. Lord Dudley, the second in command, with several other knights and gentlemen, was taken prisoner. The Cheshire men, to whom at their own solicitation had been assigned the vanguard, proved themselves worthy of

the distinction; "and if their silver swans were stained with gore, their honour remained unspotted as the plumage of the bird whose emblem was borrowed." It is recorded that they fought bravely and well. That so many of the noblest were left on the field was perhaps owing to the place they had sought in the army. In those times history was afraid to record on which side men were arrayed in civil strife, and out of the numbers of Cheshire men who fought at Blore Heath, we know only the names of those who fell in the battle, and whom we have enumerated in the following list:—

Sir Robert del Booth, of Dunham Massey; Adam Bostock, of Bostock; Sir Hugh Calveley, of Calveley; Sir John Done, of Utkington; Richard Done, of Crowton; Sir Robert Downes, of Shrigley; Sir Thomas Dutton, of Dutton, son-in-law of Lord Audley; Peter Dutton, eldest son of Sir Thomas, killed fighting by his side; John Dutton, of Halton; Sir John Egerton, of Egerton; Sir John Legh, of Booths; Sir Richard Molyneux, of Sefton; Sir William Troutbeck, of Dunham; and Sir Hugh Venables, of Kinderton.

Sir John and Sir Thomas Neville, two of the sons of the earl of Salisbury, and Sir Thomas Harrington, of Hornby castle, another distinguished Yorkist, were taken prisoners by the king's army at the battle of Blore Heath. Salisbury's two sons, being severely wounded, were conducted with Sir Thomas Harrington to Chester, where they were speedily released from captivity, by a rising of the Welshmen in their favour. But short was the triumph of the survivors. In a few months from the time of the battle of Blore Heath, the victorious Salisbury was himself taken prisoner, at the battle of Wakefield, and beheaded the next day; his head being stuck up over the gates of York with that of his son-in-law, Richard, duke of York, slain in the same battle. Sir Thomas Harrington, of Hornby castle, was killed in the same fatal battle, and his son, Sir John Harrington, was so severely wounded that he died on the following day.\*

Equally short was the triumph of the Lancastrians, for the battle of Towton, fought on Palm Sunday, 1461, destroyed for a while all the hopes of that party, and placed Edward IV., the chief of the Yorkists, firmly on the throne.

Edward IV. having secured the crown proceeded to seize on the private inheritance of the house of Lancaster, by annexing the manors, castles, &c. of the duchy to the crown, but perpetually

\* The Battle of Blore Heath; by W. Beaumont, Esq.: Journal of Archaeological, &c., Society of Chester, pp. 94-98.

separate from all its other inheritances, from the 4th March, 1461. The following is a translation of the principal passage of the deed :—  
 “ And further, it having been ordained with the consent of Parliament, that all the castles, manors, demesnes, &c., which Henry VI. had of the duchy of Lancaster are forfeited ; the king, with the authority of Parliament aforesaid, has ordained that the same manors, castles, demesnes, &c., in England, Wales, and Calais shall be and are incorporated as the duchy of Lancaster, and be named the Duchy of Lancaster, and that by the same name they shall be held separately from all other hereditaments, by himself and his heirs, kings of England, for ever. And that the county of Lancaster be a county palatine, and that the king hold the same county palatine of Lancaster as a part of the said duchy, and have his seal, chancellorship, justices and officers there for the same, and all kinds of liberties, jura regalia, &c., there lawfully used ; and another seal called the seal of the duchy of Lancaster, and a chancery for the keeping of the same, and officers and councillors for the same, as Henry V. had in the same, and that the said officers, and also the tenants and inhabitants of the same duchy, have the same liberties that they had in the reign of Henry V. And also that in the same duchy all such liberties, franchises, customs, privileges, and jurisdictions be exercised and had, and in such manner in which they were before used. And that the officers, ministers, tenants, and inhabitants of the same duchy be dealt with according to the same liberties, and not be constrained or coerced otherwise.”\*

In the Act of resumption of the 7th and 8th Edward IV. is the following exception in favour of the duchy and county palatine of Lancaster :—“ Provided also that this Act extend not to any Act made for the corporation or name of the duchy of Lancaster, or for the corporation or name of the county palatyn of Lancaster, or any annexation of the same county palatyn to the said duchy, nor to any Act made for the said duchy or county palatyn, or for the officers, ministers, tenants, inhabitants, or dwellers of or in the same duchy, or county palatyn ; but that every such Act be of the like force and effect as it should have been yf this Act had not been made.”†

Edward IV., having secured the possessions of the house of Lancaster, proceeded to grant them for life to his brother Richard, duke of Gloucester, the fierce dark prince who had so often fought by his side in the wars of York and Lancaster, and who after the king's

\* Harl. MS. No. 2115, p. 226, 6.

† Rot. Par. o. 5, p. 574.

death, murdered his children and usurped their throne. The following is a copy of this grant or warrant, which was addressed to Thomas, Lord Stanley, then the receiver of the duchy, in the counties of Lancaster and Chester :—

“ Pro Ricardo, Duce Gloucestræ. Edward, Rex, &c. To oure right trusty and well beloved cousyn, the Lord Stanley, receyvour of our duchye of Lancastr', within our counties of Lancastr' and Chestr', and to his deputies ther and either of theyme gretynge.

“ And for as moche as we now of late, by our lettres patentes under the seal of our duchie of Lancastr, have geven and granted unto our right dere and well beloved broder, Rechard, duc of Gloucestr, the honour, castell, lordship, maner, and hundred of Clytherough (Clitheroe) ; forests of Blakhenshire and Bowland ; manors of Penwortham, Blaes, Walton, Padyngton, Colne, Penhulst, Werston, Chatburn, Acryngton, and Haselyngdon, in our countie of Lancastr ; the manors of Skerton, Overton, Slynnes, Rygby and Wira, West Derby, Crosby ; the castle and towne of Lytherpole ; forestes of Quernmoor, Amounderness, West Darbishire, Blesdale, Wyresdale, Penhule (Pendle), Rossendale, and Myrescogh ; the parks of Myrescogh, Toxtath, and Croxtath, in our said counties ; the castell, maner, and lordship of Halton ; the farmes of Runcorn, More, Wydensse, Whitlegh, Congleton, in the countie of Chester, with all their appurtenances.

“ We therefor wol (well) and straitly charge you, that ye immediately after the sight of this our lettres doe paye and contente unto our said broder, all the rentes, fermes (farms), issues, profites, and revenues comen and growen of the saide honour, castelles, maners, hundredes, landes, and tenements, with their appurtenances aforesaid, from the Feste of St. Michell, the arkanngle, the eighth year of our regne hitherto, and that from hensfurth shall come and growe of the same ; any assignment or assignments therof let before by or for us to any other persone or persones made notwithstanding. And that ye from the saide Feste of St. Michell hitherto and from hensfurth be accomptant unto our saide broder or his auditors of all th' issues and profites, rents, and revenues aforesaide, not fayllyng herof, as ye will answere unto us at youre peril. Geven, &c., at Westmr, the 12th November, the ninth yere of our regne. Per billam manu regis signatum.”

The large estates thus granted to Richard, duke of Gloucester, remained in his possession until the death of his brother, Edward IV.

and the murder of his youthful nephews, Edward V. and Richard, duke of York, in the Tower. Most of them probably were retained by him until he paid the penalty of his crimes on the bloody field of Bosworth.

The overthrow of Richard III. was chiefly brought about by Lord Stanley and Sir William Stanley, both of whom had been steady supporters of the house of York, during the reign of Edward IV., but who shrank with horror from an usurper, stained with the blood of his brother's children. They were, however, compelled to act with the utmost caution; for Lord Strange, the son of Lord Stanley, was in the hands of the tyrant, and their own lives were in the utmost peril.

It was on the 7th August, 1485, that Henry Tudor, earl of Richmond, afterwards King Henry VII., landed at Milford Haven, and was eagerly welcomed by an army composed of his Welsh countrymen, and of many English adherents of the house of Lancaster. Henry Tudor was one of the descendants of John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, by Catherine Swinford, and was accepted by the Lancastrians as the lawful representative of that great house, though the legitimacy of the immediate descendants of that connection was very doubtful. His mother, the countess of Richmond, was married to Lord Stanley, a circumstance which rendered the position of the Stanleys still more perilous, and probably ultimately decided them to risk everything in support of Henry Tudor.

Richard III., who was one of the most skilful and experienced leaders of that age, on hearing of the landing of the earl of Richmond in South Wales, collected an army of 20,000 men at Leicester, near the centre of the kingdom, and waited the attacks of his enemies. To the last he seems to have hoped that Lord Stanley would join him, with the forces of Lancashire, Cheshire, and North Wales, rather than risk the life of his son; and to the last Lord Stanley, in the hope of saving his son's life, deluded the murderous tyrant with the hope that he would do so.

On the 21st of August, 1485, the earl of Richmond reached Tamworth, in Staffordshire, within a few miles of the position held by Richard's army, on the borders of Leicestershire. Lord Stanley had meanwhile collected the forces of Lancashire at Lathom house, by order of the king, and had advanced to Northwich, in Cheshire, where he was joined by his brother, Sir William Stanley, with the forces of Cheshire and North Wales. From Northwich the united



forces moved on to Stone, in Staffordshire, and then to Stafford, where Lord Stanley secretly opened communications with the earl of Richmond. From Stafford, Lord Stanley marched to Lichfield and Atherstone, finally taking a position, on the night before the battle, in a valley near the latter town, from which he could join either army on the following day.

The battle of Bosworth-field was commenced early in the morning by the advance of the forces of King Richard, led by the duke of Norfolk and the earl of Shrewsbury, on the army of the earl of Richmond, commanded by the earl in person, and by John de Vere, earl of Oxford, an able and experienced soldier. It was not until these forces had become engaged that the army of Lord Stanley and Sir William Stanley quitted the ground that it had held at the beginning of the battle, and rushed upon Richard's army, the archers sending flights of arrows into the ranks of the enemy. Desperate as the position of Richard was rendered by this double attack, he held his ground for some hours, and even made a violent effort to bring the earl of Richmond to a personal combat. At that moment the attack of the Lancashire and Cheshire forces became irresistible, and bore down all opposition. Richard was surrounded and slain, fighting desperately to the last. A crown or coronet which was found in his tent was placed on the head of Henry Tudor, by Lord Stanley and Sir William Stanley, who were joined by the whole army in proclaiming him king of England, by the title of Henry VII.

## CHAPTER IV.

## LANCASHIRE AND CHESHIRE UNDER THE HOUSE OF TUDOR.

ALTHOUGH the marriage of Henry Tudor with Elizabeth Plantagenet united in one family the rival claims of the houses of York and Lancaster, and on the birth of an heir to the throne united them in one person, yet it did not at once put an end to the struggles of the two great factions, which had been arrayed against each other for upwards of eighty years, under the banners of those two houses. The partisans of the house of York were still strong in many parts of the kingdom, and had powerful allies in Ireland, Scotland, and more especially in Flanders, where the duchess of Burgundy, the sister of Edward IV., made it the object of her life to plot the overthrow and destruction of the house of Lancaster. The schemes of the enemies of the house of Tudor were greatly aided by the conduct of the king himself, who was so thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the Lancastrian faction as to insist on resting his claim to the throne on his own most doubtful title, to the exclusion of the very superior title of his queen, whose undoubted claim to the inheritance of the house of York, if properly urged, might have induced the Yorkists to submit to the rule of her husband, without direct resistance. The consequence of the exclusive assertion of the Lancastrian claims was to keep up the excitement of the Yorkist faction, and to render many of them ready again to try the fortune of war, which had so often declared in their favour during the conflicts between the two houses. A head only was wanted; and in the absence of legitimate representatives of the house of York, many persons were found ready to maintain the rights of two notorious pretenders. One of these, Lambert Simnel by name, claimed to be Edward Plantagenet, earl of Warwick, the son and heir of George, duke of Clarence, the younger brother of Edward IV.; the other, Perkin Warbeck, claimed to be Richard Plantagenet, the second son of Edward IV. himself. The pretensions of the first of these claimants to the throne brought an invading army to the shores of Lancashire; whilst the claims of the second brought the most distinguished soldier and the wealthiest proprietor of Lancashire and Cheshire to the block.

Lambert Simnel, the pretended earl of Warwick, was trained by Richard Simon, an intriguing priest at Oxford, to act the part of the son of George, duke of Clarence—the real earl of Warwick being at that time a close prisoner in the Tower. His claims would not have attracted a moment's notice if it had not been for the support which he received from the duchess of Burgundy, the sister of Edward IV. Having been recognized by her, and furnished with money, and with a body of about 2000 soldiers, commanded by Martin Schwartz, a Flemish officer of some reputation, the false earl of Warwick landed in Ireland, where he was eagerly received as a true prince, and welcomed by the numerous adherents of the house of York, from the lord-deputy, the earl of Kildare, to the lowest of the people. He there raised a considerable body of Irish troops, which, however, were more formidable from their natural courage than from their arms and equipments.

With this mixed host of Irish and Flemings, Martin Schwartz and the pretended earl of Warwick landed in the north of Lancashire, in the harbour of the Pile of Foudry, and erected their standard on a wild moor near Ulverstone, which still bears the name of Schwartz Moor. The pretender was there joined by Sir Thomas Broughton of Furness, with some of his own tenants, and of those of the Harringtons of Hornby castle, who, like the Broughtons, had stood by the house of York from the commencement of the wars of the Red and White Rose. After remaining for a short time in that remote district, the invading army marched eastward to the city of York, where it was joined by a few more of the adherents of the house of York. The most important of these was John De la Pole, earl of Lincoln, a true Plantagenet by the mother's side, and so closely connected with the crown that Richard III. was said to have intended to adopt him as his own heir and the heir to the throne. Had the insurrection succeeded, the earl of Lincoln would probably have taken the place of Lambert Simnel. A few other persons, deeply committed to the Yorkist party, including Lord Lovel, the minister and favourite of Richard III., joined the invaders; but the number of Englishmen who were willing to share their fortunes was never large.

King Henry VII., on hearing of the approach of the invading forces, brought together a considerable army at Stafford, where it was joined by the earl of Shrewsbury and Lord Strange, the son of the earl of Derby, with 5000 to 6000 men. The two armies met at Stokefield, near Newark, on the 6th June, 1487. The followers of the pretended earl of Warwick and real earl of Lincoln, knowing

that they had nothing to hope for in the way of pardon, fought with the most desperate courage for three or four hours, but were finally defeated and destroyed, leaving 4000 men dead on the field of battle. Of the chiefs of the rebel army, the only one who survived was Lambert Simnel himself. The earls of Lincoln and Kildare, Lord Lovel, Martin Schwartz, and Sir Thomas Broughton were amongst the slain. The most notable prisoners were Lambert Simnel, and Simon, the priest of Oxford, who had trained him to act the part of earl of Warwick. The king had the magnanimity to spare the life of Lambert Simnel; and, in derision of his claims, made him a cook in the royal kitchen. The life of the priest Simon was spared, but he was long kept a prisoner. Many other persons of lesser note were punished either with death, or with fine and confiscation. The king rewarded the services of the Stanley family, by conferring on the earl of Derby the estates of Sir Thomas Broughton in Furness.

A few years later a more plausible impostor appeared in the person of Perkin Warbeck, claiming to be Richard, duke of York, the younger son of Edward IV. His story was that the murderers who killed his brother, the youthful Edward V., in the Tower, had taken pity upon him, and had spared his life. He is said to have greatly resembled King Edward IV. in person, and it is not improbable that he was an illegitimate son of that licentious prince.

The only manner in which the conspiracy of Perkin Warbeck is connected with the history of Lancashire and Cheshire, is by the disastrous effects which it produced on the life and fortunes of Sir William Stanley, the brother of the first earl of Derby of the Stanley family, and, next to the earl, the most distinguished soldier and the greatest landowner of the two counties. The early part of the history of Perkin Warbeck's conspiracy greatly resembles that of Lambert Simnel's; and, indeed, it is probable that they were both got up by the same skilful intriguer, the duchess-dowager of Burgundy. Like Lambert Simnel, Warbeck was recognized by her as a true Plantagenet; and as such he was also recognized in Ireland and in Scotland, in the latter of which countries he was received as a real prince, and was allowed to marry a Scottish lady of high rank and great beauty, Lady Catherine Gordon. He was also allowed to march across the border at the head of a Scottish army. No one could have less deserved these honours; for when Warbeck ultimately landed in the south of England, he showed a total want both of courage and military conduct.

It is very doubtful whether any of the English Yorkists of rank and influence took part with Perkin Warbeck, though several were executed on suspicion of favouring his cause, and amongst them Sir William Stanley, the brother of the earl of Derby, to whom and to his brother the king owed, not only his throne, but his life.

The instrument of Sir William Stanley's destruction was Sir Robert Clifford. This man was either a spy and informer, who had entered into the service of Perkin Warbeck at the instance of the king, for the purpose of obtaining a knowledge of his secrets and those of his adherents ; or he was a double-faced traitor, who had first deserted the king for the pretender, and afterwards betrayed the secrets of the pretender to the king. It was on his information that the king acted, in seizing on several of the leading Yorkists, amongst whom were Lord Fitzwalter, Sir Simon Radcliffe, Sir Simon Mountford, Sir Thomas Thwaites, and William Daubigny, all of whom were tried for conspiring to dethrone the king, and were beheaded as traitors. But the most important of the victims of Sir Robert Clifford was Sir William Stanley, who was charged with having spoken words which in that age were held to be equivalent to treason. What Sir William Stanley was charged with having said was, "That if he was sure that Perkin Warbeck was King Edward's son, he would never bear arms against him." These words, though far from bearing a treasonable character, and though reported by a spy and informer, were sufficient to destroy Sir William Stanley. On this charge he was arraigned for high treason, was found guilty of that offence, and was beheaded as a traitor.

After the murder of Sir William Stanley, it was stated, in hope of extenuating the guilt and odium of those who had destroyed him, that Sir William had for some time been ill affected towards the king. It was further stated that his ill-will arose from the circumstance of his having been refused the earldom of Chester, to which he was said to have aspired. His real offence was that he and his family were too powerful, and too rich, not to excite the jealous fears of the king. Sir William Stanley, and his brother the earl of Derby, had been the means of dethroning Richard III., and of placing the crown on the head of King Henry ; and it was feared that the Stanleys might aspire to the office of king-makers, and might attempt to dispose of the crown, as their relative, the great earl of Warwick, had so often done during the wars of York and Lancaster. The possession of a vast amount of power and wealth was the real offence



of Sir William Stanley, who, whether he sought the title of Earl of Chester or not, possessed the greater part both of the power and wealth of that great earldom, as his brother, the earl of Derby, possessed great part of the power and influence of the earls and dukes of Lancaster. This union in one family of powers which might be dangerous, especially to a king reigning by a doubtful title, was the real offence of Sir William Stanley. Something also was due to his immense wealth, which surpassed that of any other subject of the crown. When the castle of Holt, on the river Dee, which was the principal residence of Sir William Stanley, was seized by the officers of the crown, there was found there 40,000 marks of silver, together with immense quantities of plate, jewels, and other effects. All these were confiscated, and went to swell the hoards of the king, which at the time of his death amounted to £1,800,000, a sum then equal to ten times as much of the money of the present day.

After having destroyed one of the brothers of the house of Stanley, the king spared no pains to conciliate the other; and in the year after the death of Sir William Stanley, he determined to pay a visit to his mother, the countess of Derby and Richmond, and to the earl of Derby, at Lathom house. An account has been preserved of this royal progress, from which it appears that the king left London, or Windsor, about the 20th June, 1496, and that he arrived on the borders of Cheshire on the 16th of July. On that day he lodged at the ancient abbey of Combermere, in later times the residence of the gallant viscount who took his title from that place. On the following day the king went to Holt castle, the principal seat of the unfortunate Sir William Stanley. On the day following he proceeded to Chester, in which ancient city he was received with great honours, where he remained till the 23rd of July. From Chester the king went through Delamere Forest to the abbey of Vale Royal, on the banks of the river Weaver. From Vale Royal he proceeded, by way of Warrington, to Lathom house, where he remained as the guest of the earl and countess of Derby until the beginning of the month of August. On the 3rd of August the king was at Knowsley. On the 4th he proceeded to Warrington; on the 5th to Manchester; and on the 6th to Macclesfield. On the 8th the king was at Newcastle-under-Lyne; and travelling slowly from that place, by way of Stafford, Derby, Nottingham, Northampton, Woodstock, and Oxford, he reached Windsor on the 1st October.

The reign of Henry VII. was the only interval of even com-

parative peace enjoyed by the kingdom during the whole of the fifteenth century. The struggle between Henry Bolingbroke and King Richard II., out of which the wars of York and Lancaster afterwards grew, took place in the year 1400; and from that time to the battle of Bosworth-field, fought on the 22nd of August, 1485, England was scarcely ever free either from internal tumult or from foreign war. The reign of Henry VII. was not interrupted by any more formidable internal commotions than those raised by Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck; and although the king, for the purpose of amusing the minds of his people and opening their purses, more than once threatened to lead an army into France, and again to assert the claims of Edward III. and Henry V. to the crown of France, he had too much prudence ever to engage in so costly and hopeless an enterprise. To the end of his reign, however, he made this an excuse for asking for money from his Parliament; and one of the acts of his last Parliament was to make grants of money to meet the expenses of the marriage of Henry's eldest daughter with the king of Scotland, of the knighting of his eldest son, and of "the great and inestimable charges" which he had incurred for the defence of the kingdom. Two "reasonable aids," producing together the sum of £40,000, were granted for these purposes; and the contribution of Lancashire towards that amount was found to be £318 2s. 3¼d.

On the accession of Henry VIII., the youthful king, inflamed by the love of military glory, led a powerful army into France, and thus laid his kingdom open to one of the most formidable attacks ever made on it by the kings of Scotland. In the month of August, 1512, the 4th Henry VIII., the king being absent in France, with the earl of Derby and many of his nobles, it became known that James IV., king of Scotland, was about to invade England with the whole military force of his kingdom. To meet this threatened invasion, the king issued a proclamation, in which he stated that, confiding in the loyalty, wisdom, valour, industry, experience, and integrity of Thomas Howard, earl of Surrey, treasurer and marshal of England, he had commissioned him to raise and muster all persons able to bear arms in the counties of York, Northumberland, Westmoreland, and Lancashire; to arm them, review them, and to march them where he saw necessary to suppress the attempts of the Scots.\* In reply to this summons the whole military strength of the six northern counties, aided by the knights and gentlemen of Cheshire, who came forward

\* Rymer's *Fœdera*, v. 13, p. 359.

without being summoned, rose in arms, and marched to meet the Scottish army, which had already crossed the border. The earl of Derby being with the king in France, the Lancashire and Cheshire men assembled under the command of his son, Sir Edward Stanley. They formed the left wing of the English army at the battle of Flodden-field; and according to all the accounts that have been preserved of that terrible battle, took a great, if not the greatest part, in deciding the victory.

The battle of Flodden-field is familiar to every one from the noble poem in which Scott, one of the greatest poets of Scotland, has immortalized the brave men who conquered or fell in that terrible conflict.

The services of all the leaders in this great battle were liberally acknowledged by the king. The earl of Surrey had the ancient title of his family, the dukedom of Norfolk, restored to him; Sir Edward Stanley was made a baron, by the title of Lord Monteagle; and letters were addressed by order of the king to Sir Richard Molyneux, of Sefton; Sir Richard Norris, of Speke; Sir Richard Ashton, and others, thanking them for their services in the battle.

From the battle of Flodden-field to the commencement of the Reformation this part of the kingdom enjoyed both internal and external peace. On the Scottish border all remained tranquil; and King Henry VIII. soon became weary of the war with France, and concluded a peace, which was mutually advantageous to the two countries. During this period, as well as during the reign of Henry VII., the kingdom increased in population and wealth; the soil began to be cultivated with greater skill; and the woollen and other manufactures began to flourish in the towns and larger villages. Everything promised a tranquil reign for Henry VIII., the first king who had ruled in England with an undisputed title for more than a hundred years. In the middle of his reign, however, the king became involved in a violent quarrel with the pope, which ended in the overthrow of the papal authority in England, and in the ultimate establishment of new forms of religion, after many years of internal discord.

In the counties of Chester and Lancaster the Roman Catholic party was extremely strong, both in numbers and in property; and it was with great difficulty that the principles of the Reformation were established in those counties. For a considerable time the only zealous adherents of those doctrines were found amongst the town population of Manchester and Liverpool, both of which places began to rise into importance about this time.

The first open rupture between the adherents of the king and the pope in England was followed by the suppression of the monasteries. These were powerful everywhere, and were unusually numerous, wealthy, and powerful in the northern counties. In Lancashire and Cheshire especially, religious houses of great wealth and influence existed in every district, and exercised a most powerful influence both over the minds and fortunes of all classes of the people. The following is a slight sketch of the several monasteries which existed in the counties of Lancaster and Chester at the time of the Reformation, and which were then swept away by order of the king.

In the northern part of the county of Lancaster, the abbey of Furness, founded by Stephen, earl of Morton and Boloigne (afterwards King Stephen), in the year 1127, and richly endowed by succeeding earls of Morton, kings of England, and by the neighbouring landowners, ruled with almost regal sway over the hills and valleys of Furness. The revenue of the abbey at the time of the dissolution was valued, according to Speed, at £966 7s. 10*d.*, a sum equal to not less than £10,000 of the money of the present day.

At Cartmell, in the same district, there was a priory of Austin canons, founded by William Mareschall, the celebrated earl of Pembroke, in the year 1188, which was dedicated to the Virgin, and at the time of the dissolution was valued at £212 11s. 10*d.*

At Conishead, near Ulverstone, was another priory of Austin canons, founded in the time of Henry II., and liberally endowed by William de Lancaster, baron of Kendal. This priory was also dedicated to the Virgin, and at the time of the Reformation consisted of a prior, of ten monks, and thirty-eight servants. It was valued at £161 5s. 9*d.*

At Lancaster was an alien priory, founded by Earl Roger, of Poitiers, immediately after the Norman conquest, that is to say, in the year 1094, and granted by him, along with the church of St. Mary at Lancaster, and other churches, lands, and tithes in that county, to the abbey of St. Martin de Sees, in Normandy, founded by the father and mother of Earl Roger. At the dissolution of the alien priories, the priory of Lancaster, with the land belonging to it, was annexed to the abbey of Sion, in Middlesex. The value was £80 a year.

There were also three other religious foundations at Lancaster :— First, a hospital for a master, chaplain, and nine poor persons, whereof three were to be lepers, founded by John, earl of Morton, afterwards

King John ; second, a house of Dominican or Black friars, founded about the 44th Henry III., by Sir Hugh Harrington, knight; third, a friary for Franciscan or Grey friars, near the bridge.

At Hornby, in the valley of the Lune, was a priory, with a prior and three canons. It was dedicated to St. Wilfred, was attached to the abbey of Croxton, in Leicestershire, and was of the value of £26 per annum.

At Cockersand was an abbey, which was first a hermitage, then a hospital, but was raised to the rank of an abbey in the year 1190. It was founded, or chiefly endowed, by William de Lancaster, baron of Kendal, in the reign of Henry II. The abbey of Cockersand contained at the time of the dissolution twenty-two monks and fifty-seven servants. It was of the value of £282 7s. 7d.

At Cockerham there was a priory.

In Wyresdale there was a Cistercian abbey founded about in 1188.

At Longridge was an ancient hospital dedicated to the Virgin. There was there a master and brethren.

At Lytham there was a Benedictine cell, founded by Richard Fitz Roger in the reign of Richard I. It belonged to the cathedral of Durham, was dedicated to St. Mary and St. Cuthbert, and was of the value of £53 15s. 10d.

At Preston there were two religious foundations. The first was an ancient hospital, dedicated to St. Mary Magdalen ; the second was a priory of Grey friars, founded by Edmund Plantagenet, the first earl of Lancaster.

At Penwortham, near Preston, was a Benedictine priory, founded by Warine de Boisoul, baron of Penwortham, in the reign of William the Conqueror. It was attached to the abbey of Evesham, in Worcestershire, and was of the yearly value of £114 16s. 9d.

At Upholland, near Wigan, was a Benedictine priory, founded by Sir Robert Holland in the reign of Edward III., and dedicated to St. Thomas the Martyr. There were there five monks and twenty-six servants ; and the priory was valued at £78 12s. 0d.

At Burscough, near Ormskirk, was a priory of Black canons, founded by Robert Fitz Henry, lord of Lathom, in the reign of Richard I. It was dedicated to St. Nicholas ; consisted of a prior, five monks, and forty servants ; and its value was £129 1s. 10d.

At Whalley, near Blackburn, was a splendid abbey, founded by the De Lacys, earls of Lincoln and constables of Chester. The original site of this abbey was at Stanlow, in Cheshire ; but in the



year 1296 it was removed to Whalley. This abbey was dedicated to the Virgin; and at the time of the dissolution of the monasteries its revenues were of the yearly value of £551 4s. 6*d.*

At Kershall, or Kyrkshaw, was a Cluniac cell. King Henry II. granted, and King John confirmed, to the monastery of Nottingham the hermitage of this place, which became a small house of Cluniac monks.

At Warrington there was a friary of Austin friars, founded before the year 1379.

At Manchester was a college founded by Thomas De la Warr, rector of the parish of Manchester, and representative of the Lords De la Warr, barons of Manchester. In the 9th Henry V., Thomas De la Warr obtained permission to make the church collegiate, with a warden and a certain number of priests. This church was dedicated to the Virgin, and was of the value of £213 10s. 11*d.* The college was dissolved in 1547 by King Edward VI.; but was re-founded, first by Queen Mary, afterwards by Queen Elizabeth in the year 1578, and again by King Charles I., in the year 1636, for a warden, four fellows, two chaplains, four singing men, and four choristers. These were incorporated as the warden and fellows of Christ Church, in Manchester.

In addition to the above religious houses, there were chantries in all the principal churches in Lancashire, in which prayers were offered up for the souls of the departed. Amongst these were chantries in the churches of Wharton and Kirkby Ireleth; four chantries in the church of St. Nicholas and St. Mary at Liverpool; one each at Eccleston, at Sefton, and at Croston; four at Manchester; one at Burscough, at Ormskirk, and at Eccles; two at St. Michael's on Wyre; two at Halsall; one each at Lancaster, at Hollingfare, at Standish, and at Warrington; one at Preston, another at Ribchester; a third at Silverdale; and a fourth at Clitheroe. The right of sanctuary also existed at Manchester, where, however, it was regarded as an intolerable nuisance.

The most celebrated of the monastic houses of Chester was the abbey of St. Werburg, in the city of Chester, now forming the cathedral of that ancient city. This abbey was founded in the time of the Saxon kings, but was reorganized by Archbishop Anselm, and richly endowed by Hugh Lupus, soon after the Norman conquest. It was celebrated for the possession of the shrine and the remains of St. Werburg, a female Saxon saint, which were believed to have

the power of working miracles. At the time of the dissolution of the monasteries the abbey of St. Werburg was of the yearly value of £1073 17s. 7*d.*

The abbey of Vale Royal, on the banks of the river Weaver, was founded by King Edward I., who was the first earl of Chester of that royal line. It was liberally endowed by him and by others, and at the time of the dissolution of the monasteries was of the value of £540 6s. 2*d.*

The priory of Birkenhead was founded by Hamo de Masci, the founder of the family of the Masseys of Dunham-Massey, in Cheshire. The priory possessed large estates in Wirral, and a right of ferry across the river Mersey from Birkenhead to Liverpool, value £102 16s. 10*d.*

The abbey of Stanlow, on the banks of the Mersey, was founded by the De Lacys, of Halton castle; but the site being found unhealthy, the abbey was removed to Whalley, in Lancashire.

The priory of Norton, near Runcorn, was also founded by the De Lacy family; At the time of the dissolution it was of the value of £258 11s. 8*d.*

The abbey of Combermere, in the southern border of Cheshire, was founded by Hugh de Malbedeng, in 1133. At the time of the dissolution of the monasteries it was of the yearly value of £255.

It will be seen from the above statement that the monastic houses were scattered over the whole of Lancashire and Cheshire, from Furness to Combermere; and that chantries existed in all the principal churches of the two counties. In addition to these foundations within the two counties, the abbeys of St. Peter's in Shrewsbury, Merevale in Warwickshire, Dieulacres in Staffordshire, and other religious houses in other parts of the kingdom, also held large possessions in Lancashire and Cheshire. The monks were in general indulgent and peaceful landlords; and the religious houses had many and powerful friends amongst the gentry and yeomen, and some even in the town population. The suppression of the smaller religious houses, coupled with the denial of the pope's supremacy, and other measures, by which the English Church was placed in direct antagonism to the Church of Rome, produced a violent commotion in all parts of England, and especially in the northern counties, in which the religious houses were more than usually numerous and powerful, and the population more than usually well-affected to the Church of Rome. Shortly after the rupture of the king with the pope,

a violent insurrection, in opposition to the measures of the king, broke out in Yorkshire and Durham, and spread into the north of Lancashire. There it was arrested by the firmness of Edward, earl of Derby.

The insurrection known as the "Pilgrimage of Grace" broke out in Yorkshire and Durham in the year 1535, and spread through the district of Craven, down to the abbey of Sawley in Ribblesdale. A similar insurrection also broke out in Furness and the other parts of Lancashire lying to the north of Lancaster, and threatened to spread through the whole country. The earl of Derby, on hearing of these risings, assembled the strength of Lancashire at Preston, and there presented so strong a front that the insurgents shrank from the contest, and gradually broke up and dispersed. After the suppression of this rising, John Paslaw, the abbot of Whalley, was convicted of high treason, and hung in front of the abbey. William Trafford, abbot of Sawley, and the prior of the same place, were executed at Lancaster, along with John Castegate and William Haydocke. This insurrection, instead of saving the monasteries, only hastened their ruin. Commissioners were appointed to inquire into the abuses of the greater monasteries, who drew up against them a most formidable bill of indictment, charging the abbots, priors, and monks with incontinence, idolatry, and many other offences. How far these charges were true is perhaps doubtful; but Henry VIII., his advisers, and his Parliament held them to be proved, and the greater monasteries, like the smaller, were dissolved. Their property was disposed of, in some cases by sale, and in others by gift to favourites of the crown. Moderate pensions were granted to many of the heads of these houses, and to the monks and nuns.

The latter years of the reign of Henry VIII. were more peaceful than might have been expected, from the course of his life and the spirit of his rule. The spirit of the nobility and the power of the church were bent, if not broken, by his stern and merciless assertion of the royal prerogative; but he was rather popular than otherwise with the middle and humbler classes of the people, who had long suffered from the tyranny of those two classes, and were not sorry to see them humbled.

Towards the end of the reign of Henry VIII. another war broke out with Scotland, in which the Lancashire and Cheshire gentry and people were again called to arms. This happened in the 36th

Henry VIII., 1544, in which year a powerful English army entered Scotland, and took the city of Edinburgh. A number of books, taken and brought away by Sir William Norris, knight, of Speke, near Liverpool, are still in existence in the Athenæum Library in that town, containing the following inscription, in the language of the age, written by Sir William Norris himself:—

“M<sup>d</sup>. Yt Edin Borow wasse wone ye viii. daye of May in ano xxxvi. H [enry] et ano Dni m<sup>o</sup>cccc<sup>o</sup>xluiii. and yt this boke, Bartolus sup. pem. de gesti veteris was gottyn and broughte awaye by me Willm. Norres of the Speike Th. ye xi. day of Maye foursaide, and now ye boke of me ye foursaid Sr Willm. geven and by me left to remayne at Speke for an heireloume. In witness whereof wrcityn this, set my none hande and subscribed my name,

P. me WILLM. NORRES, Milit.”

The short reign of Edward VI. was chiefly remarkable for the progress made by the Reformation, and for another short but bloody war with Scotland. In the year 1547 all Lancashire and Cheshire were again in arms, and marched into Scotland under the duke of Somerset. They encountered the Scottish army at Musselburgh or Pinkie Clough, and after a desperate battle put it to the route. William Norris, the eldest son of the Sir William Norris, of Speke, mentioned above, was killed in this battle in a rash attack on the Scottish pikemen. His father survived the battle, and brought back to Speke the banner of David Boswell, of Balminto, whose sons were slain at Musselburgh.\*

In the reign of Queen Mary the events in the history of Lancashire and Cheshire were chiefly connected with the temporary restoration of the Roman Catholic religion. The greater part of the population of the two counties having still a strong leaning to that religion, the measures of the queen for restoring it were in general well received. The chantries in all the churches in the two counties were re-established; and the leading men in both counties eagerly concurred in restoring the old religion. But the Protestants of Lancashire and Cheshire, though only a small minority, were full of zeal and determination; and several of them laid down their lives for their religious convictions, in that age of martyrdom. The following is a list of the Lancashire men who died for their faith in the Marian persecution:—

\* Proceedings of Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire. Session II. 1849-50. P. 168.

John Rogers, a Lancashire man by birth, was the first martyr in this persecution. He was educated at Cambridge, and was one of the first scholars of the age, having assisted in translating the Bible into English in the reign of Henry VIII. He was tried on a charge of heresy before a court composed of the bishops of Winchester, London, Durham, Salisbury, Norwich, and Carlisle, in company with Hooper, bishop of Gloucester, and was sentenced to be burnt at the stake, after being first degraded from the priestly office. When brought before Bonner, bishop of London, to be degraded, he begged permission to take leave of his wife; but was refused, with the brutal taunt, that being a priest he could not have a wife. When brought to the stake he was offered his life if he would recant his opinions, but he firmly refused to do so, and died with dauntless courage, being burnt to ashes in Smithfield.

The next Lancashire martyr was John Bradford, born at Manchester. In his early life he had filled the office of secretary to Sir John Harrington, treasurer of Henry VIII. and Edward VI., but subsequently he became a minister of religion, and a steady adherent of the Reformed faith. He rose to the rank of a prebendary of St. Paul's, but preached often in his native county. He was tried, along with Dr. Taylor, for denying the doctrine of transubstantiation, and was sentenced to be burnt as a heretic. His life was spared for some time, in the hope that he would recant; but far from doing so, he seized that last opportunity of addressing letters to the people of the different towns of Lancashire and Cheshire, urging them to be true to the faith which they had adopted. He was burnt in Smithfield, in the month of July, 1555, along with a youth of nineteen, named John Lease.

A third Lancashire martyr who lost his life in the Marian persecution was George Marsh, a native of the parish of Dean, a poor curate and an instructor of youth. Having become an object of suspicion, he surrendered himself to the earl of Derby, at Lathom house, and was by him subjected to various examinations, in the course of which he addressed the earl with the following reproof:—"It is strange that your lordship, being one of the honourable council of the late King Edward, consenting and agreeing to acts concerning faith towards God and religion, should so soon after consent to put poor men to a shameful death for embracing the same religion." After several attempts to shake his firmness, Marsh



was committed to Lancaster castle, and confined in irons, with common felons. After being confined some time at Lancaster, he was removed to Chester, where he was tried before the bishop, on the charge of having preached most heretically and blasphemously in the parishes of Dean, Bury, and Eccles, as well as in other parishes in the bishop's diocese, not only against the pope's authority, but against the Church of Rome, the holy mass, the sacrament of the altar, and the articles of the Romish faith. To these charges Marsh answered, that he had preached neither heresy nor blasphemy, but only the doctrines sanctioned by authority of the king and his Parliament in the reign of Edward VI. With regard to the pope, however, he did not hesitate to declare that the bishop of Rome ought to exercise no more authority in England than the archbishop of Canterbury ought to exercise at Rome. The bishop of Chester, on hearing this, stigmatized the prisoner as "a most damnable, irreclaimable, and unpardonable heretic," and proceeded to pronounce sentence of death upon him as a heretic. For some time he was confined in the Northgate prison at Chester; and on the 4th April, 1555, he was led out to the place of execution at Spittal, Boughton, within the liberties of the city. When brought to the stake, a desperate attempt was made to rescue him by the people, headed by Sheriff Cooper; but they were beaten off by the other sheriff and his retainers, and in the end George Marsh was added to the martyrs, whose blood truly proved to be the seed of the church.

In the year 1553, the first of Queen Mary, a great muster was made of the military force of the kingdom. The particulars of the Lancashire muster have been preserved, and serve to show what was the military system of that age. The whole force raised in Lancashire was 1900 men, each of the six hundreds into which the county is divided furnishing a quota, proportioned to its population and resources.

In this levy the hundred of West Derby furnished 430 men, commanded by Edward, earl of Derby, Sir Richard Molyneux, of Sefton, Sir Thomas Gerrard, Sir Peers Legh, Sir John Holcroft, Sir John Atherton, and Sir William Norris, knights; and Thomas Butler, of Bewsey, George Ireland, of Hale, William Tarbock, of Tarbock, and Lawrence Ireland, of Lydiate, esquires.

The Salford hundred furnished 350 men, commanded by Sir Edward Trafford, Sir William Radcliffe, Sir Robert Longley, Sir

Thomas Holt, and Sir Robert Worsley, knights; and Robert Barton, Edward Holland, and Ralph Ashton, esquires.

The Leyland hundred furnished 170 men, commanded by Sir Thomas Hesketh, knight; and Edward Standish, John Fleetwood, Roger Bradshagh, John Langtree, Peers Anderton, and John Wrightington, esquires.

The Amounderness hundred furnished 300 men, commanded by Sir Thomas Hesketh and Sir Richard Hoghton, knights; and George Brown, John Kitchen, Richard Barton, William Westbie, and William Barton, esquires.

The Blackburn hundred furnished 400 men, commanded by Sir Richard Shireburn, Sir Thomas Langton, Sir Thomas Talbot, and Sir John Southworth, knights; and by John Towneley, Thomas Cotterell, John Osboldston, and John Talbot, esquires; and the Lonsdale hundred furnished 250 men, commanded by Lord Montegale, Sir Marmaduke Tunstall, knight; and Thomas Carus, George Middleton, Thomas Bradley, Hugh Dicconson, and Oliver Middleton, esquires.

The later years of Queen Mary's reign were troubled by foreign war, as well as by domestic discontent. In the year 1556 there was a levy of troops, in anticipation of a war with France, in which Lancashire was called on to furnish 200 archers, under the command of Sir Robert Worsley, knight, and Edward Tildesley. These archers were furnished by the different hundreds of the county in the following numbers:—West Derby, 40; Salford, 36; Leyland, 17; Amounderness, 30; Blackburn, 39; and Lonsdale, 36.\*

In the year 1557 the French government availed itself of the opportunity afforded by the distracted state of England to seize on the fortress of Calais, the last remnant of the great possessions which England had so long held on the Continent. On that occasion there was a general levy of troops throughout England, partly to defend Calais, partly to resist a gathering of Scottish troops on the border, promoted by Mary Queen of Scots at the request of her relatives the Guises, who then governed France, and directed the policy of the young Scottish queen, who was married to the youthful king of France. With a view to "the Scottish doings," measures were taken to array the levies in Lancashire and Cheshire. The following is a return as to this levy, addressed by Edward, earl of Derby, to Francis Talbot, earl of Shrewsbury, lord-president of the North:—

\* Lancashire Lieutenancy, Part i. p. 14.

## CAPTAINS OF LANCASHIRE SOLDIERS, AND THEIR FORCES.

Sir Richard Molyneux, knight, his brother, or son and heir, a feeble man himself, . . . . .	200
Sir Thomas Gerrard, knight, . . . . .	200
Sir Richard Hoghton, knight, not able himself, but will furnish an able man to be captain; because not able to go himself, doth furnish but . . . . .	100
Sir Thomas Hesketh, and others with him, . . . . .	100
Sir Thomas Langton, Sir William Norres, neither of them able, but will furnish an able captain, . . . . .	100
Sir William Radcliffe, or his son and heir, Alexander, who is a handsome gentleman, and Sir John Atherton joined with him, . . . . .	100
Francis Tunstall and others, . . . . .	100
Sir John Holcroft, or his son and heir, and Sir Richard Assheton, of Middleton, and others, . . . . .	100
<i>Item.</i> —The rest appointed in Lancashire be of my retinue.	

EDWARD DERBY.\*

Calais was lost, in spite of this and other levies; but the "Scottish doings" came to nothing, the Scottish nobles having refused to declare war against England, to which country they looked for support against the Guises and the Roman Catholic party.

The accession of Queen Elizabeth to the throne, in the year 1558, was followed by the triumph of the Protestant party and of the Protestant doctrines in England. The queen herself entertained many of the doctrines of the Romish Church, at least in the earlier part of her reign, but she soon found that the Protestants were her only cordial supporters. The Catholics, both at home and abroad, regarded her as illegitimate, and favoured the claims of Mary Queen of Scots, whose descent from the eldest sister of Henry VIII. gave her an undoubted right to the throne of England, supposing the claims of Elizabeth to be set aside. So early as the year 1559, Mary and her husband, Francis II. of France, assumed the titles of "Francis and Mary, by the Grace of God, King and Queen of England, Scotland, and Ireland"; and her powerful relatives, the Guises, deluded themselves with the hope of seeing the sceptre of Britain united to that of France.† It was fortunate for Elizabeth

\* Lancashire Lieutenancy. Part i. p. 17.

† Lander's Annals of the Life and Reign of Queen Elizabeth, v. i. p. 54.

that the Protestant subjects of Mary Queen of Scots were as much opposed to the claims of their own queen, on the ground of her religion, as the Catholic subjects of Elizabeth were to hers on account both of her birth and her religion. The result was that Elizabeth always had a strong party in Scotland; and that the unfortunate Queen of Scots was at length compelled to flee from her own dominions, and to throw herself on the mercy of her rival. The rivalry of Elizabeth and Mary of Scotland, and the religious district in which it originated, had the effect of keeping the north of England in a perpetual ferment of military preparation, during the whole reign of Elizabeth; and the history of Lancashire and Cheshire, during the forty-three years of the reign of Elizabeth, is little else than an account of military preparation, with the design to weaken the authority of the Queen of Scots in her own dominions, or to defend England from her friends, allies, or co-religionists in Scotland, Ireland, France, and Spain, and amongst the subjects of Elizabeth herself.

In the year after the accession of Queen Elizabeth to the throne of Scotland, a war broke out in Scotland between the queen regent (Mary of Guise) and the Catholic party, who, with the aid of French troops, attacked the Protestant lords and the other followers of John Knox. On the 6th November, 1559, the Presbyterians, commanded by the earl of Arran and the prior of St. Andrews, were surrounded and defeated by a portion of the French garrison of Leith. They retreated to Edinburgh, and afterwards fled to Stirling, whilst the queen regent and the French entered the Scottish capital in triumph. The council of Elizabeth, on hearing of the triumph of the French and Catholic party in Scotland, immediately prepared to sustain their friends in that country. Reinforcements were sent to the English garrison, and in the course of the winter a powerful army was raised to besiege the French at Leith, and to aid in driving them out of Scotland.

For the purpose of strengthening the garrison of Berwick it was ordered that Lancashire should furnish 300 men, of whom seventy-eight were to be archers, the whole under the command of Sir John Southworth, knight, of Samlesbury, "a toward and tall gentleman," "desirous to know service in war." Immediately afterwards it was ordered that Lancashire should furnish 200 soldiers and 277 pioneers, under the command of Thomas Butler, Esq., "to serve the Queen's Majesty at Leith."

In the month of January of the following year (1560), a general muster of the armed and unarmed men of Lancashire was made, when it appeared that they amounted to 3992. The following is a copy of this curious return :—

“A general muster certified in the counties of Lancaster, in January, 1559 (1560), *Anno Regni Reginae Eliz. Secundo.*

HUNDRETH.	HARNISHED.	UNHARNISHED.
Blackborne, . . . . .	407	359
Amoundernes, . . . . .	223	369
Lonsdalle, . . . . .	356	114
Salford, . . . . .	338	649
Layland, . . . . .	24	122
West Derby, . . . . .	459	413
Summa totalis of the harnished men, . . . . .		1919
Summa totalis of the unharnished men, . . . . .		2074

---

3993

In the month of April, 1560, the siege of Leith was commenced. The French defended themselves with the greatest bravery and skill, and beat back a general assault made on the 6th May; but being shut in by sea and land, without any chance of escape, a treaty was shortly concluded at Edinburgh between Elizabeth and Henry II. of France. In this treaty it was agreed that all hostilities should cease; that King Francis and Queen Mary should be reconciled with their subjects; and that they should for the future cease to use the title and insignia of England and Ireland. This treaty was followed by the entire ascendancy of the Protestant party in Scotland; and gave peace along the northern borders of England.

In the year 1566 there was an insurrection in Ireland, under Shane O'Neal, when fifty archers were sent from Lancashire to assist in upholding the queen's authority, A memorandum respecting these archers is as follows :—*Id.*, That each of the said archers was furnished with a cassock (loose coat) of blue cloth, faced with two small stripes of white cloth, a yew bow, a sheaf of arrows in a case, a skull piece of steel or iron in a red cap, a jerkin of deer or bull's hide, a sword and dagger, and every one in his purse had in ready money 13s. 4d., besides 4s. delivered for coat and conduct money at their coming to Chester. And for the furnishing of the said soldiers



the country was taxed after the rate of 40s. for each of the archers or soldiers.

In the year 1568 Mary Queen of Scots fled into England, where she was received rather as a prisoner than a guest, and soon became mixed up with numerous intrigues, which ultimately cost her her life.

From the beginning of her reign Elizabeth had been considered and treated as an usurper by the pope; and on the 25th February, 1570, Pope Pius V. issued a papal bull declaring her an excommunicated heretic, and as such deprived of her pretended title to the crown of England, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever; absolving all her subjects from every act of allegiance and obedience to her, and commanding them to disobey her orders and laws on pain of the papal anathema. This many of them had already done and afterwards did; but with no other result than to bring destruction on themselves, and to rouse a resolute, unconquerable, and merciless spirit, on the part of the queen and of her Protestant subjects. For the remainder of her reign, a war without quarter on either side was waged between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants.

Two or three months before the issuing of the Bull of Pius V., that is to say, in the month of November, 1569, the Roman Catholic "rising of the North" broke out, under the command of Percy, earl of Northumberland, and of Nevill, earl of Westmoreland, whose influence was sufficiently powerful to bring together an army of 4000 infantry and 600 horse. At the head of this force the two earls overran Northumberland, Durham, and great part of Yorkshire; and hoped to have roused Lancashire and Cheshire, by the aid of the earl of Derby, whom they invited to join them. With this view they addressed a letter to the earl, of the 27th November, calling on him to assist them. Seven days previous to the date of this despatch the earl had received a commission from the queen, appointing him her lord-lieutenant. He was, moreover, a man of eminent prudence and loyalty; and though his leanings were towards the old religion, he was not at all disposed to risk life and fortune in so desperate an enterprise as that in which the earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland were engaged. He therefore at once arrested the messenger of the insurgent earls, and sent their letter to the queen, along with a similar letter addressed to his relative, Lord Monteagle. But before this, namely, on the 24th November, the earl of Derby had written to the queen, stating that he had received

information from the earl of Sussex, the queen's commander, that the earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland were in open rebellion, and declaring that he would use all diligence to keep the county of Lancaster in obedience. Before the queen could have received this letter she wrote to the earl of Derby, directing him to raise the whole force of Lancashire and Cheshire, and with that of Nottingham and Derby, under the earl of Shrewsbury, to join with the Lord Admiral Clinton, and to proceed against the earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, then in open rebellion. The rebel forces dispersed without a blow, on the approach of the royal army. A letter is still in existence, dated Durham, December 22, 1569, from the earl of Warwick (Ambrose Dudley), and Lord Edward Clinton, the lord high admiral, stating that they had written from Ripon to know the queen's pleasure as to the discharge of part of the army. It is added that they had discharged and sent home 2000 men, being chiefly of the Lancashire and Cheshire forces; but they add that the country was still in some danger. Nor was the observation unfounded; for the rebellion of the two earls was soon followed by another insurrection, raised by Leonard Dacres, second son of William Lord Dacres, of the north, which was not suppressed without considerable loss, by Lord Hunsdon and the garrison of Berwick. Of those who took part in these wild attempts 800 persons are said to have been executed, and fifty-seven noblemen and gentlemen of the counties of Northumberland, York, Durham, &c., were attainted by Parliament in the following year. Thanks to the prudent counsels and example of the earl of Derby, this list did not contain any Lancashire names, although it was well known that many of the Roman Catholics of that county were strongly disposed to have joined the rising.

To guard against these outbreaks, there were numerous levies of troops, armour, and money in Lancashire and Cheshire in the year 1570. On the 15th February the queen issued a letter to the lords-lieutenant of all the shires in the kingdom, requiring them to hold a general muster of all persons chargeable with providing horses and geldings; to see them properly armed and furnished; and to make certificate of the same. On the 10th March the queen's letters were addressed to knights and gentlemen, requiring each to provide a lance or light horse; and to esquires, to provide one able man and horse, or able gelding, fully furnished with armour, weapons, &c., to serve in the wars as a demi-lance, and to

be at York on the 1st April. On the 7th September of the same year, the earl of Derby, as head of the lieutenancy in the counties of Lancaster and Chester, assembled the justices of the peace of the palatine counties in the different divisions, for the purpose of arranging their forces, and of adjusting the assessments to which they should respectively be liable. On the 29th September a memorandum was drawn up by Burghley himself, which still exists in his handwriting, of "things requisite to be done for putting the coast and realm of England in readiness against any invasion."

In the year 1574 there was again a general muster of arms in the counties of Lancaster and Chester, the particulars of which show not only the number of men, but the manner in which they were armed and accoutred. The following is a summary of the return:—

"A certificate of a general muster taken within the county of Lancaster, in August, anno xvi. Eliz. Reginae, wherein was certified, over and beside the 1230 men furnished by force of the Statute of Armourers, the number of 2375 able men furnished by the county, which be armed, and also the number of 2405 men able to serve Her Majesty, and which be unarmed."

It appears from this return that the strength of the Lancashire forces in the reign of Queen Elizabeth was in the infantry, and especially in bowmen and billmen; but that fire-arms, though not yet general, were coming into use. Defensive armour of various kinds was still worn.

The cavalry at this time consisted of demi-lancers and light cavalry. The demi-lancers were heavy cavalry, supplying the place of the men-at-arms. They had steel fronts and backs to their saddles. In the reign of Henry VIII. the lances of the cavalry (called *Lances d'Armes*, and used by men-at-arms in battle) were exceedingly long; but these being found unwieldy, the demi or half lance was introduced, differing little from the lance except in length. Light horsemen replaced the demi-lancers when those became more heavily accoutred.

The infantry was composed chiefly of archers, billmen, and pikemen. In the above muster of arms there were bows and arrows for 490 archers; bills or battle-axes for 305 billmen; and pikes for 213 pikemen. The long bow used by the archers was usually formed of one piece of wood, the best of yew; others of Brazil wood, elm, ash, &c.; and wych-hazel was ordered for youth under seventeen, to prevent too great a consumption of wood. The length of some

of the long bows was 6 feet 6 inches, or even more; but the best length was 5 feet 8 inches. The bow was usually tipped with horn at both ends, to make such a notch for the string as would not wear, and to prevent the extremities from breaking. Bows were kept in cases to prevent warping. The best military arrows were of ash; those for sport were made of oak, hornbeam, birch, or Brazil wood. The length was anciently a full yard—"a cloth-yard shaft." The heads were of iron well boiled, brazed, hardened at the points with steel, and marked with the maker's name. The feathering was of goose; the best feathers, grey or white. The sheaf of arrows was twenty-four in number. The quiver slung at the back held the store of arrows; those for immediate use being hung in the girdle. The archers wore steel caps, sometimes also called skulls, though these were generally of iron. The position of the English archers in battle was always in the van and on the outskirts, like that of the riflemen of modern times; and from their incomparable skill in the use of the bow, they decided many, if not most, of the famous battles of early times. The billmen, or, as they were sometimes called, halberdiers, fought with a double battle-axe, called a bill. The bill or halberd, as used by infantry, was affixed to a long staff or handle. It had a long slender blade or spit, and a side blade or blades with cutting edge, sometimes crescent-form, with a concave side sharp, at others with a converse side outwards, and edged. The opposite blade terminated in a sort of beak or pick for splitting. The partizan was a sort of broad-bladed bill, terminating in a crescent with concave blade. The black bill was so called from its blade being blacked, instead of being kept bright. Though a formidable weapon in close fight, the bill was less fatal than the spear, with which the Scottish infantry were armed.

Fire-arms were at this time partially used in the English armies, and very soon after altogether superseded bows and arrows. At the muster of arms in 1574 there were 163 calivers, in use in Lancashire. The caliver was a sort of light musket or harquebus, so called from its calibre being originally fixed according to a standard regulation. It was lighter than the unwieldy musket; indeed, it was a harquebus of specified bore, had a wheel-lock, and a magazine of bullets in the butt. It was 3 feet 2 inches long, and was fired without a rest.

Defensive armour was still in extensive use, as will be seen

from the enumeration of corslets, coats of plate armour, steel caps, and morions; and continued to be used for a hundred years longer both by infantry and cavalry.\*

The commissioners for the muster of Cheshire wrote to the Privy Council from Northwich castle, on the 2nd November, 1573, with particulars of men, horses, armour, &c., and the provision made for the defence of the shire. They also inclosed a certificate of the common soldiers without armour in the county, whose number they stated to be 2063 able men; and sent the muster-book, with the names and number of all knights, esquires, gentlemen, and freeholders in the county of Chester, with horses, armour, and other accoutrements, the number of men being 937. On the 19th July, 1574, the sheriff and justices of the county of Chester wrote to the council from Tarporley, reporting on the muster and other defences of the county.†

The musters of 1574, both in Lancashire and Cheshire, were made by Henry, fourth earl of Derby, the lord-lieutenant of the two counties palatine, who succeeded his father, Edward, earl of Derby, in the year 1572, and lived to the year 1593. In the words of Thomas Challoner, writing in 1576, he was "with Elizabeth Queene well lik't, and of her subjects in grete favour."‡

As early as the year 1567 rumours became current, of an intention on the part of Philip of Spain to invade England. A letter, dated Chester, December 29, 1567, from Richard Hurleston to the earl of Pembroke, gives intelligence, "by good information," of great preparations making by the king of Spain for the invasion of England; and adds that certain gentlemen in Lancashire had taken a solemn oath not to come to the commission, and that they rejoice greatly at the report of a Spanish invasion.§ The discontent of the English Roman Catholics soon after exploded in the "rising of the North," in which so many of them perished; but the rumours of an intended invasion of England by Spain continued at intervals, every year increasing in strength, until 1588—the famous year of the Spanish Armada. During the whole of that time great efforts were made to prepare the country, both by land and sea, to resist invasion; and though the regular army and the royal navy of England were insignificantly small, in comparison with those of Spain, the people were trained to the use of arms in all parts of

\* Meyrick, Grose, Nares, Fosbroke, &c., as quoted in Mr. J. Harland's *Lancashire Lieutenancy*, i. p. 86.

† *Cal. State Pap. Dom.* ‡ *J. Harland's Lancashire Lieutenancy*, &c., i. p. 85, note 18. § *Cal. State Pap. Dom.*



the kingdom; and the commercial marine was armed, and rendered capable of contending with signal success against the ponderous and badly-worked navy of Spain.

In the year 1586 the preparations of the Spanish fleet and army for the invasion of England had proceeded so far that all doubt had ceased as to the intentions of Spain. In August of that year Humfray Brooke, a merchant and master shipowner of Liverpool, on his voyage from St. Jean de Luz, in the south of France, to England, saw the Biscayan division of the Spanish fleet sail from Bilbao and Passages to join the other divisions. Like a good and loyal subject, he forwarded an account of what he had seen to his own government, of which the following is a copy (substituting the spelling of the present day for that of the reign of Queen Elizabeth):—

“A.D. 1586.—The particular note of the king of Spain’s fleet departed out of Biscay and the provinces, the 13th August, whereof is general (or commander), John Martinas de Recalde, natural (native) of the town of Bilboa.

“Imprimis, viii. armadas, or great ships, of 700 to 800 tons apiece.

“Item, xiiii. osaveres, or small ships, of the burden of 60, 70, and 80 tons.

“Item, vi. small barques, made gallywise, that row thirty oars upon a side.

“Item, 2000 mariners.

“Item, 4000 soldiers.

“Item, 2000 calivers.

“Item, 10,000 muskets.

“Item, 500 quintals of powder.

“Item, 300 quintals of match.

“Item, 20,000 long pikes for horsemen.

“Item, 178,000 quintals of biscuit.

“Item, 100 tons of garlic.

“Item, the king’s ancient (or royal flag), that was made to him to come into Ireland in Pedro Melendi’s time, valued at 3000 ducats; and all his men trained and mustered the same time in Passages.

“Item, 20,000 porkers for victuals.

“Item, 2000 quintals of Newfoundland fish.

“Item, the king’s commission sealed up, not to be opened before they are 30 leagues at sea.

"Item, the common speech of the vulgar is that they go either to Ireland or else to Rochelle; but the opinion of the most was that they went for Ireland.

"By me, HUMFRAY BROOKE, of Liverpool, merchant, who departed out of St. Jean de Luz, in France, the day after that the fleet set sail, and that saw them when they departed from the Passage to go along the coast to meet the rest of the fleet, which was in Casto" (a town and port in the province of Santander, a few leagues west of Biscay).

The preparations described in the above letter continued during the whole of the year 1586, and in the spring of 1587 the greater part of the armada was assembled in the Tagus. According to a letter of Sir John Hawkins to Sir Francis Walsingham (in the State Paper Office), the main strength of the armada consisted in a squadron of fifty-four "forcible and invincible ships," composed of nine galleons of Portugal, twenty great Venetians and argosies of the seas, twenty great Biscainers, four galliasses, and one ship of the duke of Florence, of 800 tons. Besides these, there were thirty smaller ships and thirty hulks, making in all 114 vessels. Another account, derived from Spanish historians, gives a higher estimate, raising the whole naval force to 134 ships, and twenty caravels or light vessels, in all 154 vessels, of the burden of 57,868 tons. The number of men was 8450 seamen and 19,295 soldiers; and the number of pieces of artillery 2639. The plan was first to proceed to the coast of Flanders, to take on board the Spanish army, commanded by Alexander Farnese, duke of Parma, the greatest general of the age; and then, having effected a landing at the mouth of the Thames, to march upon London.

To meet and encounter this tremendous armament, the whole naval and military force of England was assembled. On land there was a military force of 130,000 men, raised in the different counties, and 10,000 men raised in the city of London. Of this army, 22,000 foot and 2000 horse was encamped at Tilbury, on the north bank of the Thames, to cover the approaches to London, by land and water; 28,900 men formed an army of operations, to which was also intrusted the protection of the queen's person; 5000 men, raised in Devon and Cornwall, with the force of the Stanneries, commanded by Sir Walter Raleigh, defended Plymouth; 2000 foot and 200 horse were stationed at Milford Haven; Portland, Portsmouth, and the Isle of Wight were defended by strong garrisons;

and the ports and coast of the whole kingdom were watched by the forces raised in the neighbourhood of each. This army, though inferior in discipline and training to the army of the duke of Parma, was superior to it in numbers and enthusiasm; and would no doubt have given a good account of the Spanish army, if it had effected a landing. Great hopes were, however, founded by the Spaniards of an insurrection among the English Roman Catholics, and no doubt a deep and bitter feeling of resentment existed amongst them, the result of the cruel persecutions to which they were exposed; but the number of English Roman Catholics who joined the army of the duke of Parma in Flanders was insignificantly small, and in England the Catholics joined resolutely with the Protestants in defence of their common country.

It appears from the abstract of the returns of lords-tenant of counties that the number of trained soldiers raised in Lancashire, in April, 1588, was 1170, and in Cheshire 2189. The number of armed men, not fully trained, in Lancashire was 3600; and the number of able men was, in Lancashire 6000, and in Cheshire 3600. In the month of June, when the approach of the invading fleet and army was expected daily, the queen addressed a letter to the earl of Derby and other lords-tenant, thanking them for what had been done in their respective counties, but urging them to make still greater exertions. The letter, as addressed to the earl of Derby, is as follows:—

#### THE QUEEN'S PROCLAMATION.

“Right trusty and well beloved cousin and councillor, we greet you well.

“Whereas heretofore, upon the advertisement from time to time, and from sundry places, of the great preparations of foreign forces with a full intention to invade this realme and other our dominions, we gave our directions unto you for the preparing of our subjects, within your lieutenancy, to be in readiness and defence against any attempt that might be made against us and our realm; which our directions we find so well performed, as we cannot but receive great contentment thereby, both in respect of your careful proceedings therein, and also the great willingness of our people in general to the accomplishment of that whereunto they were required, showing thereby their great love and loyalty towards us, which we accept most thankfully at their hands, acknowledging ourselves infinitely

bound to Almighty God, in that it hath pleased Him to bless us with so loving and dutiful subjects. So would we have you make it known unto them.

“For as much as we find the same intention not only of invading, but of making a conquest also of this our realm, now constantly more and more detected and confirmed, as a matter fully resolved on (an army already being put to the sea for that purpose), although we doubt not by God’s goodness the same shall prove frustrate; we have therefore thought meet to require you forthwith, with as much convenient speed as you can, call together, at some convenient place or places, the best sort of gentry under your lieutenancy, and to declare unto them, that considering these great preparations and threatenings now burst out in action upon the seas, tending to a proposed conquest, wherein every man’s particular estate is in the highest degree to be touched, in respect of country, liberty, wife, children, lands, life, and that which is especially to be regarded, for the preservation of the true and sincere religion of Christ, We do look that the most part of them should upon this instant extraordinary occasion have a larger proportion of furniture, both for horsemen and footmen, but especially horsemen, than hath been certified—thereby to be in their best strength against any attempt whatsoever, and to be employed both about our own person or otherwise, as they shall have knowledge given them; the number of which larger proportion, as soon as you shall know, we require you to signify to our Privy Council.

“And hereunto as we doubt not but by your good endeavours they will be the rather conformable, so also we assure ourselves that Almighty God will so bless those their loyal hearts, both towards us their loving Sovereign and their natural country, that all the attempts of any enemies whatsoever shall be made void and frustrate, to their confusion, your comfort, and God’s high glory. Given under our Signet, at our Manor of Greenwich, the 17th of June, 1588, in the thirtieth year of our reign.

“To our right trusty and well beloved cousin and councillor, the Earl of Derby, lieutenant of the counties of Chester and Lancaster. And in his absence, to the right trusty and well-beloved, the Lord Strange.”

The above letter was written whilst the Spanish Armada was waiting at Corunna for a wind. The Armada sailed from the Tagus

on the 29th May, 1588; but being dispersed by a storm it took refuge at Corunna, whence it again sailed on the 12th July, and entered the English Channel on the 19th. At that time the royal navy of England was small, but the commercial navy was beginning to be of some importance, and every English port furnished its complement of ships to strengthen the royal fleet, raising in all a force of 117 ships and 11,120 men. The English sea captains of that age were amongst the greatest names in history: Drake, Hawkins, and Frobisher, the most intrepid and accomplished sea officers in Europe, were in the vigour of their power. Lord Howard of Effingham, high admiral of England (a Roman Catholic in religion), assumed the chief command of the fleet. Drake, Hawkins, Lord Henry Seymour, and Frobisher, were vice-admirals; and under them served the earl of Cumberland, Sir William Winter, Fenner, and other distinguished seamen. Howard's division amounted to sixty-six vessels, including the merchantmen by which he was reinforced: Lord Henry Seymour commanded a squadron of thirty-three sail, and these fleets were joined by eighteen merchant adventurers from the Thames.

The English fleet first saw the Armada on the 20th July, drawn up in a crescent, covering an extent of seven miles. The first engagement was on the 21st; there were others on the 23d and 25th, off the Isle of Wight. On the 27th the English fire-ships threw the Spanish fleet into confusion off Calais; and again on the 29th. Had the Spaniards been in possession of Flushing, or of any other good port on the coast of Flanders or Holland, the history of this famous expedition would have been different in its progress, if not in its results; for in that case the splendid army of the duke of Parma, intended for the invasion of England, would have been shipped, and the battle would probably have been fought out on the banks of the Thames. But the Dutch held Flushing, and all the ports that could have been turned to any useful purpose by the Armada; and the army of Parma had no opportunity of showing its prowess on English ground. On the 20th July the Armada, cut off from every port of refuge, commenced its disastrous flight northward, driven by storms, and closely followed by the English fleet.

Apprehensions continued to be entertained, for some time after the Armada had been driven into the German Ocean, that the Spaniards might effect a landing on the English or Irish coast. On the 21st June, Lord Strange, who was acting for his father the earl of Derby, then in Flanders, had issued an order to the justices in the

hundred of Salford, requiring them "to cause to be made ready all such beacons as were next adjoining unto them, and the watch to be kept at every one of them." From the 10th July to the 30th September the great beacon on Rivington Pike, which is visible from every part of South Lancashire, was watched day and night, to be ready to give warning of the approach of the Spaniards, The Pile of Foudry, in North Lancashire, where Martin Schwartz had landed, in the reign of Henry VII., was thought to be a likely place for the landing of the Spaniards, as appears from the following communication to the privy council, found in the Burghley Papers :—

" *Pylle of Foudry*, A.D. 1588.—Between Milford Haven, in Wales, and Carlisle, on the borders of Scotland, there is not one good haven for great ships to land or ride in, but one, which is the furthest part of Lancashire, called Pylle of Folder. The same pylle is an old decayed castle, parcel of the duchy of Lancaster, in Furness Fells, where one Thomas Preston (a papsyshe Atheiste) is deputy steward, and commands the hundredes lands there, which were sometime members appertaining to the Abbey of Furness. At this pylle or castle landed, in King Henry VII.'s time, Martin Swarth, with Perkyn Warbeck (Lambert Simnel), accompanied with 3000 or 4000 Flemings, who marched thence southward to Newark-upon-Trent, before they were fought with; the country is so rude, waste, and unprovided with gentlemen in those quarters. What the Spaniards mean to do, the Lord knows; but all that country being known to Doctor (cardinal) Allen (who was born by the pylle), and the inhabitants thereof, all infected with his Romish poison, it is not unlike but his direction will be used for some landing there; the rather to entertain us in sundry parts by the northern men, and for that it is not far off from Scotland, and the very best haven for landing with great ships in all the south-west coast of England, called St. George's Channel."

Fortunately the Spanish fleet, though it passed down the Irish Sea on its return to Spain, was in no condition to effect a landing any where, either in England or Ireland. After several conflicts in the Channel, that fleet retreated northwards on the 31st July. After rounding the Orkneys (where a tremendous tempest scattered the Spanish ships, and shattered not a few of them), more than thirty of them were driven on the coast of Ireland, where the popular name of Port-na-Spaigne, near the Giant's Causeway, still perpetuates the memory of this catastrophe. A small squadron was



driven back into the English Channel; where it was taken by the English and Dutch. It was about the end of September that the duke of Medina, the Spanish commander, arrived in Spain with no more than sixty vessels, the remains of a fleet of 150; with their crews suffering from hunger, cold, disease, and wounds, sustained in a three months' conflict with the ships of England and the storms of the northern seas.

Early in the month of September it was known throughout England that the Spanish fleet was destroyed or disabled, and that all danger of an invasion was at an end; and on the 23rd of that month the earl of Derby, as lord-lieutenant of the two counties, issued the following announcement of this great deliverance, and order for a day of prayer and thanksgiving:—

THE EARL OF DERBY TO SIR JOHN BYRON, ETC.—THANKSGIVING FOR  
THE DEFEAT OF THE ARMADA.

“After my very hasty commendations—Whereas I am credibly informed that it hath pleased God to continue his goodness towards our prince, church, and country—as in the late overthrow of our enemies, taken upon the coast of Ireland, it may appear by this calendar here inclosed—I have thought it expedient, in respect of Christian duty, we should fall to some godly exercise of thanksgiving for the same, by prayer and preaching, wishing you so to commend the business to the clergy of your hundred, in their several charges, as our God, by mutual consent, may be praised therefor. And this is not to be omitted nor delayed in any wise, but to be put in execution at or before the next Sabbath. And thus desiring God to bless her Majesty with long life, and continual victory over all her enemies, I bid you farewell.

“Lathom, my House, this 23rd of September, 1588.”

This is followed by a list of the ships sunk, and the men killed, drowned, or taken, on the coast of Ireland, on the side of the Spaniards.

In the spring of the year 1593, there were again considerable apprehensions of another attempt at invasion by the Spaniards; but from that time the Spanish government directed its efforts against Ireland, which was in full insurrection under Tyrone. During the latter years of Elizabeth's reign there was a constant drain of men and money, in Lancashire and other English counties, which at length enabled Lord Mountjoy to gain a complete victory.

## CHAPTER V.

## LANCASHIRE AND CHESHIRE UNDER THE HOUSE OF STUART.

QUEEN ELIZABETH closed her long and glorious reign of forty-four years and four months, on the 24th of March, 1602-3; and James Stuart, the son of the unfortunate Mary Queen of Scots, ascended the throne, under the title, James I. of England, France, and Ireland, and James VI. of Scotland. The connection of the new king with the house of Tudor being somewhat remote, the lords of the council issued a proclamation immediately after the death of the queen, informing the nation that the imperial crown had, by the death of the high and mighty Princess Elizabeth, descended on the high and mighty Prince James, lineally and lawfully descended from the body of Margaret, daughter of the high and renowned prince, Henry VII., king of England, his great-grandfather. The proclamation further set forth that the said Lady Margaret was the daughter of Elizabeth, daughter of King Edward IV., by whose happy marriage with Henry VII. both the houses of York and Lancaster were united, to the joy unspeakable of this kingdom, formerly rent and torn by the dissensions of bloody and civil wars. The nation at large cheerfully welcomed the accession of James I., glad to have once more a sovereign whose title to the throne was entirely undisputed; and thus to be freed from the doubt and anxiety that had prevailed during the latter years of Queen Elizabeth, and had been encouraged by the jealous fears which that sovereign entertained, of every possible claimant of the crown.

King James I. left Edinburgh to take possession of the crown of England on the 6th of April, 1603; and travelling slowly and with great state through the counties of Northumberland and Durham, arrived at York, on the 16th of the same month, where he remained three days, to receive the congratulations of his subjects of the northern counties. He was there met and congratulated on his accession to the throne by the leading gentlemen of Lancashire, Cheshire, and Yorkshire, on whom he showered honours with a liberal hand. Amongst the Lancashire and Cheshire gentlemen

charged with the expression of the loyalty and attachment of the two counties were, Sir Edmund Trafford and Sir Thomas Holcroft, both of whom were knighted by the king, in the garden of the archbishop's palace at York, on Sunday, the 17th of April. On the 18th of April the king reached Grimestone Park, Yorkshire, on his journey southward, where he knighted Sir Thomas Gerard, of Bryn, the representative of another of the oldest families of Lancashire. At Worksop his Majesty conferred the honour of knighthood on Sir John Byron, of Newstead Abbey, Nottinghamshire, and of Rochdale, Lancashire, and on Sir Thomas Stanley, of Bickerstaff. Amongst the Lancashire and Cheshire gentlemen who received the honour of knighthood on the king's arrival in London, were Sir Thomas Hesketh, Sir Thomas Walmsley, Sir Alexander Barlow, Sir Edward Stanley, Sir Thomas Langton, and Sir William Norris. Sir Gilbert Houghton, of Houghton Tower, was also knighted by the king, in the course of the following year.

On the accession of James I. to the throne, loyal addresses were presented to him from all the principal counties, cities, and boroughs of the kingdom, most of them couched in language of extreme adulation, and calculated to increase those extravagant notions of the regal authority which did so much to render James ridiculous, and his son and successor unfortunate. The Lancashire address, which was neither more nor less fulsome than the others, has been preserved, and is worth publishing, as a specimen of the style and mode of thought of the age. It was signed by seventy-nine gentlemen, who were at that time amongst the principal landowners of the county of Lancaster, where the descendants of many of them still hold large possessions. The address, which was agreed upon at a public meeting held at Wigan, on the last day of March, within a week of the death of Queen Elizabeth, was as follows:—

ADDRESS OF THE LANCASHIRE GENTRY TO JAMES I. ON HIS  
ACCESSION.\*

“To the Most High and Mighty Prince, James, King of Scotland, the Sixth, and of England, France, and Ireland, the First, our most gracious and dread Sovereign Lord—

“Albeit, Most Gracious Sovereign Lord, that the loyal bond of our allegiance to your Majesty cannot receive force from our testi-

\* Harl. MS. 2219, fol. 95, b.

mony or approbation, but remaineth in itself firm and inviolable, as depending in regard to your Highness' undoubted right to be our true, and lawful Sovereign, immediately upon God's holy ordinance, who established the right of princes to their crowns and kingdoms : forasmuch yet as the humble acknowledgment of duty is sometimes, though not the greatest, yet not the least grateful part of duty itself, and is, upon so just occasion as opportunity now offereth, neither improper nor undue, we therefore, your most humble subjects within the county palatine of Lancaster, have out of the abundance of our loyal resolved hearts presumed to commend to your most gracious acceptance this humble testimony and acknowledgment of our loyal duties and allegiance. That whereas the Almighty God hath, to the manifold good and blessing of this our nation, vouchsafed by the known course of lineal and lawful descent, to call your Majesty to the kingly government of these most noble realms of England, France, and Ireland, with open proclamations and general applause throughout our whole country, we do hereby protest for ourselves and ours, That during our natural lives we will perform faith and obedience to your Majesty as to our known, undoubted, rightful Sovereign, and be evermore ready, though with the hazard of our estate and expense of our dearest blood, as well to protect and defend your Majesty's most royal person, as also to withstand, resist, and pursue to death all such as hereafter at any time shall interrupt, impugn, or gainsay your Majesty's most just and lawful claim to the imperial crowns and dignities of these aforesaid realms : to the performance whereof we do all of us hereby jointly consent in the presence of our great God ; and in testimony of this our solemn act, have subscribed these presents with our hands, the faithful witnesses of our resolved hearts, and presumed to put the same to your Highness by Arthur Aston, your Majesty's servant, with our humble request, in behalf of the rest of the inhabitants of our county, that your Highness would vouchsafe to receive by him the excuse of their now absence and not subscribing.—Given at Wigan, the last of March, in the first year of your Grace's most happy reign."

The above loyal address was signed by nearly all the knights and gentlemen residing within the county. Amongst them were, John Ireland, esquire, sheriff of Lancashire, who was the brother or the son and heir of Sir Gilbert Ireland, knight, of Hutte and

Hale; Sir Richard Molyneux, of Sefton, and Sir Richard Houghton, of Houghton Tower, the members for the county; Sir Cuthbert Halsall, Sir Edward Warren, Sir John Radclyffe, and Sir Nicholas Mosley, who had been knighted in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; and Edward Stanley, Thomas Walmsley, Thomas Gerard, Thomas Langton, esquires, who were soon afterwards knighted by King James; together with the following representatives of ancient Lancashire families, namely, Francis Tunstall, the son and heir of Sir Marmaduke Tunstall, of Thurland castle; Richard Holland, of Denton, esquire; Thomas Southworth, the son and heir of Sir John Southworth, of Southworth and Samlesbury, knight; Alexander Standish, of Duxbury, esquire; William Farrington, esquire, of Worden; Roger Bradshagh, of Haigh, esquire; Nicholas Banistre, of Altham, esquire; John Towneley, esquire, son of Charles Towneley, esquire, of Towneley; Richard Sherburne, esquire, son of Sir Richard Sherburne, knight, the founder or finisher of the house at Stoneyhurst; Edmund Fleetwood, esquire, of Rossall, son of Sir Paul Fleetwood; William Hulton, esquire, of Hulton; Edward Hopwood, esquire, of Hopwood; John Braddell, of Portfield; John Massye, son and heir of John Massye, of Coddington, county of Chester, esquire; Edward Norris, son and heir of Sir William Norris, of Speke; Richard Bold, son and heir of William Bold, of Bold; Robert Hesketh, eldest son and heir of Sir Thomas Hesketh; Edward Standish, esquire, of Standish; Edward Rigby, of Burgh; Robert Moore, of Bank hall, near Liverpool; Thomas Tyldesley, the attorney-general for the county; Robert Downes, of Wardley hall; and several others.

Although the accession of James I. was sincerely welcomed by the great mass of the nation, it had not the effect of assuaging the furious passions which had been excited in the preceding reigns, by the violent struggles between the Protestant and the Roman Catholic portions of the population, and between the adherents of the Church of England and the Puritan nonconformists. The angry feelings produced by these contests still raged in all parts of the kingdom, and in few districts more fiercely than in the north-western counties. From some cause or other, which it is not easy to explain, an unusually large proportion of the landowners in the counties of Lancaster and Chester adhered to the Roman Catholic religion, and by their example and influence induced many of their tenants and the people on their estates also to

adhere to it. The result was that the Roman Catholics of the two counties were regarded with more than ordinary suspicion, and were punished as recusants with more than ordinary severity. It also happened that the principles of the Puritans, especially as relates to the preference of the presbyterian to the episcopal form of church government, took a very firm hold in the manufacturing districts of the two counties, as well as amongst a considerable portion of the landed gentry. In the reign of Queen Elizabeth, Manchester was chosen as a fit place for the publication of the assaults directed against certain of the bishops, by the writer or writers who figured under the name of Martin Marprelate ; and at a later period, that is, in the time of the Commonwealth, the presbyterian system of church government was established in Lancashire more completely and systematically than in any other part of England. The whole of the north-western district, in fact, was full of recusants, some of them of Roman Catholic, and others of Puritan opinions ; and as in those days every recusant was treated as a criminal, and almost an outlaw, the whole district was full of discontent, agitated by conspiracies, and tending gradually to confusion and civil war.

During the first few years of the reign of James I. the struggle between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants was as fierce, if not fiercer, than it had been at any previous period ; and it was at the moment of the bitterest exasperation that a few desperate men, belonging to the Roman Catholic party, formed and attempted to execute the atrocious scheme of blowing up with gunpowder the king and the two Houses of Parliament. This conspiracy had been preceded by rumours of insurrection among the Roman Catholics of Lancashire and Cheshire, and was followed by an unmerciful persecution directed against the adherents of that religion in those two counties, though the attempts to connect them with the crime were entirely unsuccessful.

In the year 1604, the year preceding the Gunpowder Plot, an examination was taken at Standish with regard to a supposed design of the Roman Catholics, instigated by certain seminary priests, to surprise the city of Chester. Little, if anything, was proved as to the matter under inquiry, but certain particulars were given with regard to the celebration of private masses. These charges were probably preliminaries to the trial of six seminary priests and Jesuits, who were tried, condemned, and executed at



the Lancaster summer assizes, under the statute of the 27th Elizabeth, for remaining within the realm. A Catholic gentleman of advanced age, then living in Lancashire, Mr. Pound by name, had the courage to petition the king, complaining of the persecution of the Roman Catholics, and particularly of the recent trials and executions in Lancashire. For this offence he was seized, taken before the Privy Council, and, after examination, handed over to the Star Chamber, which tribunal sentenced him to be imprisoned in the Fleet during the king's pleasure, to stand in the pillory both at Lancaster and Westminster, and to pay a fine of £1000.\* In the month of December in the same year certain justices of Lancashire ventured to write to the king, praying, though with little success, that certain Protestant ministers of religion in Lancashire, who had long and usefully laboured amongst them, might not be displaced for nonconformity.†

In the latter end of the year 1605 the country was suddenly roused by the news of the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot. The following account of this discovery is taken from a letter addressed to William Farrington, esquire, at his house of Worden, in Lancashire, by Mr. John Sumner, his friend and London correspondent. He says:—"True it is that upon Monday, late in the night, being the 4th of November, or rather upon Tuesday morning, there was found in a vault or cellar directly under the Parliament house a great quantity of gunpowder barrellled up—beer barrells full, 36; puncheons, 2; and hogsheads, 2—laid there by Mr. Thomas Percy, one of the king's pensioners, and one Johnson (Guy Fawkes), his servant or confederate; which vault or cellar the said Johnson had taken, with some of the housing adjoining thereunto, of purpose, it is thought, the better to work his exploit; with a full determination and purpose, that when the king, queen, and young prince, together with all the nobility and peers of the realm, had been there assembled, to have set fire upon the powder, and so, with bars of iron and faggots and such like stuff that were laid upon the barrells, to have blown up the house: which wicked practice was revealed by my Lord Monteaagle, who, having received this letter herein inclosed, presently acquainted the king and council therewith. Johnson (Guy Fawkes) is in the Tower, and hath this day, it is said, been upon the rack, and examined by divers of the Privy Council; but as yet I do not hear that he bewrayeth

\* Knight's History of England, vol. iii. p. 22.

† Cal. State Pap. Dom. anno 1604.

any more. Percy is fled; for the apprehension of whom there is a proclamation come forth in print, which proclamation is sent unto you by William Sumner.

"The said Johnson (Fawkes) was brought privately, upon his apprehension, before the king, who asked him whether he was not sorrowful for that his wicked purpose; who answered that indeed he was sorrowful because his purpose did not take full effect. Great bonfires are made throughout all the streets, and ringing of bells throughout all London upon Tuesday, the 5th November, at night, for joy the said devilish practice was revealed, all the streets being set with watchmen the same day."\*

The letter to Lord Monteagle referred to above, and supposed to have been written by Francis Tresham, one of the conspirators, whose sister was married to Lord Monteagle, was as follows:—

"My Lord, Out of the love I bear to you and some of your friends, I have a care of your preservation, therefore I advertise you, as you tender your life, to devise some excuse to shut you off attendance of the Parliament: for God and men have concurred to punish the wickedness of our time; and think not slightly of your advertisement, but retire yourself into the country, where you may expect the event with safety, for though there be now no appearance of any storm, yet I say they shall receive a terrible blow, and they therein shall not see who hurt them; the counsel is not to be contemned, because it may do you good and no harm, for the danger is passed so soon as you have burned the letter. And I hope God will give you grace to make good use of it, to whose holy protection I commit you."

Lord Monteagle received a grant of £200 a year in land, and £500 in money, for communicating the above letter to Secretary Cecil, which led to the search of the vault beneath the Parliament house, the discovery of the plot, and the apprehension of Guy Fawkes. Peter Haywood, Esq. of Haywood, a magistrate of Lancashire (having probably accompanied Sir Thomas Knyvett in the search), apprehended Fawkes on coming forth from the vault. In the same month of November in which the plot was discovered a list of the recusants in Lancashire was despatched to the Privy Council, and a similar return was made in the following March. Among other documents relating to the Gunpowder Plot, is one dated March 6, 1606, being the examination of Edward Oldcorne (alias Hall), and others, in

\* The Stanley Papers, published by the Chetham Society: Part Second; Introduction, p. 70.

which it is stated that one of the conspirators came on the 6th of November to Mendlip House, near Worcester, the seat of Thomas Abingdon (who had married a sister of Lady Monteagle and of Francis Tresham), and told Oldcorne of the plot, of its failure, and of an expected rising. They, however, refused to join in it, on which he set off, as he said, to rouse the Catholics of Lancashire. In this, however, he entirely failed.<sup>32</sup>

For some years after the Gunpowder Plot all Roman Catholics were treated with greatly increased severity, and were subjected to heavy fines as recusants. These fines the king granted either to persons to whom he owed money, or to others on whom he wished to confer favours. In the documents mentioned in the Calendar of the State Papers for 1607, is a grant to Sir Richard Coningsby, of the benefit of the recusancy of the following Lancashire Catholics:—Hugh Farrington, of Ribbleson; Robert Plesington, of the Dimples; Thomas Singleton, of Ingleshead; Robert Keightly, of White Leade; William Latwise, of Goosenargh; William Harris, of Lytham; Thomas Procter, of Belsnap; Edmund Threefall, of Goosenargh; and Peter Mason, of Westham, all in the county of Lancaster. The fines of these recusants were granted to Sir Richard, in lieu of £1000 due to him by the king. A similar grant was made in the same year to Captain Thomas Allen, of the benefit of the recusancy, amongst others, of John Ince, of Wigan; William Rishton, of Harwood; and William Richardson, of Merscoe (Mearscough), also in the county of Lancaster. A third grant was made to Lawrence Marbury of the benefit of the recusancy, amongst others, of Thomas Westby, James Gorsage, William Formby, Roger Bradshaw, William Massey, Henry Banistre, and Richard Greenacres, all of Lancashire. A fourth grant was made to David Stewart, of the recusancy of Henry Banistre and Thomas Brockholes, both of Lancashire. Grants of a similar kind continued to be made for some years after, and amongst those of 1608 was a grant to Charles Chambers of the benefit of the recusancy of three gentlemen of very high standing in the county of Lancaster—namely, Thomas Brockholes, of Claughton; Thurston Tyldesley, of Stanacre; and Edward Singleton, esquires. These and similar measures were thought to be very efficacious, not only in putting down conspiracy, but in producing conformity; for, after the summer assizes of 1609, Sir Richard Philips, justice of the Common Pleas, writing to the earl of Salisbury, noticed the quiet state of Northumberland, Cumber-

<sup>32</sup> Cal. State Pap. Dom. anno 1606.

land, Westmoreland, and Lancashire, "where," he observes, "only thirteen persons have been executed, and where recusants decrease."\*

It would appear, however, that the security produced by hanging and by forced conformity was not of any great duration, for in the year 1612 it was resolved that all recusants should be disarmed, and the clergymen of the several parishes were called on to return a list of their names. At a meeting of the lord-lieutenant, the earl of Derby, and the justices of the peace, held at Wigan, it was resolved that all convicted recusants should be disarmed; and the justices, on receiving a list of such recusants, were to "repair to the dwelling houses or places of the said convicted recusants, or non-communicants, and to take from them all arms and weapons other than shall be necessary for defence of their houses."† On the same occasion the following order, with regard to recusants and noncommunicants was issued and addressed to the clergy:—"Whereas we have received direction from the lords of his Majesty's most honourable Privy Council, to be informed of all recusants and noncommunicants within this county; this, therefore, shall be in his Majesty's name to require and charge you, that you do within twenty days after Easter next deliver unto us a true and perfect presentment of all persons dwelling within your parish, above the age of sixteen years, with their several additions, that have not communicated within the space of one year then last past, and that you for the better information herein—the parson, vicar, or curate—do give public notice in the parish church the next Sabbath or holy day after the receipt hereof, at the time of divine service, that all those that do not, before the expiration of the said twenty days, come to the church, and there communicate according to the laws in that case provided, must be presented and further proceeded against as we are commanded. Fail not herein at your uttermost peril. Given at Wigan, this 24th of March, 1612.—Your loving friends,

RAUPH ASHTON, JOHN BRADSHAW.

In the year 1608 William, earl of Derby, writes from Lathom to the Privy Council that he has directed a view and muster of the seven hundred soldiers for Ireland, and he incloses a letter from his deputy-lieutenant to himself stating their defects.‡

The practice of inflicting fines on Roman Catholic as well as Puritan recusants continued for some years after the Gunpowder Plot;

\* Cal. State Pap. Dom. anno 1619.

† Lancashire Lieutenancy under the Stewarts, vol. ii. p. 261.

‡ Cal. of State Pap.

but gradually both the king and his advisers became more indulgent to the Roman Catholics. This was carried still further in the reign of Charles I., when the high claims to authority put forth on the part of the church by the Roman Catholics rendered them agreeable to the high churchmen of the court. From this and other causes they were treated more indulgently in the latter part of the reign of James I. than at the commencement; and this indulgence was continued during the reign of Charles, and down to the great civil war, in which the Roman Catholics, not only in the north-western counties but everywhere, were amongst the most loyal and devoted supporters of the crown. Unfortunately for themselves, whilst the laws against the Roman Catholics were every year administered in a milder spirit by James and by Charles, exactly the opposite course was taken with regard to the Protestant recusants or nonconformists. The laws against them were administered with increasing severity to the time of Archbishop Laud, who strained those laws to the utmost point of harshness, and thus brought destruction upon himself and master, as well as a temporary overthrow of the church which he wished to aggrandize and extend. These events, however, belong to a later portion of this chapter.

The early part of the reign of James I. was rendered memorable in Lancashire by an extraordinary burst of superstition and cruelty, directed against a number of unfortunate creatures suspected of the crime of witchcraft, who were tried, convicted, and punished with death, for that imaginary offence. In those times the belief in witchcraft was very general, and the royal driveller on the throne, James I., had a few years before published a work on "Demonology," in which he declared that witches and wizards abounded in the land, and denounced all who denied it as Sadducees and infidels. There is too much reason to fear that the judges who presided at the trials of the Pendle Forest witches (as they were called) in Lancashire, were influenced by the opinions of the king, and even courted his favour in persecuting to the death the unfortunate creatures tried before them. In an official account of the trials, published by one "Master Potts," with the authority of the judges, it is stated that the facts of these cases confirmed all the assertions of the king on the subject. As a curious chapter in the history of superstition, it is worth while to preserve a record of these strange but most tragical cases.

The belief in witchcraft, though prevalent everywhere, was more particularly so in wild, thinly peopled districts, as the Forest of

Pendle then was. But these fears were not confined to this district. A few years previously the public of Lancashire had been agitated by the belief that Ferdinando, the fifth earl of Derby, had been murdered by witchcraft ; his death having been occasioned either by poison, or by some sudden and violent disease, which far surpassed the knowledge of the faculty of that day. Still more recently Dr. Dee, the warden of Manchester college, had fallen so strongly under suspicion, as a practiser of magical arts, that he had found it necessary to publish a solemn denial of the charge, and a passionate vindication of his innocence. There is no doubt, moreover, that many of the persons suspected and accused of witchcraft, either believed themselves to be possessed of such powers, or professed to do so for purposes of gain. This was the case with at least two of the women tried, convicted, and hung at Lancaster. They had practised witchcraft as a trade, and had convinced the public, and possibly even themselves, that they were able to command the services of evil spirits.

The trials of the witches of Pendle Forest, which took place at Lancaster at the autumn assizes of 1612, were as remarkable as any investigations of that kind that were ever held, as well for the number of prisoners tried, and the extravagance of the charges made against them, as for the frivolous and incredible evidence by which those charges were supported, and above all for the terrible acts of judicial murder by which they were crowned.

The number of pretended witches or wizards tried on this occasion was twenty. Of these twelve belonged to the witches of Pendle Forest, and eight to the witches of Samlesbury, a place not far distant. They were tried separately, and with different results, nearly all the Pendle witches being convicted and hung, whilst all the Samlesbury witches were either acquitted or allowed to go at liberty on giving securities for their good behaviour.

The Pendle Forest witches were tried first, and the following summary of the evidence will show the offences of which they were accused, and the sort of evidence on which they were convicted.

Elizabeth Southernnes, a poor, old, illiterate widow, known by the nickname of Old Demdike, was regarded as one of the mother witches of Pendle Forest. She was so fortunate as to die in prison previous to the trial. Before dying she is said to have made a confession, which was produced on the trial, and was used as the means of destroying several of the members of her own family. We have no informant as to the manner in which this confession was obtained, nor any



certain evidence that it ever was made, but it had sufficient weight on the trial to destroy all the other members of her family, except one.

According to the alleged confession of Elizabeth Southernnes she was herself a witch, and had for upwards of twenty years been under the influence of an evil spirit. This demon she was said to have met near Gouldshay in the Forest of Pendle. To him she had consented to sell her soul, he having promised to grant her anything she wished for on those conditions. With the assistance of this demon she was said to have attempted to destroy a man named Richard Baldwin, who had refused to pay her for services which her daughter had rendered in his mill, and who had driven her off the premises, swearing at her and her daughter, as witches and strumpets. It did not appear, however, from the evidence, that she had done any harm to Baldwin, or that any harm had happened to him which could be imputed to witchcraft, even according to the notions of those days. Another accusation against her was that she had persuaded her daughter, a married woman, named Elizabeth Device or Davies, nicknamed Young Demdike, also to sell herself to the devil. This daughter, it was said, had taken her advice, and had not only sold herself to the devil, but had induced her young daughters, Alizon Device and Jennet Device, and her own son, James Device, to do the same thing.

The second person charged was Elizabeth Device, the daughter of the above Elizabeth Southernnes. The evidence against her was her mother's confession and the testimony of her own daughter, a poor child nine years of age, who was produced on the trial as a witness against her mother. She described the evil spirit, which was the familiar of her mother, and by whose agency she was said to have bewitched to death John Robinson, James Robinson, and James Milton. These three persons were said to have been murdered by her incantations, out of revenge, one because he had called her a strumpet, and the others for having refused to give Old Demdike a penny. This weak, lost child further stated that her mother had taught her two charms, by one of which she procured drink, and the other cured the persons who were bewitched. The first of these was a sentence in broken Latin, and was merely a statement that the cross or crucifix was the sign of eternal life, the words being "Crucifixus hoc signum vitam eternam." The other prayer or charm was as follows :—

## A CHARM.

Upon Good Friday day, I will fast while I may,  
 Until I hear them knell  
 Our Lord's own bell ; Lord in his Messe,  
 With his twelve apostles good,  
 What hath he in his hand ?  
 Sigh in leath wand :  
 What he in his other hand ?  
 Heaven's door key—  
 Open, open, heaven door keys ;  
 Steek, steek, hell door, &c.

This seems to be merely a relic of an old hymn on Good Friday, which had probably come down from the Roman Catholic times, and was certainly quite as innocent as the Latin charm given above. Poor Elizabeth Device had the misfortune to be very ugly, or, as Mr. Potts, the reporter of the trial, says, "She was branded with a preposterous mark in nature, her left eye standing lower than her right, and one looking down and the other up at the same time." Her mode of destroying her enemies was said to be by forming figures of clay, and causing them gradually to waste away, her victims wasting away at the same time.

James Device, the son of the above Elizabeth Device, a poor decrepid boy, apparently of weak intellect, and so infirm that it was found necessary to support him in court on his trial, was convicted, principally on the evidence of his sister, a girl of nine years of age, of bewitching and killing Mrs. Ann Towneley, the wife of Mr. Henry Towneley, of the Carr, by means of an image of clay. He also was hung along with his mother and his elder sister, Alizon Device.

Alizon Device was accused of having been initiated in the arts of witchcraft by her mother, and of having practised them. She was hung as a witch along with her.

Thus four members of this unfortunate family were destroyed. Jennet Device, a younger child, was allowed to escape on that occasion, but was ever afterwards regarded as a witch, and was tried again on a similar charge in the year 1633.

Ann Whittle, *alias* Chattox, who is described as "a very old, withered, spent, and decrepid creature, eighty years of age, and nearly blind," was also tried on this occasion, as one of the mother witches of Pendle Forest. The poor old creature had followed the very honest occupation of a carder of wool in her youth, and had all her life lived in the Forest of Pendle, where the woollen trade was carried on. She was accused of having bewitched and murdered Robert Nutter,

of Greenhead, in the Forest of Pendle. She was also accused of having murdered by witchcraft, John Device, a son of Elizabeth Southernnes, the rival witch of the Forest. Several other minor offences were charged against her, as for instance, that she had bewitched the drink of John Moore; and that she had produced butter from a dish of skimmed milk. She also was in a great measure convicted on her own evidence, for she avowed herself a witch. She stated that fourteen or fifteen years before, a thing standing upright, like a Christian man, "had persuaded her to sell her soul to the devil, and that she had consented to do so." On her trial she pleaded guilty, but prayed that the judges would be merciful to her daughter, Ann Redfearne, who was tried along with her.

The charge against Ann Redfearne was that she was a witch, and that she had conspired with her mother to place a bad wish upon Robert Nutter, of which he had died. This was said to have been done in consequence of some insult having been offered to the daughter. She, also, was convicted and hung.

Several other persons were tried for their supposed connection with these supposed witches. They were all ignorant and helpless creatures, with the exception of one named Alice Nutter. She was a lady of good fortune and respectable connections, and was the wife of Richard Nutter, of Roughlee. She firmly and to the last moment protested her innocence. The charge against her was that she had joined in killing Henry Mitton, by witchcraft, because he had refused a penny to Elizabeth Southernnes, known by the nickname of Old Demdike. The charge made at the trial of Alice Nutter took a further or different form on the evidence of Elizabeth Device, James Device, and Jennet Device, who stated that Alice Nutter attended a meeting of twenty witches at Malkin Tower, the house of Old Demdike, on Good Friday, 1612, for the purpose of "killing the gaoler at Lancaster, and before the next assizes to blow up the castle there; to the end that the aforesaid prisoners might by that means make an escape."

The accusation against Katherine Hewyth was that she had killed a child by witchcraft; and had attended the meeting of witches at Malkin Tower, on Good Friday.

John Bulcock and Jane Bulcock, his mother, were charged with conspiring with others to kill a Mr. Leister, and with attending the same meeting at Malkin Tower. The witnesses, as usual, were James Device, Elizabeth Device, and Jennet Device. They are said to have

confessed; but Mr. Potts says in his arraignment of these two persons—"But amongst all the witches in this company, there is not a more fearful and devilish act committed, and voluntarily confessed by any of them, comparable to this, under the degree of murder, which impudently now (at the bar, having formerly confessed) they forswear, swearing they were never at the great assembly at Malking Tower, although the very witches that were present in that action with them justify, maintain, and swear the same to be true against them: crying out in very violent and outrageous manner, even to the gallows, where they died impenitent for any thing we know, because they died silent in the particulars. These of all others were the most desperate wretches (void of all fear or grace) in all this pack."

To conclude the list of these unfortunate people, Isabel Robey was charged with bewitching with sickness the wife of one Peter Chaddock, in consequence of quarrels arising out of jealousy; Isabel Robey being said to have been much vexed at their marriage. She was charged with bewitching other persons with sickness.

Mr. Potts says, in what he calls the arraignment of Isabel Robey:—"Here then is the last that came to act her part in this lamentable and woeful tragedy, wherein his Majesty hath lost so many subjects, mothers their children, fathers their friends and kinsfolkes, the like whereof hath not been set forth in any age. What hath the King's Majesty written and published in his "Demonologie," by way of premonition and prevention, which hath not here by the first or last been executed, put in practice, or discovered?"

Another set of unfortunates, known as the Samlesbury witches, were tried about the same time. Their names were Jane Bierley, Ellen Bierley, and Jane Southworth. They were charged with having bewitched a girl named Grace Sowerbutts, at Samlesbury. One of these poor creatures was the grandmother of the girl who pretended to be bewitched; and the charge seems to have been got up by the girl, whose character was very indifferent, either from revenge or the wish to make money. She swore that these women dragged her about by the hair of her head, and took her senses and memory from her, and adopted other means to induce her to become one of their company. She further swore that they appeared sometimes in their own likenesses, sometimes in the likenesses of black dogs; and that they met from time to time four black things, going upright and yet not like men in the face, who carried them across the river, danced

with them, and indulged in all kinds of familiarities. She further charged them with having bewitched and killed a child, named Thomas Washman, by placing a nail in its navel; and with taking up the corpse, eating part of the flesh, and making an unctuous ointment by boiling the bones. Fortunately the judge and jury, who had already supped full of horrors, were unable to swallow these, and the poor creatures were acquitted. Several other persons apprehended on similar charges—namely, John Ramsden, Elizabeth Astley, Alice Gray, Isabel Sidegraves, and Laurence Haye, were all discharged without trial.

“The principal person concerned in bringing these unfortunate creatures to trial was Roger Nowell, Esq., of Reed Hall, near Pendle, who was sheriff of Lancashire in 1610. He was of the same family as Alexander Nowell, the dean of St. Paul’s, and Laurence Nowell, the restorer of Saxon literature in England. He is described by Mr. Potts as a very religious and honest justice of the peace, and probably may have been so in all matters in which his superstitious fears were not appealed to. He was certainly kept in countenance in these proceedings, not only by the judges before whom the prisoners were tried, but also by King James himself, who, in his work on “Demonology,” published a few years before, spoke of “the fearful abounding at this time and in this country of those detestable slaves of the devil, the witches or enchanters;” and vehemently protested “against the damnable opinions of those who are not ashamed in public print to deny that there can be such a thing as witchcraft: and to maintain the old error of the Sadducees in the denying of spirits.” Sir Edward Bromley and Sir James Altham, barons of the Exchequer, before whom these trials took place, say, in a sort of advertisement to Mr. Potts’ report of the proceeding, as follows:—“We thought it necessary to publish them, and thereupon imposed the labour of this work upon this gentleman.” In a further notice to the public, following this, Mr. Baron Bromley adds, under his own signature, “I took upon me to revise and correct it, that nothing might pass but matter of fact apparent against them by record.” It is to be hoped that Mr. Baron Bromley was as much deluded in this matter as the ignorant witnesses who appeared to swear away the lives of these unfortunate creatures, and that he was in no degree influenced by a wish to countenance the opinions or obtain the favour of the king. Even supposing him to have been one of the deluded, and not one of the deluders, it is impossible to read the following

speech, in which he sentenced to death ten of his fellow creatures, for an impossible offence, without a shudder :—"You," said he, addressing the wretched prisoners, "of all people have the least cause of complaint, since on the trial of your lives there has been so much care and pains taken ; and what persons of your nature and condition were ever arraigned and tried with so much solemnity ? The court hath had great care to receive nothing in evidence against you but matter of fact ! As you stand simply (your offences and bloody practices not considered) your fate would rather move compassion than exasperate any man ; for whom would not the ruin of so many poor creatures at one time touch, as in appearance simple and of little understanding ? But the blood of these innocent children, and others, his Majesty's subjects, whom cruelly and barbarously you have murdered and cut off, cries unto the Lord for vengeance. It is impossible that you, who are stained with so much innocent blood, should either prosper or continue in this world, or receive reward in the next."

"In this melancholy case," says Mr. Crossley, in his recent edition of Potts' 'Discovery of Witches,' published by the Chetham Society, "the main interest centres in the fate of Alice Nutter. Wealthy, well conducted, well connected, and placed probably on an equality with most of the neighbouring families, and with the magistrate before whom she was brought and by whom she was committed, she must be distinguished from the companions in misfortune with whom she suffered. Instances are very few in England in which the ferocious statute of James I. was brought to bear against any but the lowest classes of the people."

In the year 1611 King James created the hereditary dignity of baronet as a step between the peerage and the ordinary ancient knighthood of England, which originally belonged to every gentleman possessed of a certain amount of landed estate, but was never hereditary. Amongst the baronets created on the 22nd of May, 1611, were the following Lancashire and Cheshire knights :—Sir Richard Molyneux, of Sefton ; Sir Richard Houghton, of Houghton-tower ; Sir Thomas Gerard, of Bryn, in the county of Lancaster, all the representatives of families which had held their estates from the time of the Norman conquest ; and Sir George Booth, of Dunham Massey, the representative of Hamon de Masci, also one of the followers of the Conqueror. Subsequently the rank of baronet was conferred by James I. on Sir Thomas Stanley, of



Bickerstaff, an ancestor of the present earls of Derby; Sir John Stanley, of Alderley, an ancestor of Lord Stanley of Alderley; and other gentlemen holding large estates in the two counties.

In the year 1617, James I. paid a visit to Lancashire and Cheshire, on his way from Scotland to London, and was received with honours more due to his office than to the gloomy and pedantic bigot who held it. On his arrival at Hornby castle, the ancient seat of the Harringtons, he was welcomed with all the honours due to royalty. From Hornby he proceeded to Ashton hall, near Lancaster, then the residence of Thomas, the first Lord Gerard. From Ashton he repaired to the royal forest of Myerscough, where he spent two days in enjoying the pleasures of the chase; for at that time the forest of Myerscough abounded with red deer, the noblest of all the British animals of chase. From Myerscough the king proceeded to Houghton tower, in Leyland, the magnificent seat of the ancient family of Houghton, whose ancestors had been falconers to the kings of England so early as the reign of Henry II. At Houghton the king was treated with royal magnificence; and there he remained for three days, feasting, hunting, witnessing the old Lancashire sport of rushbearing, and spending his time with the jolly company, as "merry," according to an eye-witness, "as Robin Hood and all his fellows."\* During his stay

\* The following bill of fare on the occasion of James' visit to Houghton Tower has been preserved, and is a curiosity in its way:—

SUNDAY'S DINNER, THE 17TH OF AUGUST, (1617).—FOR THE LORDS' TABLE.

*First Course.*—Pullets, boiled capon, mutton boiled, boiled chickens, shoulder of mutton roast, ducks boiled, loin of veal roast, pullets, haunch of venison roast, burred capon, pasty of venison hot, roast turkey, veal burred, swan roast one and one for to-morrow, chicken pye hot, goose roast, rabbits cold, jiggits of mutton boiled, anipe pye, breast of veal boiled, espous roast, pullet, beef roast, tongue pye cold, sprod boiled, herons roast cold, curlew pye cold, mince pye hot, custards, pig roast.

*Second Course.*—Hot pheasant, one, and one for the king, quails, six for the king, partridge, pouls, artichoke pye, chickens, curlews roast, peas buttered, rabbits, ducks, plovers, red deer pye, pig burred hot, herons roast, three of a dish, lamb roast, gammon of bacon, pigeons roast, made dish, chicken burred, pear tart, pullets and grease, dried tongues, turkey pye, pheasant tart, bogs' cheeks dried, turkey chicks cold.

SUNDAY NIGHT'S SUPPER.

*First Course.*—Pullet, boiled capon, cold mutton, shoulder of mutton roasted, chicken boiled, cold capon, roast veal, rabbits boiled, pullet turkey roast, pasty of venison hot, shoulder of venison roast, herons cold, sliced beef, umble pye, ducks boiled, chickens baked, pullet, cold neat's tongue pye, neat's tongue roast, sprod boiled, curlews baked cold, turkeys baked cold, neat's feet, boiled rabbits, rabbits fried.

*Second Course.*—Quails, pouls, herons, plovers, chickens, pear tart, rabbits, peas buttered, made dish, ducks, gammon of bacon, red deer pye, pigeons, wild boar pye, curlew, dry neat's tongue, neat's tongue tart, dried bog's cheek, red deer pye.

MONDAY MORNING'S BREAKFAST, THE 18TH OF AUGUST.

Pullets, boiled capon, shoulder of mutton, veal roast, boiled chickens, rabbits roast, shoulder of mutton roast, chine of beef roast, pasty of venison, turkey roast, pig roast, venison roast, ducks boiled, pullet, red deer pye

at Houghton the king knighted Sir Cecil Trafford, of Trafford park, and Sir Arthur Lake, of Middlesex. On the 19th of August the king proceeded to Lathom house, on a visit to William, the sixth earl of Derby, and there he knighted Sir William Massey, Sir Robert Bindloes, Sir Gilbert Clifton, Sir John Talbot, Sir Gilbert Ireland, and Sir Edward Osbaldistone, all gentlemen of Lancashire. From Lathom house the king proceeded to Bewsey hall, near Warrington, then the seat of Thomas Ireland, esquire, whom the king raised to the rank of Sir Thomas Ireland, knight, before he left the house.

Crossing the Mersey by the bridge of Warrington, the king entered Cheshire, and proceeded over the hills to the noble castle of Halton, near Runcorn, which belonged to the king, as one of the possessions of the duchy of Lancaster, to which it had become united by the marriage of Alicia de Lacy, the heiress of the constables of Chester and earls of Lincoln, with Thomas, earl of Lancaster, in the reign of Edward II. Halton castle was at that time in all its original beauty and strength, and not a romantic ruin as at the present day. It then not only overlooked but commanded the passage across the Mersey at Runcorn, besides overlooking the beautiful park of the ancient family of the Brookes at Norton Priory, and a most extensive and beautiful range both of land and water. From Halton castle King James proceeded to the beautiful house of Clifton, or Rock Savage, the newly-erected mansion of the ancient and knightly family of the Savages of Cheshire.

Webb, in his "Vale Royal," and Nichols, in his "Progresses of King James I.," shall conduct his majesty through the rest of the county.

"The ride in the evening [from Rock Savage] would skirt the rich vale of the Weever, unless the king deviated, for the purpose of hunting, from the usual route; and as we hear nothing of a visit to Northwich, he probably turned aside at Winnington bridge to Vale Royal. Arriving there the 21st August (Thursday), he there kept his court till Monday after."\*

cold, four capons roast, poults roast, pheasant, herons, mutton boiled, wild boar pye, jiggits of mutton boiled, jiggits of mutton burred, gammon of bacon, chicken pye, burred capon, dried hog's cheek,umble pye, tart, made dish.

- *Servants*—For the pastries, John Greens, Richard Blythe, William Aldersey, Alexander Cowper; for the ranges, John Coleburne, Elias James, John Rarirke, Robert Dance; for boiling, John Manyer, William Parkes; for pullets, John Clerke, John Bibby.

*Chief Cook*—Mr. Morris.

\* Nichols, vol. iii. p. 405.

“James spent four days with his court at Vale Royal, hunting. Heard the dean of Chester preach on the Sunday, and delighted his courtiers by his disquisitions on the discourse; and on another occasion showed his learning and skill in the arts of the chase. Sir John Done had the care of the entertainment of the king at Vale Royal, which had long been the seat of the Holerofts, but had lately come into the possession of the Lady Mary Cholmondeley.”\*

Webb gives the following account of the king's visit to Chester:—“In August, 1617, our city was graced with the royal presence of our sovereign King James, who being attended with many honourable earls, reverend bishops, and worthy knights and courtiers, besides all the gentry of the shire, rode in state through the city, the 23rd of August, being met with the sheriffs-peers and common council, every one with his foot cloth, well mounted on horseback; all the train soldiers of the city standing in order without the Eastgate, and every company with their ensigns in seemingly sort did keep their several stations on both sides of the Eastgate Street. The mayor and all the aldermen took their places on a scaffold, railed and hung about with green; and there, in most grave and seemly manner, they attended the coming of his Majesty. At which time, after a learned speech delivered by the recorder, the mayor presented to the king a fair standing cup, with a cover, double-gilt, and therein an hundred Jacobins of gold; and likewise the mayor delivered the city's sword to the king, who gave it to the mayor again; and the same was borne before the king by the mayor, being on horseback; and the sword of estate was borne by the Right Honourable William, earl of Derby, chief chamberlain of the county palatine of Chester.

“The king rode first to the minster, where he alighted from his horse, and heard an oration in Latin, an anthem sung, and after prayers went from thence to the Pentice, where a sumptuous banquet was prepared at the city's cost; which being ended, the king departed to the Vale Royal, and at his departure the honour of knighthood was offered to the mayor, but he refused the same.”

A Chester journalist gives these additional particulars:—“He stayed in Chester not above five hours. After the departure was a collection made in the city towards the charges the city was at for the cup of gold, which was £120; the banquet, £40; besides

\* Webb, *King's Vale Royal*, vol. ii. p. 10.

fees to his Majesty's servants, £50; and other charges to a good value."<sup>2</sup>

From Chester, "in his return to Vale Royal, the king diverged from his direct rout to visit Lea hall, near Aldford, an ancient mansion of the Calveleys, and there he knighted Sir George Calveley."<sup>†</sup> On Monday the king proceeded to Nantwich, after having left Delamere Forest.<sup>‡</sup>

From Delamere Forest and Utkinton the king proceeded southward (on the 25th August) same day to Townsend, the mansion of Thomas Wilbraham, esquire, near Nantwich. At Nantwich the king, on the 26th August, knighted Sir Hugh Wrottesley, and in the afternoon proceeded on his way to Gerards Bromley, with his own retinue and train of the principal gentry of Cheshire, including the high sheriff, John Devonport, of Devonport. At his taking leave on the confines of the county, his Majesty gave him thanks for his attendance, and bestowed on him knighthood. On the same day the king arrived from Nantwich at Gerards Bromley, in Staffordshire, the seat of the first Lord Gerard.<sup>§</sup>

The visit of James I. to Lancashire was followed by an act which gave great offence to a numerous class of his subjects. From the time of the Reformation a great difference of opinion and practice had existed, both in the Church of England and out of it, as to the proper method of observing the Lord's day, or as it was called by all those who held the stricter views, the Sabbath. The high church party were in general disposed to look upon it much in the same way as the Roman Catholics had previously done, that is, as a religious festival which did not exclude cheerfulness and even mirth. The low church party, if we may venture to employ a term which had not yet come into use, together with the Presbyterians of Scotland and the Puritans of England, took a stricter view of the observance of the day; and were disposed to observe the Christian sabbath with a good deal of the strictness prescribed by divine authority in the observance of the Jewish sabbath. To a certain extent this difference of opinion still exists; though both parties have become more moderate both in their opinions and their practice.

In the days of James I. and of his son, moderation and toleration were alike unknown. When James I. visited Lancashire in the

\* Harl. MSS. 2125, p. 306; quoted by Nichols, vol. iii. p. 409.

† Nichols, vol. iii. p. 410.

‡ Nichols, vol. iii. p. 410.

§ Nichols' Progresses of King James I., vol. iii. p. 413.

year 1617, he found that the strict observance of the Lord's day was generally in use, and that the edicts of certain commissioners, who sat at Manchester in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, were rigorously carried into effect, which forbid "pipers and minstrels playing, the making and frequenting of bear-baiting and bull-baiting, on the Sabbath days, or upon other days in time of divine service; as also the superstitious ringing of bells, wakes, and common feasts; drunkenness, gaming, and other vicious and unprofitable pursuits." Some of these restrictions the king objected to, and on his return put forth a proclamation, in which he stated, "that in his progress through Lancashire he found it necessary to rebuke some Puritans and precise people, and took order that the said unlawful carriage should not be used by any of them hereafter, in the prohibiting and unlawfully punishing of his good people for using their lawful recreations and honest exercises upon Sundays, after service." The proclamation proceeds to declare that "the king had found that two sorts of people within his county of Lancaster much infested that county, namely, Puritans and Papists, and that they had maliciously traduced and calumniated his just and honourable proceedings; he had therefore thought proper to clear and make his pleasure manifest to all his good people in those parts. And his Majesty's pleasure was, that the bishop of the diocese should take strict order with all the Puritans and precisians within the county of Lancaster, and either constrain them to conform themselves or to leave the country, according to the laws of this kingdom and the canons of the church; and as for his good people's lawful recreation, his pleasure was that, after the end of divine service, they be not disturbed, letted, or discouraged from any lawful recreation, such as dancing, either men or women; archery for men, leaping, vaulting, &c., or any other such harmless recreation; nor for having of May games, Whitson-ales, and Morrice dances, and the setting up of May poles, &c., and other sports therewith used, so as the same be had in due and convenient time, without impeachment or neglect of divine service; and that women should have leave to carry rushes to the church, for the decorating of it, according to their old custom: but withall his Majesty did here account still as prohibited all unlawful games to be used upon Sundays only, as bear and bull baitings, interludes, and, at all times in the meaner sort of people by law prohibited, bowling. And, likewise, did bar from this benefit and liberty all

such known recusants, either men or women, as did abstain from coming to church or divine service, they being unworthy of any lawful recreation after the said service that would not first come to the church and serve God: prohibiting, in like sort, the said recreations to any that, though conforming in religion, were not present in the church at the service of God before their going to the said recreations."

The above proclamation was followed, in the course of the same year, by the publication of the "Book of Sports," which the bishops were ordered to cause to be read and published in all the parish churches of their respective dioceses, on pain of punishment in the high commission court. These proceedings were no doubt agreeable to a certain portion of the members of the high church party in the reign of James I., but they were almost as offensive to the members of the low church party as they were to the Puritans and the Presbyterians of Scotland; and they had the effect of alienating a greatly increased number of persons from the Church of England. Many of these, with their pastors, took refuge in New England; but a much greater number remained at home indignant, and waiting for the time when they could openly avow their indignation.

The power and influence of the crown in the north-western, as well as in other districts of the kingdom, was greatly weakened in the time both of James and Charles I., by the sale of numerous estates which had belonged to the crown, or the duchy of Lancaster, from very early periods. Originally the rights of the crown extended to the whole of the territory of England, every estate either paying a certain rent to the crown or being held subject to the performance of certain military and civil services. In course of time, by far the larger portion of the estates of the crown had been alienated by imprudent grants, or had been leased for long terms, or in perpetuity, at rents which were originally much below their real value, and which, being payable in gold and silver, became quite insignificant, with the continual depreciation of the coinage by successive sovereigns, and the great decrease in the value of gold and silver caused by the discovery of the gold and silver mines of America. Thus, for instance, the whole of the crown land and of the royal rights, in the borough of Liverpool, were held by the Molyneux family, from the reign of Henry VII. to that of Charles I., at a yearly rent of £14, although they must have been worth some hundreds of pounds yearly in the



latter portion of that period. With equal improvidence the royal deer park of Toxteth, near Liverpool, was sold for a few hundred pounds to William, earl of Derby, who resold it to Sir Richard Molyneux, for £1100, a few years later. Other estates, in different parts of Lancashire and Cheshire, were disposed of with an equal disregard of their real value; and in the second year of the reign of Charles I., that sovereign, who was always greatly in want of money, disposed of upwards of 300 royal estates, many of the most valuable of which were in Lancashire, in payment of various sums furnished to him, or to his father, by the citizens of London. The rental of those estates, even at that time, was £12,496 per annum; and if they had been let at their true value it would have been at least ten times as much. The result of this, and of many other similar sales, was that the crown became poorer every year, whilst the expenses of the government, under the direction of Villiers, duke of Buckingham, and other advisers equally selfish and reckless, every year became much greater. In consequence, the crown was driven to the necessity either of appealing to Parliament for continual grants, which were never made without at least a promise of a redress of grievances; or in place of Parliamentary grants, of having recourse to the use of antiquated and obnoxious if not absolutely illegal demands, made under cover of the royal prerogative. The amounts obtained by these means were small, both in proportion to the wants of the crown, and to the odium and unpopularity incurred in raising money by such unpopular means.

In the year 1635 the demand of King Charles I. for a contribution, under the name of ship-money, threw the whole kingdom into the most violent state of excitement. The sum demanded for the county of Lancaster was £1000; that for the borough of Wigan was £50, for the borough of Preston £40, for Lancaster £30, for Liverpool £25, for Clitheroe £7 10s., and for Newton also £7 10s. This demand was made in the year in which Humphrey Chetham was high sheriff of Lancashire, and it appears from his memoirs that it produced extreme dissatisfaction, especially at Liverpool. Its two great opponents in that port were John Moore, Esq., of Bank hall, Kirkdale, who afterwards commanded the garrison of Liverpool against Prince Rupert, and at a later time sat in judgment on the king himself; and Edward Nicholson, a principal shipowner of the port. After great trouble the high sheriff succeeded in obtaining the money; but the exacting of it left behind a bitter feeling; and the

fact of the judges having declared the demand for ship-money to be legal, only involved them in the same unpopularity which was gathering around the crown and church.

Some curious memorials of the times immediately preceding the great civil war, are found in the account of the shrievalty of William Ffarington, of Worden, for the year 1636, recently published in the Ffarington Papers, by the Chetham Society. It appears from this account that Edward, Lord Newburgh, was chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster at this time, having been appointed to the office in the year 1629, and holding it to the year 1644. In a letter from the Duchy house, dated the 4th of June, 1636, to the high sheriff, he states, that by special directions, there were commands given to his Majesty's judges of assize, that in their circuit they should take the oaths of all the justices of peace within the county of Lancaster; but as the greater part of them had not appeared at the previous assizes, the high sheriff was ordered to warn and summon all the justices of the county, that were not then sworn (a list of which was inclosed), to appear and attend the judges, without fail, to take their oaths at this next assizes. The list of justices inclosed in the chancellor's letter contains the following names:—William, earl of Derby; James, Lord Strange; John (Bridgeman), bishop of Chester; Henry, Lord Morley; Edward, Lord Newburgh; Sir George Vernon, knight; Sir Robert Berkley, knight; Sir Edward Mosley, knight; Sir Gilbert Houghton, knight and bart.; Sir George Booth, knight and bart.; Sir Ranulph Ashton, bart.; Sir Alexander Radcliffe, knight of the most noble order of the Bath; Sir Charles Gerard, knight; Sir Cecil Trafford, knight; Sir Thomas Barton, knight; Richard Murray, clerk (warden of Manchester College); William Leigh, bachelor of divinity; Thomas Standish, John Atherton, Edward Rawsthorne, Robert Holte, Thomas Worrall, John Braddell, Edward Hopwood, Henry Ogle, Peter Winne, John Brockholes, Thomas Ashton, John Starkey, Henry Ashurst, Edward Bridgeman, William Radcliff and Richard Burghe, esquires; with Robert Markland, mayor of Wigan.

This list of magistrates is followed by a list of the gentlemen and tenants who wore the high sheriff's cloth or livery at the assizes. These consisted of gentlemen who paid the sheriff this compliment from respect to himself and his family. Of these there were twenty: in addition to these Mr. Tildesley attended himself, supported by six of his tenants and sixteen tenants of the high sheriff's; Mr. Fleetwood appeared, supported by ten of his friends and tenants; Mr. Bannister

appeared, attended by six of his tenants ; Mr. Thomas and Mr. Henry Ffarington appeared, attended by two friends and fourteen tenants and dependents, making the whole company in attendance on the high sheriff seventy-six persons, including two trumpeters.

The calendar contained the names of twenty-three persons. Of these one was accused of feloniously killing Thomas Riley ; four were accused of burglariously breaking into houses ; one was accused of diminishing his Majesty's coin by clipping ; two were accused of cattle-stealing, one of horse-stealing, and one of sheep-stealing ; two persons were accused of forcibly holding possession of certain goods, late in the possession of one Gabreal Westhead ; two were accused of feloniously stealing certain goods, one of whom confessed the theft ; one was accused of being an incorrigible and wandering rogue, being branded in the shoulder, who hath been divers times in the house of correction ; one was accused of buying and receiving of stolen deer skins, and refusing to confess who brought them unto him ; one was charged with refusing to put in sureties for his good behaviour ; and two were charged on suspicion of cutting purses. This would in modern times be considered a very light calendar, even making allowance for the difference of population. In addition to the prisoners tried at the summer assizes, there were seven prisoners who had been in gaol since the previous assizes, besides ten witches. It would appear from the names of these pretended witches, that they were some of the poor creatures convicted and sentenced to death at the assizes of 1633 ; so that, although their lives were spared, they were subjected to a long imprisonment. There were also five other females in the prison, whose offences are not clearly stated, but who were also probably detained on a similar charge.

William Prynne being conveyed through the city of Chester, in the year 1636, on his way to be imprisoned in Caernarvon castle, the Puritans there assembled, to show respect and express their veneration for him. By this conduct they consequently incurred the severe displeasure of the government ; and some of the Chester friends of this well known writer were fined £500, some £300, and others £250. Mr. Peter Ince, stationer, made a recantation before the bishop, and Mr. Calvin Bruen did the same to the city authorities ; but two of the others refused to make submission ; these were Mr. Peter Lee and Mr. Richard Golborne, who suffered their bonds of £300 each to be estreated, rather than accept pardon on the conditions offered.\*

\* Ormerod's Cheshire vol. i. p. 203, who quotes Cowper's MSS.

The feeling against Prynne continued to influence the Chester authorities, for in the next year four portraits of him, said to have been painted in Chester, were burned at the High Cross in the presence of the magistracy.\*

In the year 1638 the growing discontent of the English nation became doubly dangerous, from the sudden and violent insurrection of the people and Parliament of Scotland against the rash attempts of the government, urged on by Archbishop Laud, to force the forms and doctrines of the Episcopal church on the Presbyterian people of that country. The Scotch nation, thoroughly roused by this daring attack on the doctrines and discipline which they had adopted at the time of the Reformation, in defiance of the Roman Catholic queen, and which they had clung to with unshaken firmness after the Stuarts had adopted the doctrines of the Church of England, at once rose in insurrection; and bringing together a numerous army, headed by the most powerful peers of Scotland, advanced to the border, and prepared to resist by force of arms all further interference of the English government with their most cherished opinions. Although perfectly prepared to fight for their religion against any enemies, however formidable, the Scottish people and their leaders were greatly strengthened in their resistance by the knowledge, that a large portion of the English people entirely sympathized with their views, and were prepared to make the battle their own. After much ineffectual negotiation, attended at one time by a partial disarmament, the Scotch army pushed boldly forward into England, and even crossed the Tyne, driving before it the ill-organized and mutinous army of the king.

At the time when the quarrel with the people and Parliament of Scotland broke out there was no regular army in England; and it was also well known that the trained bands or militia of London, and others of the large towns, were full of discontent, with the long-continued attempts of the king to govern without a Parliament, and the tyrannical efforts of Laud to force the doctrines and forms of the high church party on the whole nation. In this state of things the king called on all the leading noblemen and gentlemen throughout the kingdom, but more especially those in the northern counties, to employ their influence, in raising an army amongst their tenants and the smaller gentry. One of the first persons called upon by the king for this assistance was James Stanley,

\* Ormerod, vol. i. p. 203.

Lord Strange, the son and heir of William, earl of Derby, the lord-lieutenant of Lancashire and Cheshire, and president of North Wales. Owing to the great age of the earl of Derby, all the duties of the lieutenancy were performed by Lord Strange, aided by his vigorous-minded wife, the celebrated Charlotte de la Tremouille.

At the beginning of the month of February, 1638, King Charles, who was still at Westminster, but preparing to advance to the Scottish borders, addressed a letter to the earl of Derby, K.G., and Lord Strange, calling on them to raise the military force of their lieutenancies in support of the crown. The letter of the king was as follows:—

THE KING TO THE EARL OF DERBY, K.G., AND THE LORD STRANGE.

CHARLES R.

“Right trusty and right well beloved cousin, and right trusty and well beloved son, we greet you well: Taking into our consideration the warlike preparations and rebellious proceedings of some in Scotland, who, being ill-affected to government, endeavour under pretence of religion, which is utterly false and a mere mask of rebellion, to insinuate disloyalty into the hearts of our people there, and under colour of defence of that kingdom to raise soldiers and lodge them upon the borders, that upon the first approach of our forces levied here, only for the safety and preservation of this our kingdom, they may be ready to invade and make a spoil of the good subjects of this our kingdom, we have thought it very necessary to have all the trained bands, both of horse and foot, in those counties to be ready upon all occasions for defence against whatsoever may be attempted by the said Scots, by way of invasion or otherwise, against the peace and quiet of this kingdom. To which purpose our will and command is, that you forthwith signify our will and pleasure to all the colonels of our said counties of Lancaster and Chester forthwith to consider of the same, with the advice of Sir Jacob Astley, or some deputed by him, to appoint some fit place or places of rendezvous in our said counties, where all the horse and foot belonging to our said trained bands may assemble with most convenience, and best advantage for our service: and we will that you take effectual order that all our said forces of those counties fail not to be then ready in case of invasion, or any act of hostility executed by the said Scots, to march at twenty-four hours’ warning,

as upon summons from Sir Jacob Astley, our serjeant-major general of the Field, shall be directed, for which this shall be your sufficient warrant.—Given under our signet, at our Palace of Westminster, the 19th day of February, in the fourteenth year of our reign.”

Lord Strange having received the above intimation from the king, immediately proceeded to write to the deputy-lieutenants in the several hundreds of the counties of Lancaster and Chester, calling upon them to render him all the assistance in their power in carrying out the commands of the king. The correspondence of his lordship with the deputy-lieutenants in the Lancashire hundreds of Leyland, West Derby, and Salford has been preserved in the Ffarington Papers, and no doubt forms a fair specimen of the correspondence with the deputy-lieutenants of the other hundreds of Lancashire, as well as those of Cheshire.

Lord Strange writes as follows to William Ffarington, esquire, of Worden, in the hundred of Leyland, an old and warmly-attached friend of his family. His letter is dated Knowsley, the 9th day of February, 1638 :—

LORD STRANGE TO WILLIAM FFARINGTON, ESQUIRE.

“The times do expressly call upon every man’s care and providence to be in readiness for his Majesty’s service; and whereas some parties lying more convenient than others for the same are now summoned thereunto; for which I have received his Majesty’s command to attend his royal person and standard at York, the 1st of April next, and bring with me as many horse, sufficiently furnished, as is within my means in so short a time to provide. In pursuance whereof, being thereto encouraged by the experience of former times of the love and respect my ancestors have found upon the like occasions, I do hereby intreat the like assistance of my good friends, and such as (I consider) will not only herein honour me, but thereby further his Majesty’s intended service; wherein every well-affected and vigilant subject is most nearly in interest bound. For which purpose I have particularly made a list of such my good friends within the hundred of Leyland, unto whom I desire you to repair with this my instance, and request that for this service they will severally make me (supply me with) a light horse completely furnished, for my attendance upon his Majesty, as I am commanded, which I shall esteem as a special



respect, and upon all occasions be ready to witness my thanks to every one of them, and so I rest,

“Your assured loving friend,

“J. STRANGE.

“KNOWSLEY, 9th day of February, 1638.”

In consequence of the above letter, Mr. Ffarington addressed a circular to all the leading gentlemen of the hundred of Leyland, calling on each of them to comply with the request of his lordship. Amongst the gentlemen to whom this request was addressed were, Ralph Standish, of Standish; Thomas Hesketh, of Rufford; John Fleetwood, of Penwortham; Thomas Standish, of Duxbury; Richard Ashton, of Croston; Robert Charnock; James Anderton, of Cleaton; William Anderton, of the Ford; Henry Banistre, of Bank; Alexander Rigby, of Burgh; and William Hoghton, of Park hall, esquires; together with Peter Catterall, Robert Mawdisley, and Mr. Edge, of Little Hoole, gentlemen. In his letter to the above, Mr. Ffarington, after informing them of Lord Strange's request, and the grounds on which he hopes for their support, adds:—  
“I intend (God willing) to be at Chorley on Monday next, for to execute part of my Lord's commands about this service, and other commands which I am commanded speedily to go about, where, if I might enjoy your good companies, I should explain myself further than now time will give me leave. So, leaving the premises to your worthy considerations, in hope you will be pleased to give me meeting at the place aforesaid, with the remembrance of my bounden respects, I rest your assured loving friend,

“WILLIAM FFARINGTON.”

In the West Derby hundred Lord Strange engaged Sir Charles Gerard, of Halsall, the father of Charles Gerard, lieutenant-general of the Horse to the king, created Baron Gerard of Brandon in 1645, to render him the same services in raising troops, which he had requested of Mr. Ffarington. In doing so, however, he found that there was a great want both of arms and armour, or, as they were then called, “furniture,” in the hundred; the natural result of almost forty years of internal and external peace. In consequence of this deficiency, Sir Charles Gerard wrote to Mr. Ffarington, asking him to request Lord Strange to procure what was wanted in London. The letter is as follows:—

SIR C. GERARD TO WILLIAM FFARINGTON.

"SIR,—I conceive you are desired by our honourable lord-  
lieutenant to solicit the gentlemen of your hundred of Leyland,  
for their assistance to his lordship with horses furnished for his  
Majesty's service, as I am in like manner for this hundred of West  
Derby; and upon conference with divers of the gentlemen there,  
I find many of them willing to be at the charge of a horse fur-  
nished, but know not how to get the furniture in so short a time.  
Whereupon I made suit unto his lordship how, at his going to  
London, that his lordship would endeavour to provide and buy  
furniture there; and his lordship was pleased that for so many as  
he shall forthwith be certified from me or you that they were  
willing and wanting in this kind, and as should send to Knowsley  
the money they would afford for the price of such furniture, his  
lordship would take care to obtain what they should want to be  
sent down in convenient time. Thus much I thought good to  
signify unto you, because I conceived the like occasion may fall  
in your hand.

"I purpose to call some freeholders which may perhaps think  
much [think it too much] to make a horse each for this service;  
and for these, if some three, four, five, or more join together, I  
conceive it will be accepted. And if they cannot furnish them-  
selves, if they please to join together to the charge, I presume it  
will be provided for them.

"And thus with my love remembered do rest,

"Your loving friend,

"CHA. GERARD.

"HALSALL, 14th February, 1638."

Sir Charles Gerard further writes to William Ffarington that  
the answers of the gentlemen of the county with regard to the  
trained horse may be returned in time to have a review of them  
at Ormskirk, some time within three weeks after the date of his  
lordship's letter. Any horses received in the meantime, after being  
examined and accepted by Sir Charles Gerard, to be sent forth-  
with to Lathom. "The moneys that you shall receive in that  
behalf, his lordship desires they may be returned to my Lady  
Strange; in the mean time he will provide horse and arms for  
the money. If there be want of ryders, he will furnish himself  
of able ryders."

In the Salford hundred Sir Cecil Trafford, of Trafford, superintended the levies directed by Lord Strange. Two letters remain addressed by him to Mr. Ffarington, which contain some rather curious information as to the mode in which the levies were made, and from which also it appears that Lady Strange already took an active part in carrying out the business of the lieutenancy.

On the 16th of February, 1638, Sir Cecil Trafford wrote to Mr. Ffarington as follows:—

SIR CECIL TRAFFORD TO WILLIAM FFARINGTON.

“SIR,—I have received your letter, and have perused the certificate made to the like letter from the Right Honourable the Lords of his Majesty’s Council. The answer is (*viz.*), We have enrolled also all the able men of the county between sixteen and sixty years of age, which amount to a great number; out of which levy may be made as his Majesty or the Lords of the Council shall direct. This general answer then was received. Now for the callander; the number of pioneers was 5247 in the county, which was not ment, as I conceive, all the able men; and there you may certify whether you like better, but I conceive that general answer is the better way. Nevertheless, referring it to your better judgement, and so with my respects unto you,

“I rest to do you service,

“CECIL TRAFFORD.

“TRAFFORD, 16th *February*, 1638.”

In another letter of the 4th of March, Sir Cecil Trafford again wrote to Mr. Ffarington, informing him of what course he had taken in raising troops in the Salford hundred. On this subject he says:—

SIR CECIL TRAFFORD TO WILLIAM FFARINGTON, ESQUIRE.

“SIR,—I have received your letter, with certificate enclosed, the which I have subscribed, and dated it at Preston, the last of February (for it had no date), and shall send it to my neighbour, Mr. Greenhalgh. The course I took was this: I went to every particular gentleman’s house or person, and took their answer (and have certified my Lady Strange every their answer, and those that gave money I sent it to my lady); and those that offered money to discharge themselves of trouble to provide arms, I sent their

offers. On Friday Mr. Greenhalgh was at Knowsley with my lord, and he took every man's answer under their hand; few denied. And so, with my respects unto you,

"I rest your ever loving friend,

"CECIL TRAFFORD.

'TRAFFORD, 4th March, 1638.'

On the 11th of March Lord Strange wrote to Mr. Ffarington, to thank him and the gentlemen and freeholders of the hundred of Leyland for the zeal they had shown in raising troops, and at the same time to state that he had not occasion for so many horses as he had expected; and as he was unwilling to be chargeable to his kind and good neighbours and friends, unless necessity required it, he was resolved to respite and forbear all the assistance offered till he further saw his Majesty's designs, and his occasions to use the same. On the 9th of April following, for some reason or other, connected no doubt with the state of affairs on the Scottish border, Lord Strange made a sudden demand for ten demi-lances, or lancers, and thirty light horse. The horse were to be furnished by the different hundreds of the county in the following proportions:—West Derby,  $7\frac{1}{2}$ ; Salford,  $4\frac{1}{2}$ ; Leyland,  $2\frac{1}{4}$ ; Blackburn,  $5\frac{1}{4}$ ; Amounderness, 6; and Lonsdale,  $4\frac{1}{2}$ . The demi-lances were to be furnished in the same proportions.

We have no information as to the number of Lancashire and Cheshire troops which were moved to the Scottish border when the king collected his forces there; but a memorandum in the Ffarington Papers states that Sir Cecil Trafford was to command five troops, four of "carobins" (carbineers) and one of dragoons. Another memorandum in the same collection states, that there were letters come forth to all earls and barons in the kingdom to attend his Majesty at York, the 1st day of April, with as many horse (on their own charge) as they can raise. Also it was thought that the third part of the trained bands of every county would attend his Majesty at the same place.

Although the differences with Scotland were patched up for the moment, yet they soon broke out again with increased violence, and in the end compelled the king to call together his Parliament, after an interval of arbitrary rule extending over a period of twelve years. The Parliament, however, thus reluctantly summoned, was soon as hastily dissolved. This was a blunder which cost the king very dear,

for the majority of the members of this short Parliament was composed of men of moderate opinions, who would have met any reasonable concessions on the part of the crown in a friendly spirit. None such were made, but, on the contrary, preparations were entered upon for the struggle between the king and the Parliament which soon afterwards burst forth.

In the month of November, 1640, Lord Strange began to collect gunpowder for the supply of the various magazines in the county of Lancaster, the principal of which were at Liverpool, Manchester, Blackburn, Chorley, Preston, and Lancaster; and at a great meeting of the magistrates and deputy-lieutenants, held at Wigan in the same month of the following year, it was arranged, with the assent of the high sheriff and justices of the peace, that the ordering and disposal of the magazines for the use of the county should be wholly vested in the lord-lieutenant, the Lord Strange and his deputies, and should be dispersed into several places in the county, the proportions being left to the discretion of the lord-lieutenant. We find in the Ffarington Papers an account of the manner in which the magazine of Liverpool, which was one of the principal in the county, was furnished with gunpowder. This is contained in a letter from Lord Strange to Francis Sherrington, Esq., one of the treasurers of the county's moneys collected within the county of Lancaster, for military affairs, for his Majesty's service.

The first transaction relates to the purchasing of as much powder as came to the sum of £179 13s. 2*d.* This powder was purchased in London, under an agreement (by Lord Strange's command) with Mr. Robert Massey, of Warrington, to the effect that he should buy and provide powder, with a proportion of match fit for the same, to be put into a magazine for the safeguard of the county, he receiving one penny profit for every shilling that he should disburse. His lordship therefore required and entreated Mr. Sherrington to meet Mr. Ffarington at Sankey bridge, near Warrington, to view, try, and weigh the said powder and match, and to cause the same to be conveyed by some sufficient and trusty persons to Liverpool, and to be paid for out of the county's money. This was accordingly done, and it appears that the sums paid on this account were as follows:—£135 for twenty-five barrels of powder, at £5 8s. per barrel, each barrel weighing 116 lbs., of five score to the cwt.; £16 2s. 6*d.* for 8 cwts. 3 qrs. of match, at £1 16s. 6*d.* per cwt.; £12 11s. 10*d.* for the profit on the above, at a penny for every shilling disbursed; £15 6s.

for the carriage of this powder and match from London to Warrington, at 9s. per cwt.; 5s. for the carriage of the goods above written to Sankey bridge from Warrington; 6s. 10*d.* cellarage at Sankey, straw for covering it to preserve it from Sankey to Liverpool; and 1s. as earnest to a boatman to carry the last match and powder to Liverpool—making a total of £179 13s. 2*d.* By a bill of September 23, 1640, it appears that Mr. Massey also furnished corn-powder, and match to the value of £294 19s. 3*d.*, procured by him from Thomas Brown, grocer; that he supplied powder and match to the value of £351 0s. 6*d.*, on the 19th October; and that he further supplied powder and match of the value of £151 2s. 6*d.*, on the 23rd October, in the same year.

Soon after the meeting of the Long Parliament the struggle between the Parliament and the Crown became more violent, and everything threatened the open rupture which soon after followed. In the month of May, 1641, on the occasion of what was called the Army Plot, the following protestation was drawn up by the Commons, and after having been taken by all the members present, and by all the Lords, except Southampton and Roberts, was ordered by the Commons to be sent down to the counties and boroughs, declaring all who refused to take it unfit to bear office in church and state. A copy of it is found in the Ffarington Papers, and was no doubt forwarded with the intimation that it should be taken in all parts of the county of Lancaster. It is as follows:—

“A copy of the Protestation, and the Oath of the Covenant, made in Parliament the 3rd of May, 1641.

“I, A. B., do in the presence of Almighty God promise, vow, and protest to maintain and defend, as far as lawfully I may with my life, power, and estate, the true reformed Protestant religion, expressed by the doctrine of the Church of England, against all Popery and Popish innovation within this realm, contrary to the said doctrine. And, according to the duty of my allegiance, I will maintain and defend his Majesty's royal person, honour, and estate.

“And also the power and privilege of Parliament, the lawful rights and liberties of the subject, and every person that shall make this protestation in whatsoever he shall do in the lawful pursuance of the same. And to my power, as far as lawfully I may, I will oppose, and by all good ways and means endeavour to bring condign punishment on, all such as shall by force, practice, counsel, plots, conspiracies, or otherwise, do anything to the contrary in this present



protestation contained. And further, that I shall in all just and honourable ways endeavour to preserve the unions and peace betwixt the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland. And neither for the hope, fear, or any other respects, shall relinquish this promise, vow, and protestation."

During the whole of the year 1641 a vehement struggle continued in Parliament between the adherents of the king and the supporters of the rights of Parliament. This gradually resolved itself into a contest as to which of the two should have the control of the militia, or trained bands, which then formed the only armed force of the kingdom. In the month of November of that year, when almost all hope of a peaceful settlement had passed away, a great meeting of the magistrates of Lancashire was held at Wigan, by order from the Lord Keeper to Lord Strange, for the purpose of administering the oath of allegiance, and of making other arrangements, originating in the fear of a rapidly approaching civil war. The following is an account of the orders which were issued on that occasion :—

ORDERS MADE AT WIGAN, NOVEMBER 23, 1641.

1. *Imprimis*, it is ordered and agreed upon, that each captain of the trained bands, within the county, shall forthwith convent (convene) and summon, under order from the lord-lieutenant or his deputies, to their usual place of rendezvous, all the soldiers under their conduct; and that at the said meeting the oath of allegiance be rendered unto them: for which purpose the next justices of peace are to attend, upon notice from the captains of their days of meeting; and in case any soldier refuse or forbear to take the oath, then the said justices and captains to certify the same under their hands forthwith, unto the lord-lieutenant, and such as be well affected and conformable to the now established religion of this kingdom, placed in their stead; and that command shall be given them by the said justices of peace and their captains, that each soldier shall be in a readiness to march to such place of rendezvous as by their captains or superior officers shall be assigned, upon twenty-four hours' warning at the most, or lesser if occasion be, in complete arms, and well furnished.

2. And that the like course shall be observed, in each division and hundred, by the captains of the freehold bands and the soldiers under their conductions; and moreover, that each soldier shall have strict command to furnish themselves with one pound of powder,

twenty bullets, and three yards of match, to be in a readiness as occasion shall happen, or as they shall have notice from their captains or superior officer, which are to be commanded by the lord-lieutenant or his deputies.

3. And it is likewise ordered that due watch and ward shall be kept in each several township within the said county, according to the discretion of the next adjoining justice of peace, and that strict command be given to the watchmen that they apprehend and stay all such known papists, strangers, or other persons, which ride and travel in the night-time, or that go armed offensively, or whom they shall suspect to carry any letters or messages. And if upon search, or any other notice, they see or suspect just cause, that then they bring them to the next constable, which shall immediately carry them before the next justice of peace, if he think fit, to be further examined and dealt with as cause shall require: and also the watchmen each night shall go and see privately about such recusants' houses as are of great rank and quality, if that they can find there, or see any unlawful assemblies or tumults thereabout: and that the said watchmen shall certify the constables of their said townships daily of what they do or find upon their watch; and the constables to certify the next adjoining deputy-lieutenant, or justice of the peace; and the said deputy-lieutenant, or justice of peace, to certify the lord-lieutenant when and so often as the case shall require.

4. And whereas the Right Honourable Lord-Lieutenant is pleased to disperse the ammunition now remaining in magazine to several places of this county, it is therefore ordered that the principal officers of such towns and places (whereunto the said ammunition shall be sent) shall take care and charge of the same, and cause it to be safely kept for the use of the county, until they shall receive further direction from the said lord-lieutenant or some of his deputies.

(Signed)	J. STRANGE,	PETER EGERTON, High Sheriff,
	ED. WRIGHTINGTON,	WM. FFARINGTON,
	ALEXANDER RIGBY,	EDMUND ASSHETON,
	ROBERT HOLT,	JOHN MOORE,
	EDM. HOPWOODE,	EDW. BUTTERWATH,
	JOHN GREENHALGH,	HENRY OGLE,
	HENRY ASHURST,	W. RADCLYFF.
	RADCLIFF ASHTON,	

## CHAPTER VI.

## THE GREAT CIVIL WAR.

IN the month of January, 1642, the differences between the Crown and the Parliament having become so great as to destroy all hope of a peaceful solution, the king left London, where the power of the Parliament was too great to be resisted, and proceeded towards the Midland and Northern counties, where his adherents were numerous, powerful, and determined. The object both of the king and of the Parliament from this time forward, if not from an earlier period, was to prepare for the coming civil war, and steps were immediately taken by both parties to secure the command of the armed force of the kingdom. At the same time, both the royal and the parliamentary parties were extremely anxious to throw the odium of an appeal to arms from themselves and upon their opponents. Hence the war of swords was preceded by a war of pens, in which each party put forth all its strength, in vindication of its own cause, and in blackening the character and the motives of those of the opposite party. In the course of this war of words numerous petitions and remonstrances were presented both to the king and to the Parliament, from their friends, strongly urging them to proceed in the course which they had already marked out for their own adoption.

A considerable time before the king left London a petition had been presented to the House of Commons, assembled in Parliament, from divers knights, esquires, ministers, gentlemen, and freeholders, of the county palatine of Lancaster, friendly to the parliamentary party. In this petition the petitioners state that they had seen with thankful hearts the fidelity, patience, and unparalleled industry of the honourable house, in its endeavours to restore to order the discomposed condition of the church and state, and to put the same into a way to unite purity and peace. These advantages they thought were to be brought about by purging the fountains of government, and establishing his Majesty's royal throne upon the old and sure foundation of impartial justice, national laws, and the subjects' love; by the blessed union of two kingdoms, England and Scotland, to the

terror of our enemies and the strength and splendour of both nations ; by expunging out of the church, innovations, and confining churchmen to their proper functions ; by a national synod of able divines to compose the disputes of the kingdom, and to settle the differences both of doctrine and discipline ; by restoring to the subjects of this kingdom courage, industry, and vivacity of spirit, by the freedom of their persons and estates ; and by settling the present fruition and the lasting possession of those high and invaluable benefits, by disposing of the militia, and the kingdom itself, under the command of persons of honour and unquestionable fidelity. Such a person the petitioners acknowledged to be the noble lord, the Lord Wharton, appointed by Parliament to be lord-lieutenant of the county of Lancaster, "whom with thankfulness they receive, and according to the power wherewith he shall be trusted will ever most readily and willingly obey." The petitioners then proceeded to request that such persons, whether ecclesiastical or temporal, whose ends and interests are not the same with those of the Protestants of this kingdom, may be removed from the great council of the kingdom ; that the distractions of the church may be settled by a national synod ; that the number of preaching ministers may be augmented in this county, and a better distribution of the church revenue be made ; that a provision be made for the relief of the distressed Protestants of Ireland, who in multitudes daily arrive in this county ; that a fleet of small ships may be appointed for the guard of this coast, as well to prevent the aid and intelligence that may be given to the Irish rebels from the papists of these or any other parts, as for the defence of his Majesty's faithful subjects inhabiting the maritime parts of this kingdom, opposite to Ireland ; that the recusants of this county may be disarmed, and such posts, or other strengths, as yet remain in any of their keepings may be deposited in the hands of Protestants ; and that sufficient guards may be appointed in places convenient, and the militia of the county be put in a posture for the defence of the same. The above petition was presented to the house by divers gentlemen of the county palatine of Lancaster, and was very graciously received, the speaker being directed to inform the petitioners "that the house had read their petition ; and do find in it many weighty considerations, and great expressions of their care and affection to the commonwealth, and to this house in particular: For the particulars mentioned in the petition they will take them into consideration."<sup>3</sup>

\* Dr. Ormerod's Civil War Tracts of Lancashire, Published by the Cletham Society, 1844, p. 5.

In the spring of 1642, when the king had left London, and when civil war was becoming every day more threatening, petitions or addresses were presented to the king, who was then at York, both from the parliamentary and the royalist parties in Lancashire. Of course the advice given by these parties was very different, and so also was the reception which it met with from the king. The address or petition of the parliamentary party was in substance as follows :—The petitioners expressed their heartbreaking sense and sorrow at the unhappy rents and distractions in his Majesty's dominions, especially in the session of so grave and religious an assembly as the House of Commons, most graciously convened by his Majesty, and endeavouring the glory of Almighty God in the reformation of religion, the honour and weal of these realms, and the settling and securing of the royal throne in plenty and peace. These divisions, in their opinion, arose from the long and remote distance of his Majesty from that honourable assembly, and they therefore prayed his Majesty to return to his great council, and there present a live body of the kingdom in whom the nation hath so far confided that they have intrusted them with their lives, liberties, and estates.

But the address or petition of the royalists of Lancashire took a very different view of the matters in dispute, and to it the king returned a very gracious reply. This petition was described as the petition of divers of his Majesty's faithful subjects of the true Protestant religion, in the county palatine of Lancashire, presented to his Majesty at York, the last day of May, 1642, by the high sheriff of that county and divers other gentlemen of quality, and subscribed by sixty-four knights and esquires, fifty-five divines, 740 gentlemen, and of free-holders and others above 7000. This petition was drawn up by Richard Heyrick, Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford, and warden of Manchester College.

These petitioners begin by stating that the most real and convincing testimonies of the princely care of his Majesty for the advancement of God's true religion in these realms, and the common good of all his Majesty's subjects, could no less than draw from the petitioners (who have hitherto in these stirring times sat still) this humble acknowledgment of their due and necessary thanks. They then proceed to state that they esteem and prize his Majesty's most righteous intentions of governing his liege people according to the wholesome laws, as a thing often and with earnestness avowed by the king, to which they yield that hearty credence which is due to so religious and

righteous a prince ; they also acknowledge the manifold and evident manifestations to the world that the king does not affect an arbitrary government, but the common prosperity and happiness of all his loyal subjects, by the following proofs—namely, by his readiness to join with Parliament in a speedy raising of forces for a timely suppression of that odious rebellion in Ireland ; by the late proclamation for the putting in due execution the laws against papists ; by his most gracious condescending to the desires of the great council of the nation of the realm, in signing the bills for triennial parliaments ; by the king's relinquishing his title of imposing (duties) upon merchandise, and the power of pressing soldiers ; by the taking away of the Star Chamber, and the High Commission Courts ; by the regulating of the Council Table, and by the bills for the Forests and Stannary Courts, with other most necessary acts. The petitioners then proceed to state that they are confident and well assured of his Majesty's zeal for the advancement of the true Protestant religion, and with inexpressible joy do understand his most Christian and pious resolution for the preservation of those powerful encouragements of industry, learning, and piety, the means and honour of the ministry ; for the maintenance and continuance of our church government, and solemn liturgy of the church of long-continued and general approbation of the most pious and learned of this nation and of other countries, composed according to the primitive pattern by our blessed martyrs and other religious and learned men. The petitioners further state, that they have seen with pleasure that it is the wish of his Majesty that all abuses of church and state shall be reformed, according to the model of Queen Elizabeth of ever blessed and famous memory, by the one of which he had weakened the hopes of the sacrilegious devourers of the church's patrimony, if there be any such, and by the other at once provided against all popish impieties and idolatries, and also against the growing danger of Anabaptists, Brownists, and other Mobilities ; all which piety, love, and justice, say the petitioners, we beseech God to return into your royal bosom ! But yet, most gracious Sovereign, they proceed, there is one thing that sads our hearts and hinders the perfection of our happiness, which is the distance and misunderstanding between your Majesty and your Parliament, whereby the hearts of your subjects are filled with fears and jealousies, justice neglected, sacred ordinances profaned, and trading impaired, to the impoverishing of many of your liege people, for the removal whereof we cannot find out any lawful means without your Majesty's assistance and



direction. Wherefore, the petitioners proceed, we humbly beseech your most excellent Majesty to continue your most Christian and pious resolution of ruling your people according to the laws of the land, and maintaining the same; of being a zealous defender of the established doctrine, liturgy, and government of our church, from heresy, libertinism, and profaneness; an advancer of learning, piety, and religion; an encourager of painful orthodox preachers; and whatever your Parliament shall offer to your royal view conducing to this blessed end, the common good, and tranquillity of your subjects, to be pleased to condescend unto and graciously to confirm: and withal to declare unto us some expedient way how we may make a dutiful address unto your Parliament, for the taking away of those differences and impediments which stay the happy proceedings of that most honourable assembly, whereof your Majesty is the head (which once removed, we doubt not you will speedily be as near your Parliament in person as in affection, that there may be a blessed harmony between your Highness and that great council); and we shall with alacrity observe the same, humbly tendering our lives and fortunes for the preservation of your royal person, crown, and dignity, according to our bounden duty and allegiance; and heartily praying for your Majesty's long and prosperous reign over us."

The above loyal address, though unfortunately wanting in any specific plan for restoring confidence between the king and the Parliament, was very graciously received and very civilly answered. The reply of the king being short we give it without abridgment:—

" At the Court, at York, 6th June, 1642.

" His Majesty hath commanded me to give you this his answer to your petition.

" He is very glad to find such real acknowledgments of those great graces which he hath bountifully bestowed upon this his kingdom of England, in the time of this Parliament; and likewise it is a great contentment to him to find so many true sons of the Church of England, as by your expressions in the said petition doth plainly appear to him; assuring you that he shall not yield in his zeal and constancy for the maintenance of the true Protestant profession, neither to Queen Elizabeth nor to his father, of ever-blessed memory, both against Popish superstition on the one side, and schismatical innovation and confusion on the other. In the last part, as he doth take in very good part your desire of a good

understanding between his Majesty and his two houses of Parliament, so likewise he cannot but much commend the way that you take therein. And as for your directions, if you will but seriously consider his Majesty's just and necessary desires expressed in his answers and declarations since his coming to York, your zeal and knowledge will not need more particular instructions to make such addresses to both houses as the times require, and befitting such loyal and true-affected subjects to your king and country as this petition expresseth you to be."

Whilst the grounds of difference between the king and his Parliament were thus discussed in general terms, leading to nothing, both parties very seriously prepared themselves to struggle for the command of the military power in the north-western districts, as well as in other parts of the kingdom. There were already two claimants in the county of Lancaster to the office of lord-lieutenant, which implied the command of the military force of the county. James, Lord Strange, claimed this office, which his ancestors had held both in Lancashire and Cheshire from the time when the office itself was created; and proposed to exercise it with unfaltering loyalty on behalf of the king. Philip, Lord Wharton, also claimed the office of lord-lieutenant, on the appointment of the House of Commons, and proposed to exercise it with equal determination on behalf of the Parliament. Each of these claimants was supported by a numerous and influential body of deputy-lieutenants, equally zealous for the rival causes of King and Parliament. On the part of Lord Strange was a large proportion of the principal landowners of the two counties, backed by the authority of the king and the great local authority of the earls of Derby. On the other side, also, were a large number of gentlemen of ancient family and high standing, supported by nearly the whole of the members of Parliament of the two counties, and by the authority of Parliament, which was always great in this county, and was especially great at the commencement of the civil war, from having been long trampled upon by the court.

The commencement of the civil war in Lancashire, which was also the commencement of the civil war in England, was occasioned by a struggle between the adherents of the rival lords-lieutenant for the possession of one of the principal magazines of arms and ammunition in the county, namely, that of Manchester. In the

months of June and July, 1642, Lord Strange obtained possession of the magazines of Lancaster, Preston, Chorley, and Liverpool, leaving only those of Manchester and Blackburn in the hands of the adherents of Parliament. On the 4th of July, 1642, Lord Strange also made an attempt to obtain possession of the magazine at Manchester, but the attempt failed; and in the tumult to which it gave rise the first blood shed in the great civil war was spilt.

It appears from a variety of papers published, some of them by adherents of Parliament, and others by those of the king, that a great meeting of the county, convened by the high sheriff, was held on Preston Moor, on the 24th of June, 1642. This meeting was attended by Lord Strange, Lord Molyneux, Sir George Middleton, Sir Edward Fitton, of Gawsworth; Sir Alexander Radclyffe, of Ordsall; Mr. Tyldesley, then resident at Myerscough park; William Ffarington, of Worden; the high sheriff, Sir John Girlington, and many others of the leading gentlemen of Lancashire. At this meeting the commission of array issued by the king, and directed to Lord Strange, Sir George Middleton, Sir Alexander Radclyffe, Mr. Tyldesley, and Mr. William Ffarington, was read, in defiance of the protests of the parliamentary commissioners. Lord Strange, who was attended by a large body of men, said to amount to 700, refused to listen to their remonstrances; and, as was stated by Alexander Rigby, esquire, one of the members for the county, "in contempt of the order from Parliament, departed, with some of his friends, and cried out, 'All that are for the king go with us,' and cried, 'For the king, for the king.' On this a considerable number of persons joined with him, and rode up and down the moor, crying, 'For the king,' 'for the king;' but far more in number," says Mr. Rigby, "stayed with the committee, and prayed for the uniting of the king and Parliament, with a general acclamation."

After this open rupture Sir John Girlington, of Thurland castle, the high sheriff of the county, seized on the magazine of powder and match at Preston; and a day or two afterwards, Lord Strange seized upon and took away about thirty barrels of powder, and a great quantity of match from Liverpool, "parcel of the county's magazine." The seizing of these magazines produced a strong excitement throughout the county; and the leaders of the parliamentary party, seeing that they must strike then, or be deprived of the power of striking at all, assembled at Manchester, and prepared to resist any attempt of Lord Strange to obtain possession

of the magazine in that place. Amongst the parliamentary deputy-lieutenants who assembled at Manchester on that occasion were Sir Thomas Stanley, baronet, of Bickerstaff, a descendant of Thomas, the first earl of Derby, and a progenitor of the present line of the earls of Derby; Sir George Booth, of Dunham Massey, an ancestor of the earls of Stamford and Warrington; Robert Holland, of Heaton, esquire—from whom the earls of Wilton are descended in the female line—who afterwards acted as the governor of Manchester for the Parliament; Mr. Holcroft, the representative of a very old Cheshire family; Thomas Birch, of Birch; John Moore, esquire, of Bank hall, one of the members for Liverpool; Ralph Assheton, of Middleton, one of the members for the county; Peter Egerton, esquire, of Shaw in Flixton; Alexander Rigby, esquire, of Preston, and others. These influential leaders soon found themselves at the head of a very powerful force, consisting of 7000 or 8000 men, well furnished with muskets and pikes, and completely trained by the captains who commanded them. They all assembled to the cry of 'For the king and Parliament, for the king and Parliament,' and steadily refused to allow the magazine at Manchester to be surrendered to Lord Strange.

The accounts of Lord Strange's proceedings, when he appeared before Manchester to demand the surrender of the magazine, are of the most contradictory description. According to the royalist account, he entered the town peacefully, and at the invitation of many of the most respectable inhabitants, and narrowly escaped being killed in a sudden attack made by the parliamentary party. An eye-witness and an inhabitant of the town of Manchester, Mr. Jo. Rousgoe, thus describes the scene:—"My Lord Strange yesterday, six miles from Manchester, namely, at Bury, by virtue of the commission of array, summoned all persons of able body between sixteen and sixty years of age to meet him there, with such arms as they had, which was performed accordingly; whereof 2000 went forth of Manchester and the neighbouring villages. After, in the evening, about four of the clock, the townsmen of Manchester, hearing my lord was coming to lodge all night in Sir Alexander Radclyffe's house at Ordsall, went to meet him on the way, and invited him to take a banquet at Manchester, which his lordship courteously accepted of; and about five of the clock came into Manchester, attended with about 120 horse, well accoutred. My lord and the townsmen were all agreed about the magazine, his

lordship promising the town to join with them in any reasonable thing they would propose, and withal that he should stay with them till Monday morning; but in the meanwhile Captain Holcroft, Sir Thomas Stanley, and your cousin Birch (Colonel Thomas Birch), who were appointed commissioners, by Parliament, for the militia, began to strike their drums, to put the militia in execution in another part of the town; which when my Lord Strange and my Lord Molyneux heard, they came and met them, and some blows passed on both sides. But two men of your cousin Birch's company are shot, one of which died this morning, and nine are mortally wounded. There are on my Lord Strange's side eleven or twelve men mortally wounded. Your cousin Birch was shot at twice, yet escaped with some few blows, by means of a coach that stood in the street."\*

All the royalist accounts of this transaction agree in substance with the above. The accounts published by the parliamentary party throw the whole blame of the collision on Lord Strange; and on that ground the House of Commons impeached him of high treason, before the House of Lords. In this impeachment it was stated that James, Lord Strange, the son and heir-apparent of William, earl of Derby, to the intent and purpose to subvert the fundamental laws and government of this kingdom of England, and the rights and liberties and very being of Parliament, did upon the 15th day of July, at Manchester, and at several other times and places, maliciously, rebelliously, and traitorously raise great forces of men and horse, and levied war against the king, Parliament, and kingdom: and in further prosecution of the aforesaid wicked, traitorous, and malicious purposes, the said James, Lord Strange, and divers other persons, whom he had drawn into his party and faction, did also upon the said 15th day of July, at Manchester aforesaid, maliciously and traitorously, with force of arms, and in a hostile and warlike manner, kill, murder, and destroy Richard Percival, of Kirkman-Shalme, in the said county of Lancaster, linen webster; and did then and there, and at divers other times and places, in like hostile manner, shoot, stab, hurt, and wound divers others of his Majesty's good subjects."

Not only did the House of Commons thus impeach Lord Strange of the crime of high treason, but they published a statement of the transactions at Manchester, which they described as "the beginning

\* Ormerod's Civil War Tracts of Lancashire.

of civil wars in England," in which they threw the whole blame of the collision and loss of life on Lord Strange. This charge was repeatedly brought against his lordship; and when he stood upon trial for his life, after the battle of Worcester, it was urged against him with fatal success.

Although there is every reason to believe that the account of the transactions at Manchester contained in this statement is exaggerated and one-sided, it is worth preserving as the parliamentary account of the commencement of the great civil war :—

"The beginning of civil warres in England, or terrible news from the North. Printed by order of Parliament, July 9, 1642."

"The malignant party of this kingdom hath for a long time continued in their wicked and damnable designs; insomuch as their impudence is grown to such a height, that they are not ashamed to make their intentions publicly known to the whole world, as may appear by the ensuing relation :—

"Upon the 4th of this instant month of July, 1642, the Lord Strange came from York, and approached near the town of Manchester with a great number of armed men, and coming near the town, he sent to the inhabitants thereof to know their minds; whether they would agree to the propositions, which he had sent them two or three days before, for the restoring of the magazine which was in that town to his custody, threatening that if they would not he would send such a messenger as would make them yield, and bring them in due subjection.

"The inhabitants having received this message resolved to send their answer unto him, which they did accordingly, that for the magazine which was in that town, they would not restore it to him, it being the only safeguard and defence they had.

"And they likewise declared, that if his lordship did take any other course to seize upon it violently, they would loose their dearest lives in defence thereof, by reason the country was in such a great distraction and perplexity, and that they did not know how soon they might be dispossessed of all they had, if so be they had not arms to defend themselves withall.

"The Lord Strange having received this answer, and hearing what their resolution and intentions were, he was much perplexed in mind. Drawing all his forces together, he marched against the said town of Manchester, and shot off three or four muskets against them; but the



inhabitants seeing that he was come, and that he was resolved to take away the magazine by force, understanding his full intention by the messengers which came from him, they resolved every man to fight it out.

“Whereupon each man stood upon his guard, and about nine of the clock in the morning of the 5th day of this present month, the Lord Strange came with his forces against the town, and would have entered, but they kept him out by force; but Captain Smith being in front gave a fierce firing against the inhabitants of Manchester, but was answered with most puissant courage again, and slew two of the lord's men.

“Whereupon a great and furious skirmish did ensue. The Lord Strange having besieged the town, he began to give battle against them; but the inhabitants being true within themselves, ordered their business so well that they drew out ten small companies, and set them in fair battalion against them, answering each other very furiously at the first; but after some two or three hours' skirmish, there were seven more of the Lord Strange's men slain, and two of the inhabitants of Manchester; only one person also was shot in the thigh. After they had ceased two or three hours, they ended the battle with the sun of the day; the Lord Strange withdrawing his forces about two miles from Manchester, having lost, as is justly supposed, twenty-seven men; of the other side, eleven. Capt. Band is well recovered again, praised be God.

“We daily expect when the Lord Strange will visit us again; but I hope the Lord will enable us against his coming. They gave out many threatening speeches against us, and it is thought here that he hath sent for many more forces towards York.

“The Lord Rivers gives out many scandalous speeches against us, and striveth by all means he possibly can to set the whole country against us.

“This is the beginning of the civil war, being the first stroke that hath been struck, and the first bullet that hath been shot; but God knows when the ending will be, or when the troubles of this kingdom will grow to a period. Many thousands I doubt will loose their lives before this kingdom will be settled in peace and unity, as it hath been formerly; for no man knoweth the cruelty of war but those that have felt it, and tried it. For when that time cometh many a child will be fatherless, and many a poor wife husbandless.

“But God of his great mercy stop the sword from going any

further, and as it is but a little way drawn, so, Lord, I beseech thee sheath it again, before that it be drawn any further, that so by that means the walls of Syon may not be beaten down nor destroyed.

"It is ordered that the Lord Strange be required to deliver that part of the magazine of the county of Lancaster into the hands of the deputy-lieutenants. Ordered that this be printed and published.

"JOHN BROWN, Cler. Parl."

Lord Strange was as little disposed to surrender anything that he had taken for the service of the king to the Parliament, as any man in England. So far from doing so, he continued to make the most active preparations to maintain the royal authority, and in two or three months was at the head of a well-trained force of 3000 or 4000 men. At the beginning of the month of September following, supposing that he was strong enough to seize on the magazine at Manchester in spite of all resistance, he advanced on that place, at the head of an army estimated at 2000 foot and 600 horse, supplied with eight or nine pieces of cannon.

During the interval between the first and second attack, considerable fortifications had been erected at Manchester. As Lord Strange's principal line of advance was from the west, it was impossible to get into the town with the main body of his troops without crossing the river Irwell, and the only means of doing so at that time was by the bridge at Salford, which was strongly fortified by the parliamentary party. At the time of the great civil war, Manchester did not extend much beyond the tongue of land bounded on the west by the Irwell, the south by the river Medlock, and the north by the river Irk. All the approaches to the town had been as well fortified as the circumstances of the times admitted, and in a manner sufficient to render them strong enough to resist the means of attack brought against them. The leading men in Lord Strange's army in addition to his lordship were Richard Lord Molyneux, Sir John Girlington (the high sheriff of the county), Sir Gilbert Langton, Sir Alexander Radclyffe, Sir Gilbert Gerard, Colonel Tyldesley, Mr. Standish, of Standish, Mr. Prestwich, Mr. Windbanke, Sergeant-major Danvers, Sergeant-major Sanders, Mr. Downes, of Wardley, Mr. Towneley, Mr. Ashton, of Penketh, junior, Mr. Ogle, Mr. Byrom, of Byrom, Mr. Nowell, of Read, Mr. Standish, of Duxbury, the younger, Mr. Charnock, Mr. Ffarington, of Worden, Mr. Holt, of Ashurst, Mr. Rosterne, of New Hall, the younger,

Mr. Tarbuck, of Tarbuck : in short, nearly all the deputy-lieutenants and gentlemen of the royalist party in the county.

At the time when Lord Strange advanced from Warrington on Manchester the only parliamentary forces in the town were the Manchester trained bands, and 150 of the tenants of Colonel Ralph Assheton, of Middleton. He was one of the members for the county, as well as a colonel of one of the parliamentary regiments, and afterwards rose to the rank of major-general and commander-in-chief of the militia of Lancashire. On this, as well as on many subsequent occasions, he proved himself to be both a skilful officer and a gallant soldier. No sooner was he informed of the approach of Lord Strange than he ordered the bells to be rung backward, which was the signal that an attack was about to be made ; and sent mounted posts into the country to give warning to all the commanders of the trained bands, of the approach of the royalists. Immediately on receiving this summons, Colonel Holland, of Heaton, Captain Booth (the eldest son of Sir George Booth, of Dunham Massey), Colonel Duckenfield, Mr. Arderne, of Alvanley in Cheshire, Colonel Egerton, of Shaw in Flixton, Edward Butterworth, of Bel-field, Robert Hide, of Denton, and Thomas Chetham, of Nuthurst, moved rapidly into Manchester with their tenants, and the whole parliamentary force of the district.

Lord Strange, being delayed by the breaking of a wheel of one of the carriages which carried his ordnance, did not arrive before the town until nine o'clock on Sunday morning, when "sundry companies and their colours appeared in open view." His lordship had divided his forces, one part of them advancing from Warrington along the north bank of the river Irwell, the other advancing along the south side of the river from Cheshire. The division on the north side of the river entered the town of Salford, which was unfortified, on the morning of Sunday, and about the same time the other division appeared on the outskirts of Manchester, near the end of Deansgate. On the approach of Lord Strange's forces two gentlemen were sent out of the town to inquire the reason of his coming in such a manner. His lordship detained one of them as a hostage, and sent one of his own officers, Captain Windebanke, into the town, to demand admittance for himself and his forces in the king's name. This was unanimously refused by the garrison of the town. On the same day William, earl of Derby, died, and Lord Strange became the seventh earl of Derby, of the Stanley family.

On Monday, 26th of September, James, the new earl of Derby, sent another message into the town demanding the surrender of the place, promising to use the town kindly if it surrendered, and warning the garrison that if it did not, fearful ruin would ensue. This second summons being met by a second refusal, the royalists opened a fire upon the town from two of their batteries. One of these batteries was directed against the fortifications at the Deansgate, and the other against Salford bridge. The bullets that were found weighed between four and six pounds each, which was considered heavy in those days. After a sharp cannonade the royalists attempted to carry the town by a double assault, directed, at the same moment, against Salford bridge and Deansgate; but the parliamentary troops, under the command of Captain Bradshaw, received the attack at Deansgate with great steadiness, and beat back the royalists, who left many of their men slain on the field; and the attack on Salford bridge was equally unfortunate. There the parliamentary forces were directed by a German engineer named Captain Rosworm, an officer trained in the Thirty Years' War, who had constructed the fortifications of the town. Under his directions the royalists, on attempting to force their way across the bridge, were received with so heavy a fire that they were forced to retreat, with the loss of several of their men; they succeeded, however, in obtaining possession of a house at the foot of the bridge, from which they kept up a fire at intervals during the following night.

On the next day, Tuesday, an assault was made on the town at the Market Street end, which was repulsed by Captain Radclyffe and his company, who not merely drove back the royalists, but likewise sallied out, took several prisoners, and slew or put to flight others who were straggling in the fields. In the evening of the same day the earl of Derby sounded a parley, and sent to the town a message in writing, which was as follows:—"In obedience to his Majesty's commands, I have drawn some forces hither with no intention of prejudice to your town or to any person in it, but to require your ready obedience to his Majesty, in yielding yourselves dutifully and cheerfully unto his protection, which I once more (so great is the value I set upon the effusion of one drop of my country's blood) summon you to surrender, under this assurance, that no man's person or goods shall be harmed, so as you give up your arms to be disposed of by me according to his Majesty's command. But if you shall yet continue obstinate in your dis-

obedience and resolve to stand it out, I will in that case proceed with all honour by offering you a safe convoy of your women and children out of the town, so as it be done immediately.

(Signed) "J. DERBY."

The commanders of the parliamentary garrison asked till ten o'clock of next day to consider their answer, and Lord Derby agreed to grant them till seven o'clock. It was further agreed that all acts of hostility should cease during the time; and this enabled the parliamentary forces, who were "wearièd with watching three days and three nights before, to get comfortable refreshing." They complained, however, that the royalists were very busy plundering and pillaging about the town; that they slew two of their neighbours of Bolton, who were coming peaceably with about 150 more to assist the garrison; and that they planted two pieces of cannon in Salford. On Wednesday morning the parliamentary commanders returned the following answer, again refusing all the demands of the royalist leader:—"May it please your honour to receive this answer to your propositions: We are not conscious to ourselves of any act committed by us that should in the least kind divest us, his Majesty's loyal subjects, of his royal protection, or of any disobedience to his Majesty's lawful commands: for we can no way persuade ourselves that his Majesty, that hath so often solemnly declared to rule his people by his laws and to preserve the propriety of our estates, should require us to give away our arms, which are, under God, one means of our lawful defence against malignant enemies and multitudes of bloody Papists, which do abound in our county; and had not God by his infinite mercy prevented, had ere this day made the like rebellion in our county and committed the like barbarous outrage against us and others of the true Protestant religion, as their brethren have done in Ireland, seeing they are actuated by the like hellish principles as they. And we cannot but much wonder that your honour should come against us in such an open hostile manner to take away our arms, which is absolutely against all law and the right of the subject, which we are bound and resolved faithfully to maintain, according to our late solemn protestation. And we can by no means be assured by your lordship of the safety of our persons and goods if we deliver up our arms, seeing, since the treaty, some of our neighbours' houses, being Protestants, have been plundered or attempted to be plundered, and some of our friends,

coming in a peaceable way to our relief, have been cruelly murdered and slain by some of your soldiers."

After another ineffectual attempt at mediation, through Sir John Marson, K.B. and M.P., a royalist negotiator, celebrated for "assisting in all councils and one in all treaties," which the gentlemen commanding the garrison at Manchester had referred to the soldiers, who all resolutely answered "that they would not give him a yard of match, but would maintain their cause in arms to the last drop of their blood," the earl of Derby again ordered his guns to open on the town. They must, however, have been very ill served, as they only killed one man, who was standing on a stile looking at the engagement. On the following Thursday, Captain Standish, the eldest son and heir apparent of Thomas Standish, of Duxbury, esquire, one of Lord Derby's officers, was killed by a bullet, whilst endeavouring to induce his soldiers to make another attack on Salford bridge. On Friday the royalists continued to fire on the town from the opposite side of the river and from the lodge, a house belonging to Sir Edward Moseley, where they had planted a battery; and began to cast up a trench before the end of Deansgate, as if they intended to make a long siege. The fire of the cannon made holes in many houses and battered down a piece of a chimney, but did little harm; and on Friday night the cannon were withdrawn and the attack was abandoned. On Saturday there was an exchange of prisoners, according to the proposal of Lord Derby; and on the same day his lordship retired with his forces from before the town. The Parliamentary Chronicle of this second siege of Manchester, which was read before the House of Commons on the 11th of October, and ordered to be printed, concludes as follows:—"Our soldiers from first to last had prayers and singing of psalms daily at the street ends, most of our soldiers being religious, honest men, of a civil and inoffensive conversation, which came out of conscience of their oath and protestation. The townsmen were kind and respective to the soldiers; all things were common; the gentlemen made bullets night and day; the soldiers were resolute and courageous, and feared nothing so much as a parley. The deputy-lieutenants, Captain Chantrell, and the other gentlemen, took pains night and day to see that the soldiers did their duty. The Lord Strange's soldiers, some of them wept, others protested great unwillingness to fight against Manchester, affirming they were deceived and deluded or else they had not come thither. Thus the Lord



hath preserved an unwall'd town from being destroyed or detained by a great army, consisting, as some say, of 4000, some say 3000 foot, seven pieces of ordnance, 200 dragooneers (dragoons), and 100 horsemen. To God alone be the praise."

There is no doubt that some of the earl of Derby's soldiers were extremely disaffected and unwilling to take part in the attack on Manchester, for we find in the Ffarington Papers a copy of a letter from the countess of Derby to Mr. Ffarington, in which she informs him, that a person had been at Lathom house to inform her that he had heard one of his lordship's followers say, that they were going to Manchester, and that there would be a bloody day amongst them, for my lord must lead or they would not go at all; "and after the first musket went off, there were forty soldiers of the hundred of Amounderness who had sworn that they would shoot my lord himself, and after they had seen him fall they would go no further." Partly from this half-heartedness of his followers, and partly from the resolution of his opponents, Lord Derby's second attack on Manchester was an entire failure. According to the parliamentary account, his loss in killed and wounded was from 100 to 200 men, whilst that of the parliamentarians was only four or five men; but these estimates of numbers must be received with great allowance, being always very highly coloured by the wishes of those who formed them.

The gallant defence of Manchester was warmly acknowledged by the Parliament, in the following vote of thanks to the garrison and inhabitants:—

THANKS OF PARLIAMENT TO MANCHESTER.

"Jovis 6 October, 1642.

"A declaration of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament in commendation of the inhabitants of the town of Manchester, for their valiant resisting the late Lord Strange and now earl of Derby, and to encourage them in their valour which they have shewed for their own defence, and to endeavour to suppress or apprehend the said earl or any of his accomplices; assuring them of allowance and payment for all disbursements or losses in their service.

"JOHN BROWNE, Clerk, Parliament."

"Whereas, upon credible information made unto this house that

\* Ffarington Papers, p. 87.

James, late Lord Strange, and now earl of Derby, heretofore impeached in the name of the House of Commons and of all the commons of England, by the name of James, Lord Strange, for high treason, hath, in pursuance of his traitorous actions, procured divers papists and other ill-affected persons in a hostile and rebellious manner, with guns and other warlike weapons, to make war upon his Majesty's subjects in the town of Manchester, in the county Palatine of Lancaster, and hath killed and murdered divers in that town, and hath robbed and spoiled divers others of his Majesty's good subjects inhabiting near the same, the inhabitants whereof, with the Christian help and aid of divers well-affected gentlemen and others of that county, have valiantly resisted the said earl and his complices, and have thereunto bravely defended themselves and the town : It is thereupon ordered by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, that such gentlemen and others of his Majesty's good subjects, who have already hazarded their lives and spent of their estates, and all such others as shall hereafter, either with their persons or purses, give aid unto the inhabitants of the said town of Manchester for their defence, and shall endeavour to suppress or apprehend the said earl or any of his complices, shall have allowance or payment made of all such monies, or any other charge which they shall expend or disburse in that service, upon account made unto the House of Commons ; and such their actions and endeavours are declared to be a service, both agreeable unto the law of the land, acceptable to both houses of Parliament, and beneficial to the commonwealth.

JOHN BROWNE, Clerk of Parliament."

Whilst the siege of Manchester was in progress the grand armies of the king and the Parliament were advancing to meet each other in the midland counties. The earl of Derby abandoned the siege of Manchester on the 1st of October, 1642, and immediately proceeded, by royal order, to join the king at Shrewsbury, with three Lancashire regiments of infantry and three squadrons of cavalry. These troops were incorporated with the royal army, and afterwards marched with the king to Edge Hill, in Warwickshire, where they took part in the memorable but indecisive battle, fought at that place on the 23rd October. After the battle of Edge Hill the Lancashire troops marched forward with the royal army to Oxford and Reading, and Lord Molyneux's regiment took part at the storming of Brentford, within five or six miles of London. Lord Derby

returned to Lancashire, and immediately set to work to raise a new army for the king amongst the royalists of Lancashire, Cheshire, and North Wales, in all of which his influence was very much greater than that of any other person either on the royalist or the parliamentary side. It will be convenient at this point of our narrative to describe the relative position and strength of the royalist and the parliamentary parties in the various districts of Lancashire and Cheshire, in every part of which the battle between the king and the Parliament raged fiercely for the next three years.

James, Lord Derby, the head of the royalist party, was a leader whom all the royalists of the north-western district were proud to follow, not only on account of his rank and immense influence, but also of his personal virtues, his dauntless courage, and his unwavering loyalty, to the last of which he cheerfully sacrificed not only his property but his life. From the commencement of the contest to its close he had a firm and faithful adviser in his wife, the celebrated Charlotte de la Tremouille, daughter of the Duc de Thours, and of his wife, Lady Charlotte, a daughter of the famous William I., Prince of Orange.

The parliamentary party had no leader who could at all compare in rank or influence with the earl of Derby. Philip, Lord Wharton, whom Parliament had appointed to the office of lord-lieutenant of the county, was unknown in Lancashire, and was not a man of much influence anywhere. But the Parliament was very ably represented in Lancashire by a committee, composed principally of the most influential of the members for the county and boroughs, which acted with much of the authority of Parliament. The leading members of this committee were Ralph Assheton, one of the members of the county, who held the rank of colonel of one of the Lancashire regiments at the commencement of the war, and acted as commander-in-chief of the militia with distinguished success; Richard Shuttleworth, one of the members for Clitheroe, and son and heir-apparent of Richard Shuttleworth, of Gawthorpe, who, with his three brothers Nicholas, Ughtred, and William, held the rank of colonel in the parliamentary service; and John Moore, esquire, of Bank-hall, near Liverpool, one of the members for that borough, who held the rank of colonel in the parliamentary service. The other members took a less active part, and some of them had a strong leaning for the royalist party. The following are the names of the Lancashire members of the Long Parliament, to most of whom we shall have reason to refer more than once in the succeeding narrative:—

LANCASHIRE MEMBERS OF THE PARLIAMENT MEETING AT  
WESTMINSTER, NOV. III., MDCXL

<i>Lancashire.</i>	<i>Liverpool.</i>
RALPH ASSHETON, Esquire, ROGER KIRBY, Esquire.	JOHN MOORE, Esquire, SIR RICHARD WYNN, Knight and Bart.
<i>Clitheroe.</i>	<i>Newton.</i>
RALPH ASSHETON, Esquire, RICHARD SHUTTLEWORTH, Esquire.	WILLIAM ASHURST, Esquire, SIR ROGER PALMER, Knight.
<i>Lancaster.</i>	<i>Preston, in Anderness.</i>
SIR JOHN HARRISON, Knight, THOMAS FANSHAW, Esquire.	RICHARD SHUTTLEWORTH, Esquire, THOMAS STANDISH, Esquire.
<i>Wigan.</i>	
ORLANDO BRIDGEMAN, Esquire, ALEXANDER KIRBY, Esquire.	

The principal strength of the royalist party both in Lancashire and Cheshire, was in the western districts, which were chiefly given to agriculture and commerce; whilst the strength of the parliamentary party was in the eastern districts of the two counties, in which a large portion of the population was already engaged in mining and manufactures. At the same time, it must be observed that the parliamentary party had many staunch and determined supporters both among the landed gentry and in the towns and ports on the western side of the two counties; whilst many of the most powerful landowners, and a certain number of the town population, even in the eastern districts, were favourable to the king.

Taking the six hundreds of Lancashire it may be stated generally that the four hundreds of Lonsdale, Amounderness, Leyland, and West Derby, were mostly in favour of the royal cause, whilst the two hundreds of Salford and Blackburn were favourable to the Parliament. In the same way the royalists in the county of Chester had the ascendancy in the city of Chester, and in the hundreds of Wirral, Broxton, Eddisbury, and perhaps of Northwich, whilst the parliamentary party had the upper hand in the hundreds of Nantwich, Macclesfield, and Bucklaw.

Taking the hundreds of Lancashire in succession, it may be stated that the royalists had the entire ascendancy in Lonsdale at the commencement of the war. The castle of Lancaster, the strongest place in that district, was held for the king by Sir John Girlington, and Roger Kirby, Esq., one of the members of the county. In the same district the royalists had the command of Hornby castle, one

of the strongest and noblest castles in Lancashire, originally built by the Montbegon family, with a tower, the walls of which were thirty-six feet in thickness at the base; and afterwards rebuilt by Edward Stanley, Lord Monteagle, on so vast a scale as to include twenty-one acres of land within its walls. The neighbouring castle of Thurland was also held for the king by Sir John Girlington, the high sheriff of the county, who had recently purchased it from the representatives of the Tunstall family, who had held it from the time of Edward II. Thurland castle was a magnificent structure, strongly fortified, and of great extent.

Passing to the south, the whole of Amounderness was held for the king. The town of Preston, which commanded the only bridge across the Ribble, was seized by Lord Strange and Colonel Tyldesley at the beginning of the war, strongly fortified, and placed under the command of Adam Mort, a near relation of Colonel Tyldesley, and like his relative, a man of determined courage. All the other strongholds in the Amounderness hundred, of which Greenhaugh castle, near Garstang, belonging to Lord Derby, was the most important, were also held for the king.

In the Leyland hundred the royal party was also much the strongest. Houghton tower, one of the most extensive and strongest castles of Lancashire, where James I. had been entertained with royal magnificence, was held for the king by Sir Gilbert Houghton, baronet, a determined royalist.

The whole of the great hundred of West Derby was also in the hands of the royalists. The borough and port of Liverpool, with its castle, had been seized by Lord Strange at the commencement of the war, and had been well fortified and garrisoned. The towns of Wigan and Warrington were also fortified by the royalists; as well as the earl of Derby's strong and extensive castle, more familiarly known as Lathom house.

The number of fortified positions held by the parliamentary party in Lancashire, at the commencement of the war, was comparatively small, consisting only of the towns of Manchester and Bolton. But Manchester had already proved itself strong enough to repulse a most formidable attack, and Bolton was equally successful shortly afterwards. Nearly the whole of the country held by the parliamentary party in Lancashire was naturally strong, being hilly or mountainous, and intersected by numerous rivers.

In Cheshire the city of Chester was the great stronghold of

the royalists, who held it during a siege or blockade of nearly two years' duration, against the most formidable enemies. The old Roman walls were merely used as an inner line of defence, the main line of works being a very thick and high wall of earth or mud, erected on the east side of the city, and stretching across the neck of the peninsula formed by the windings of the Dee, in which the city of Chester is built. In addition to the city of Chester the royalists held the castles of Hawarden and Holt, on the banks of the Dee, and the castle of Halton on the banks of the Mersey.

The town of Nantwich, then the chief place in the Cheshire salt district, was the principal town fortified and held by the parliamentary party in Cheshire. They also obtained possession, at the beginning of the war, of Beeston castle, the most extensive and strongest of all the feudal castles of Cheshire.

Such were the principal military positions in Lancashire and Cheshire, held by the rival parties, at the commencement of the civil war. We now proceed to trace the course of events, first in Lancashire and then in Cheshire.

After the failure of the royalist attack upon Manchester, and the great battle of Edge Hill, both parties in Lancashire set themselves to work to organize their forces for the civil war; but no blow was struck by either until the commencement of the month of December, 1642. The earl of Derby was the first to move. With a considerable force, which he collected about Wigan, the earl advanced towards Leigh, in the first week in December. The news of his approach was received on Sunday morning, as the people were going to church, and the intelligence was immediately spread throughout the whole district. Before the afternoon the parliamentary party had assembled nearly 3000 men, horse and foot, including most of the farmers' sons and other young men of the neighbourhood. The engagement commenced in the neighbourhood of Chequerbent, and for a short time the royalists were successful; but later in the afternoon the parliamentary forces were strongly reinforced, and charging resolutely upon the royalists they drove them back towards Wigan. Having followed up their success too hastily, the royalists in their turn faced about, and gave the parliamentary troops rather a severe check at Hindley chapel.

In the same week the royalists and parliamentarians of the Blackburn hundred came into collision on Hinfield Moor. The parliamentary force was formed of the men of Blackburn, Padiham,



Burnley, Clitheroe, Colne, and the "sturdy churls," in the two forests of Pendle and Rossendale. The royalists consisted of a large force raised by Sir Gilbert Hoghton, Bart., in the hundreds of Leyland and Amounderness. The rival forces met on Hinfield Moor, and after a sharp contest the royalists were beaten and driven back upon Preston, which was then held by their party.

At the commencement of the new year, 1643, the parliamentary forces of the Salford hundred, who had been carefully trained by Sir John Seaton, a parliamentary officer sent down for that purpose by order of Parliament, with an escort of a regiment of dragoons, took the field, with a determination to obtain possession of all the strongholds of the royalists in the Amounderness and Lonsdale hundreds, and more particularly of the town of Preston and the castle of Lancaster. In this expedition Major-general Sir John Seaton acted as commander-in-chief, attended by Colonel Holland, Major Birch, Major Sparrow, Captain Booth, and other parliamentary officers; Colonel Assheton remaining in charge of Manchester and Bolton. The expedition marched from Manchester on the 7th of February, 1643, and was joined as it proceeded northward by three companies of foot from Bolton, four or five companies from the Blackburn hundred, all well armed, as well as by 2000 clubmen, forming a part of the levy *en masse* of the district through which it advanced. On Thursday morning the parliamentary forces appeared before Preston, and immediately rushed forward to the assault; Colonel Holland's company and Captain Booth's having a great strife which should enter the town first. The assault was directed by Sir John Seaton himself, and was made at the end of Church Street, the parliamentary musketeers driving the royalists from the church and the steeple by a heavy fire of musketry. The mayor of the town, Adam Mort, who was also the commander of the garrison, defended the place with determined courage, and killed one of Colonel Holland's men with his own pike; but the town was carried by the parliamentary forces, and Mort was himself killed together with his son, with Captain Radcliff Hoghton, a brother of Sir Gilbert Hoghton, with Sergeant-major Purvey, who had lately come from Ireland to join the garrison, and with Dr. Westby, together with two or three lieutenants, and several other persons of good standing. Captain Ffarington, Captain Preston, and Mr. Anderton, of Clayton, were taken prisoners; and Lady Hoghton, Lady Girlington, and Mrs. Towneley, were also

found in the town. Three pieces of ordnance, a "murdering" piece, a great number of muskets, with many horses, and two or three stand of colours, were likewise taken. The further results of the taking of Preston were a large contribution out of the adjacent country for the maintenance of the parliamentary army; and the cutting off of the communications of the royal forces at Newcastle with those at Chester and Shrewsbury.

After the taking of Preston, Major Birch, of the Manchester trained bands, was sent forward to take the town and castle of Lancaster, which he effected very rapidly. The high sheriff, Sir John Girlington, with Roger Kirby, one of the knights of the shire, made some resistance; but perceiving that they were not able to hold the place successfully, they retired from the castle, and Captain Birch took possession of it.

In the attack on Lancaster, Captain William Shuttleworth, of Gawthorpe, one of the four brothers of that family in the parliamentary service, was killed.

The earl of Derby, on hearing of the movement of the parliamentary forces from Manchester to the attack of Preston, lost no time in taking the field; and instead of following the Salford troops northward, he determined at once to carry the war into their own country. For this purpose he collected all his forces at Wigan, and at once advanced to Bolton, which was then the second parliamentary garrison in the county. His advance on that place was so unexpected, sudden, and impetuous, that he succeeded in carrying the out-works; but the garrison, being well commanded, soon recovered its courage, and after a desperate combat beat off the assailants.

It appears from a contemporary statement, that when the Manchester troops marched northward to attack Preston and Lancaster, there were left to guard Bolton, Colonel Assheton, Captain Bulkley, of Oldham; Captain Scofield, of Rochdale; Captain Holt, of Bury; and Captain Ashurst, of Radcliffe bridge, and their companies, to the number of 500 men. On Thursday, the 16th of February, the earl of Derby advanced upon the town with eleven colours, two companies of dragoons, and some troops of horse and pieces of cannon. They advanced so rapidly that they were within a mile of the town before anything was known of their approach; and marched so vigorously, under the guidance of some of the royalists of the neighbourhood, that they surrounded the garrison before it was aware, and so effectually stopped the approaches to the town that

scarcely any help could come from the country to its assistance. The first assault was made at the Bradshaw gate end of the town, where the garrison had three sconces or outworks; and the royalists attacked so resolutely that they beat them from these works, and forced them to retire within the mud wall and the chains at the end of the streets, which formed the chief fortification of the place. When the royalists had carried the outworks, they made a desperate effort to break through the walls and chains. They played heavily upon the walls with their ordnance, their shot being five or six pounds in weight, and passing through the mud walls, which were two yards thick. They also came up to the breastwork, even to the mouths of the muskets; but the garrison fought so steadily, and fired so fast, that they could not enter there. Part of the assailants then marched to the left, forced their way into a number of houses at the end of the town, and by opening a fire from those houses, on the rear of the men who kept the gate, while the main body of the royalists kept up a heavy fire in front, they at last drove them back from their works. The fire of the royalists from the houses killed several of Captain Buckley's men, on which a company of the garrison was ordered to drive the royalists out. By desperate efforts the assailants were beaten out of the houses, the royalists being so desperate that three times they came to the ends of the muskets, and caught hold of them as they went off, on which the garrison attacked them with the butt-ends of their muskets, and finally beat them both out of the houses and from the works. After a furious battle, the royalists were compelled to retire to Wigan, carrying off two or three cartloads of dead bodies, and leaving behind them nearly 100 men killed and wounded, one of whom was Captain Ashton, of Penketh. "Our men," says a parliamentary writer, "fought like lions; and amongst the rest Colonel Assheton behaved himself very valorously. I verily believe a sharper bout hath never been in our county fought; and God did both exceedingly put courage into our men and also (did) fight for them; otherwise, in all likelihood, we had both lost the day, the town, our lives and all. There came to have aided us all the clubmen in Middleton, Oldham, and Rochdale, and old Captain Radcliffe, with 200 fresh soldiers, from Manchester, besides the country thereabouts, to the number of 1500 men. But it was too late; they were gone away to Wigan before these came."\*

\* Ormerod's Civil War Tracts of Lancashire, p. 84.

Undeterred by the failure at Bolton, the earl of Derby determined to march into the northern parts of the county, and to recover Lancaster and Preston, and the other positions taken by the parliamentary forces at the beginning of the campaign. Leaving Wigan on the 13th of March, with 600 foot and 400 horse, he arrived the first night at Kirkham, where he was joined by a large body of the country people, to the number of 3000, who, being wearied, as we are told, with the insolence and tyranny of the rebels, came with great cheerfulness to join him. On the following day he marched to within four miles of Lancaster, where he was joined by Sir John Girlington and Colonel Tyldesley, with 600 men, of whom 300 were musketeers. One principal object of his lordship in advancing upon Lancaster was, to recover several pieces of cannon which the parliamentary forces had seized, on board a Spanish ship in that port.

On Saturday, the 18th of March, the earl of Derby summoned the town of Lancaster to surrender; but the approaches being well fortified, and manned with 600 musketeers under the command of Lieutenant-colonel Holcroft, Sergeant-major Sparrow, and Sergeant-major Haywood, his summons met with a prompt refusal. On this the royalists pushed boldly forward to the attack, forced their way across the moat, and in two hours drove the garrison into the castle. In this assault Captain William Shuttleworth, one of the parliamentary officers, with many of the townsmen, were killed; and the "mayor, and divers of the townsmen, such as were most seditious, were taken prisoners."

Having captured the town, the earl of Derby laid siege to the castle of Lancaster; but having no means of doing it effectually, owing to the strength of the works and the smallness of his own artillery, he abandoned the siege in a few days, on hearing that Major-general Sir John Seaton was advancing to its relief, with 1500 musketeers and some troops of horse.

On Monday, the 19th March, the noble earl retired from before Lancaster; and making a very rapid and skilful march, arrived before Preston on the night of the same day. A considerable portion of the garrison having been withdrawn by Sir John Seaton, the earl of Derby at once assaulted the town, and, after two hours' of desperate fighting, carried it, killing eighty of the garrison, including Captain Ashworth, and taking from 300 to 400 prisoners, with one brass piece of ordnance. On the following day Sergeant-

major Brewyer, who commanded his lordship's regiment of horse, defeated two troops of the parliamentary dragoons, under the command of Captain Norris, taking the captain himself prisoner, together with forty of his soldiers, and killing fifty of them in the battle.

The re-capture of Preston, and the defeat of the parliamentary cavalry, were the last successes gained by the earl of Derby, and, indeed, by the Lancashire royalists, in this campaign. After the earl's success at Preston, he collected a large force in that town, with which he prepared to overrun the hundred of Blackburn, nearly the whole population of which was in arms in support of the Parliament, under the command of Colonel Assheton, Colonel Richard Shuttleworth, of Gawthorpe, and other leaders of great local influence. Already, in the earlier part of the campaign, on the 14th of February, the Blackburn trained bands had taken Hoghton tower after a sharp combat, but had sustained a heavy loss by the accidental explosion of the powder magazine, by which accident Captain Starkie, of Huntroyd, and nearly 100 of his men had lost their lives.

At the beginning of the month of May, the earl of Derby, Lord Molyneux, Sir Gilbert Hoghton, Colonel Tyldesley, with all the other leading royalists of the county, marched out of Preston, and crossed the Ribble at Ribchester, with eleven troops of horse, 700 foot, and, as we are told, an infinite number of clubmen; in all, conceived to be 5000 men. The outposts of the parliamentary forces, which were at Dunkinhalgh hall, hearing of the approach of this force, retreated to Padiham, having before sent to Colonel Shuttleworth to raise the country. This he did very effectually, for on the following morning all the musketeers of the district assembled, with some of the clubmen. At first the parliamentary force was not much more than 500 men, and fell back before the royalists; but being afterwards strongly reinforced, it suddenly faced round on the royalists, threw their advanced guard into confusion, and, the panic spreading, drove the whole royalist force back into Whalley. There a short stand was made by the royalists; but the parliamentary forces, knowing the ground, spread themselves amongst the hedges, and opened so heavy a fire that the royalist infantry fell into confusion; and being suddenly charged by the parliamentary cavalry, gave way, and fled through Salesbury park to Ribchester, crossing the Ribble in the greatest confusion.

This was considered at the time to be the greatest victory, with the exception of the "first great bout at Manchester," that the parliamentary forces had gained in Lancashire; and it proved to be so in its results, for the royalist army fell back into the different garrisons of the county, especially Wigan, Liverpool, Warrington, and Lathom house, but never again made a stand in the open field, until Prince Rupert advanced into Lancashire in the following year.

A few days after the defeat of the royalist army at Whalley, Colonel Assheton marched upon Wigan, which was the strongest garrison of the royalists in that part of Lancashire, with a force of about 2200 horse and foot. The town was held by Colonel Tyldesley for the king, with 700 foot and nine troops of horse. On the approach of the enemy, the royalist garrison, believing the place to be indefensible, retired from the town; part of them falling back on Liverpool, the other retiring northward towards Preston. On the retirement of the garrison, Colonel Assheton demolished all the outworks and fortifications, burnt the new gates and posts that had been set up, and took an oath from the townsmen never again to bear arms against the king and Parliament.

In the course of the same month of May the parliamentary forces under Colonel Assheton advanced upon Warrington, and, after a siege of about ten days, got possession both of the town and of the church, as well as of the bridge across the Mersey.\*

At the beginning of the month of June, 1643, Liverpool was the only town in Lancashire which remained in the hands of the royalists. In the first week in June Liverpool was attacked both by sea and land, Colonel Assheton advancing upon the town with the parliamentary forces of Lancashire, and one of the ships of the parliamentary squadron, commanded by the earl of Warwick, entering the river Mersey about the same time, and taking part in the attack. The royalist garrison consisted of about 1600 men, under the command of the gallant Colonel Tyldesley. After some very hard fighting, the parliamentary forces obtained possession of the church and of the main street of the town, that is, Castle Street; but the royalists held out for several days in the castle, and in the tower of the Stanley family. When the parliamentary forces had succeeded in planting their ordnance on the church, which then commanded the town, the royalist commander sent to ask

\* Ormerod's *Civil War Tracts of Lancashire*, p. 104.



for a parley. Hostages were delivered on both sides, and propositions were made to Colonel Assheton by Colonel Tyldesley to the following effect:—1st. That the forces in the town should surrender the same to Colonel Assheton, for the use of the king and Parliament, upon quarter. 2nd. That they (the royalists) should carry away with them their ordnance, arms, and ammunition, and so march away with bag and baggage. 3rd. That, without pursuit or interruption of the Parliament's forces, they should march to Wigan, or some other place in the county, without molestation. These terms were refused by the parliamentary commander, who at once made another assault on the royalists, killed eighty of them, and took 300 prisoners, with ten pieces of ordnance, and all their bag and baggage. The remainder of the royalists escaped from the town, most of them leaving their arms behind them, and either dispersed, or retired to Chester or other of the royal garrisons.

After the capture of Liverpool, Colonel Assheton marched northward to lay siege to Hornby castle and Thurland castle, both of which he took after a short siege. It was supposed that the taking of these northern castles had put an end to the war in Lancashire, entirely overturned the authority of the king, and established that of the Parliament in the whole county. The leading royalists of Lancashire, believing the struggle to be hopeless in their own county, proceeded to join the king's forces in other districts. The earl of Derby and Lord Molyneux joined the royalists of Chester, and took part in the memorable defence of that city. Colonel Tyldesley, who was soon after knighted and raised to the rank of major-general, was intrusted with the honourable task of conducting the queen from York to Oxford, in the performance of which duty he forced the bridge of Burton-upon-Trent, carrying a bridge of thirty-six arches by a desperate charge of cavalry. Having effected the object of his mission, he returned to the north-west, and joined the garrison at Chester. Sir John Girlington, the high sheriff of the county, was less fortunate. After the overthrow of the royalists in Lancashire he joined Sir Marmaduke Langdale, the commander of the king's cavalry, in the midland counties. There he rose to the rank of major-general, but was slain near Melton Mowbray, in the year 1645, in a battle between Langdale and Rossiter, one of the commanders of the parliamentary cavalry.

In the midst of this general overthrow the heroic Charlotte de la Tremouille, countess of Derby, alone remained unconquered.

During the rest of the year 1643 she remained at Lathom house, avoiding any open rupture with the parliamentary authorities, but at the same time declining any direct submission to their commands. From respect to her rank and her sex she was allowed to remain quietly at Lathom house until the end of the year. About that time, however, it became pretty evident that Lancashire would again, before long, become the seat of another and still more violent struggle. On the 28th February, 1644, Captain Markland brought a letter to the countess, from Lieutenant-general Sir Thomas Fairfax, together with an ordinance of Parliament, requiring her to surrender Lathom house "upon such honourable conditions as he should propose," and offering a pardon to the earl of Derby if he would submit to the authority of Parliament. As it was very much doubted whether the countess would surrender the house, it had been previously arranged that Colonels Assheton, Moore, and Rigby, should move with their regiments against Lathom.

In reply to the summons of Sir Thomas Fairfax to surrender Lathom house, the countess expressed surprise that she should be asked to give up her lord's house, without any offence on her part done to Parliament, and asked for a week's time for consideration, before she gave any positive answer. Two or three days were spent in negotiation, and in very active preparation on the part of the countess to defend the house, if the negotiations should fail. On Saturday, the 2nd of March, 1643, Colonel Assheton and Colonel Rigby proceeded to Lathom house and made the following proposals to the countess :—

1st. That all arms and ammunition of war should be forthwith surrendered into the hands of Sir Thomas Fairfax.

2nd. That the countess of Derby, and all the persons in Lathom house, should be suffered to depart with all their goods to Chester, or any other of the enemy's quarters, or upon submission to the orders of Parliament, to their own houses.

3rd. That the countess, with all her menial servants, should be suffered to inhabit in Knowsley, and to have twenty muskets allowed for her defence, or to repair to her husband in the Isle of Man.

4th. That the countess, for the present, until the Parliament be acquainted with it, shall have allowed for her maintenance all the lands and revenues of the earl, her husband, within the hundred of (West) Derby, and that the Parliament shall be moved to continue this allowance.

It being the settled determination of the countess not to give up Lathom house, and her great object to obtain such a delay as would enable her friends without to come to her assistance, she met the proposals of Sir Thomas Fairfax with the following counter-proposals:—

1st. Her ladyship desired a month's time for her quiet continuance in Lathom, and then herself and children, her friends, soldiers, and servants, with all her goods, arms, and ordnance, to have free transport to the Isle of Man, and in the meantime that she should keep garrison in her house for her own defence.

2nd. She promised that neither during her stay in the country, nor after her coming to the Isle of Man, any of the arms should be employed against the Parliament.

3rd. That during her stay in the country no soldier should be quartered in the lordship of Lathom nor at Knowsley house.

4th. That none of her tenants, neighbours, and friends then in the house with her, assisting her, should suffer in their persons or estates after her departure.

The object of these proposals was too evident to impose upon men like Sir Thomas Fairfax and Colonel Assheton, but being anxious to avoid an open rupture with the countess, they met her counter-proposals with the following propositions:—

1st. That the countess should have the time she desired, and then liberty to transport her arms and goods to the Isle of Man, except the cannon which should continue there (at Lathom) for the defence of the house.

2nd. That her ladyship, by ten o'clock to-morrow, disband all her soldiers, except her menial servants, and receive an officer and forty Parliament soldiers for her guard.

The above propositions, not being at all to the countess' mind, were at once refused by her in the following message, in which she at once defied Sir Thomas Fairfax and his employers to do their worst. Her answer was:—

That she refused all their articles and was truly happy they had refused hers, protesting she had rather hazard her life than offer the like again. That though a woman and a stranger, divorced from her friends and robbed of her estate, she was ready to receive their utmost violence, trusting in God for protection and deliverance.

Even after receiving this very decided message the parliamentary commanders made another attempt to talk her ladyship into sur-

render, and Captain Ashurst, "a man that deserves a fairer character than the rest for his even and civil behaviour," brought a new missive to her ladyship, in these terms :—

1st. That all former conditions be waived.

2nd. That the countess of Derby, and all persons in the house, with all arms, ordnance, and goods, shall have liberty to march to what part of the kingdom they please, and yield up the house to Sir Thomas Fairfax.

3rd. That the arms shall never be employed against the Parliament.

4th. That all in the house, excepting 100 persons, should leave it, and the rest within ten days.

The gallant countess, having quite made up her mind not to surrender the house, answered :—

That not a man should quit her house ; that she should keep it, whilst God enabled her, against all the king's enemies ; and, in brief, that she would receive no more messages without an expression of her lord's pleasure, who, she now heard, was returned from the Isle of Man, and to whom she referred them for the transaction of the whole business.

Lathom house, which the countess of Derby thus undertook to defend against all the power of Parliament, was an ancient castellated building, erected about the year 1496, by Thomas, the first earl of Derby of the Stanley family, on the site of the more ancient mansion of the Lathom and the Stanley families. It was a mansion within which, in the words of the old poem, might "be lodged kings three ;" and which in later days was the residence of Earl Edward, with whose death, in Camden's words, "the glory of English hospitality seemed to fall asleep." This latter building, the Lathom house of 1644, is said to have furnished King Henry VII. with the first idea of his new palace at Richmond. The "bright house of Lathom" had nine towers on high and nine in the outer walls. It had a turreted gallery in the outer wall, and in the centre of the building the Eagle tower rose to a commanding height above all the other towers. "As to the situation of Lathom house," says an ancient writer, "it stands upon a flat, boggy, and spumous ground, encompassed with a wall of two yards thick, without which is a moat of eight yards wide and two yards deep ; upon the bank of which moat, betwixt the wall and the graff, was a strong palisado throughout. Upon the walls were also nine towers flanking them,

and on each tower six pieces of ordnance, which played, three one way, and three another; besides these there was in the middle of the house a high tower, called the Eagle Tower. The gate-house also being a strong and lofty building, stood at the entrance of the first court; on the top of all which towers stood the choicest marksmen (keepers, fowlers, and the like), who shrewdly galled the enemy and cut off divers of their officers in the trenches.\*

The garrison which so bravely defended Lathom house consisted of not more than 300 men. The officers by whom they were commanded were Captain Henry Ogle, Captain Edward Chisnall, Captain Edward Rawsterne, Captain Henry Farmer, Captain Molyneux Ratcliffe, and Captain Richard Fox, assisted in their consultations by that firm friend of the Stanley family, William Ffarington, of Worden. Each of these captains chose his own lieutenant. The place was well supplied with provisions. The artillery consisted of six pieces called sacers, and two sling pieces in every tower, with one or two smaller pieces called "murderers," to scour the ditches. The only fear was lest the supply of powder should fall short.

On the day after that on which the negotiations were broken off, a gallant sally from the castle was made by Captain Farmer, a Scotchman, and a faithful and gallant soldier, at the head of 100 foot and twelve horse, which latter was the whole cavalry force of the garrison. These suddenly rushed into the trenches where the parliamentary troops were at work, and without firing a shot killed thirty of the parliamentarians, took six prisoners and forty stand of arms, and returned into the castle without the loss of a single man. On the Sunday following, the garrison, led by Captain Chisnall, made another gallant attack on the parliamentary troops who were at work on the new trenches, and put them to flight, killing two or three men. On the 20th of March the besiegers succeeded in bringing up and opening a fire from a piece of cannon, throwing heavy balls of twenty-four pounds weight, which, however, produced little impression on the thick walls of the castle. On the 24th March the besiegers had got up two pieces of cannon, and by the 29th four pieces. On the 1st of April the besiegers began to fire from six cannon loaded with chain-shot and bars of iron; and on the following day they opened fire from a mortar, or granado, as it was then called. On the 9th of April, about eleven o'clock, 140 soldiers of the garrison, led on by Captain Farmer, Captain Molyneux Ratcliffe, Lieutenant

\* Peck's *Desiderata Curiosa*, vol. ii. p. 43.

Penketh, and Lieutenant Worrall, sallied out at a postern gate ; beat the enemy from their works and batteries, which were now cast up around the house ; spiked all their cannon ; killed about fifty men ; and took sixty stand of arms, one colour, and three guns. During this engagement Captain Fox, by means of colours on the Eagle tower, gave signal to the royalists when to march and when to retreat, according to the motions of the enemy. On the Friday following a bullet from one of the parliamentary guns "entered the window of my lady's chamber, but was too weak to fright her from the lodging." From this time to the 25th of April the fire of the besiegers became stronger every day, and the mortar, though badly worked, blew down a considerable portion of the defences of the place.

At six o'clock on the morning of the 26th April, the garrison made another most determined sally, drove back the enemy, and captured the mortar, which they brought into the castle in triumph. From this time forward the siege languished, till the 23rd of May, about which time the news was received that Prince Rupert had arrived at the city of Chester, at the head of a large army, had raised the siege of Chester, and was advancing towards Lathom house. A few days afterwards this news was confirmed, and on the 26th of May the besiegers abandoned the siege and retired, one part of them towards Bolton, the other to Liverpool, to wait for the approach of Prince Rupert.

At this point of time the history of the military operations in Cheshire becomes closely connected with that of the operations in Lancashire, and it will therefore be convenient to trace the operations in Cheshire to this date before proceeding further with the history of the operations in Lancashire.

The civil war commenced in the county of Chester, as it did in most parts of England, in rival attempts of the supporters of the king and of the Parliament to obtain the command of the armed force of the district. In the month of August, 1642, Sir William Brereton, of Honford, the most daring and successful of all the parliamentary leaders in the north-western district, made an attempt to raise an armed force for the service of Parliament, in the city of Chester, by beat of drum. In this attempt he was supported by the deputy-lieutenants appointed by Parliament to act as commissioners for organizing the militia of Cheshire ; but the supporters of the royal cause in the city were both stronger and bolder than



those of the Parliament, and the result was that Sir William Brereton himself was taken prisoner, and was for some time kept in custody. It is stated that Sir William was unpopular in the city from having refused to pay ship-money on his lands, situate within the city, at the time when the citizens in general submitted.

A few weeks after this attempt of Sir William Brereton, King Charles himself arrived at Chester, and by his presence and favour so strengthened the royalist party in that city, that it ever afterwards remained unalterably attached to the royal cause, and proved its loyalty by efforts and sacrifices greater than those made by any other town or city in the kingdom. During the king's visit he resided at the palace of the bishop, and was splendidly entertained by the corporation at a great banquet, where he was presented by the mayor with the sum of £200 in his own name, and with £100 in that of his eldest son, Charles, who was at once Prince of Wales and Earl of Chester. During the stay of the king at Chester he issued a royal declaration, charging the Parliament with refusing to treat with him for the peace of the kingdom, and declaring it responsible for all the evils which might follow. Before the king left Chester, he commanded that the city should be placed in a proper state of defence. This was immediately done, a new and much stronger line of fortifications, consisting of a high and thick mud wall, being constructed in front of the ancient walls of the city, and well supplied with artillery. The city at once assessed itself at the sum of £100, for the purpose of repairing the gates, and afterwards contributed many hundreds, and indeed thousands of pounds, for the constructing, maintaining, and defending of the fortifications of the city.

As early as the month of July, Lord Strange, who was acting for his father as lord-lieutenant both of Lancashire and Cheshire, called together the latter county at Knutsford, for the purpose of organizing an armed force for the support of the royal cause. Another meeting, called by the parliamentary commissioners for organizing the militia, was held at Nantwich on the 12th of August, and at the same time the king's commissioners of array also held a meeting at Ravensmore, within a mile of Nantwich. On this occasion the two parties came in contact on Beam Heath, and would have come into armed conflict, if actual violence had not been averted for a short time by the exertions of Mr. Wilbraham, of Darfold, and Mr. Worden, of Chester.

But the conflict was only postponed, and from that time both parties prepared openly for civil war. In the following month Lord Grandison entered the county from the south with a large body of the royal horse, and was at once joined by Lord Cholmondeley, Sir Hugh Caverley, and other Cheshire gentlemen of the royalist party. With these forces they marched upon the town of Nantwich, then a place of great trade, being the chief town in the salt district, and also the head-quarters of the parliamentary party in Cheshire. Some works had been hastily thrown up by the parliamentary party around the town; but on the approach of Lord Grandison's forces the inhabitants, fearing that they would have to deal not only with those forces, but with the whole of the royal army then assembled at Shrewsbury, agreed to terms of surrender, and allowed the town to be disarmed. After remaining a few days, the royalist troops retired from Nantwich, and proceeded to Shrewsbury, whence they marched with the royal army to the battle at Edgehill. Soon after the royalists had abandoned Nantwich, Sir William Brereton reoccupied the town in the name of the Parliament, erected new and stronger fortifications, and converted it into a place of arms, which successfully resisted all subsequent attacks.

The whole of the winter of 1642-43 was spent by both parties in preparations for the campaign in the spring and summer of the next year. The command of the parliamentary forces was taken by Sir William Brereton, who during all the operations of the war proved himself to be, not only a brave soldier, but a skilful officer. The command of the Cheshire royalists was conferred on Sir Thomas Aston, baronet, the representative of another ancient Cheshire family, and a man of great courage, but without much talent for military command. Early in the month of March the parliamentary and the royalist armies, under the command of Sir William Brereton and Sir Thomas Aston, encountered each other at Middlewich, on the banks of the Dane. Few particulars have been preserved of the fight, but it ended in the entire defeat of the royalist party. In this battle upwards of 400 prisoners and 100 horses were captured by Sir William Brereton, together with two pieces of cannon and 500 fire-arms. Amongst the prisoners were one colonel, one major, ten captains, four lieutenants, and four ensigns. Sir Thomas Aston retired with his broken army within the fortifications of Chester, where he was placed in arrest. He afterwards published a long memoir in defence of his conduct. At a later period of the war Sir Thomas

Aston lost his life, fighting bravely for the royal cause; but the royalists of Cheshire never recovered from the injury inflicted on them by the first battle of Middlewich.

On the 18th of July, 1643, Sir William Brereton appeared with his army in front of the city of Chester, and the next morning, made a desperate attempt to carry the city by assault. In this, however, he signally failed; the works being much too strong to be carried without the help of cannon, and the garrison, which included all the principal royalists of the county, being alike numerous and brave. The loss of the parliamentary forces in this attack was very great, whilst that of the garrison was quite insignificant, consisting of only one man killed and another wounded.

Sir William Brereton, finding that Chester was not to be taken by storm, determined, if possible, to cut off its communications and supplies; and on the 11th of November, in the same year, succeeded either in bribing or in intimidating the garrison of the adjoining castle of Hawarden into a surrender. The castle of Hawarden at this time belonged to the earl of Derby, but the surrender was made by Thomas Ravenscroft, esquire, and Mr. John Aldesey, who were in authority in the castle at the time. The effect of the establishment of a parliamentary force on the Welsh side of the river Dee was to deprive the garrison of Chester of its usual supplies of provisions and fuel, and to compel the garrison to burn the suburbs of Handbridge on that side of the river. For the same reason Overlegh hall, Bache hall, and Flookersbook hall, the mansion of Sir Thomas Smith, were also destroyed, that they might not afford cover to the enemy in an advance on the city.

It had been the object of the king and his advisers, from the commencement of the civil war, to bring over into England the army of Ireland. That army had been raised by the earl of Strafford during his vice-royalty in Ireland, and was commanded by officers, and composed of men well known for their attachment to the royal authority. Although there were few, if any, Irish Roman Catholics in this army, it was a favourite party misrepresentation of the time to describe the English army in Ireland as an army of Roman Catholics or Papists; and to represent it as a force inflamed with a fanatical hatred against English Protestants, and eager to inflict on them all the cruelties which had been inflicted on the Protestants of Ulster in the great Irish insurrection of 1640. Partly from unwillingness to rouse the fears and jealousies of the

English people, and partly from the fact that the English army in Ireland was engaged in an actual struggle with the Roman Catholics of that country, the army was not brought over into England until the end of the second year of the great civil war. It had been originally intended that the Irish army should be landed in Lancashire; but this had been rendered impossible by the capture of Liverpool by the parliamentary forces. For some time after that event it was doubtful whether the Irish army could be got across the channel at all; for no sooner had the parliamentary party obtained possession of Liverpool than they fitted out a number of small vessels, which they dignified with the name of frigates, and sent them to cruise in the Irish sea. For some time the city of Dublin, and the royal army collected in and around that city, were cut off from all communication with England, by means of the Liverpool frigates, which were commanded by an active officer named Captain Danks. The effect of the blockade was also to cut off the supplies of provisions, coals, and other necessaries required for the consumption of Dublin. But near the end of the year a royalist naval force arrived off Dublin, and compelled the Liverpool frigates to retire into the river Mersey. Shortly afterwards the embarkation of the Irish army for England commenced. The city of Chester was then besieged, or rather blockaded, by a numerous force of the trained bands of Cheshire and Lancashire, but defended by a numerous and gallant force, commanded by the earl of Derby, Lord Byron, Lord Molyneux, Robert Grosvenor, Henry Legh, J. Mainwaring, and other distinguished royalists of the two counties.

In the month of November, 1643, the Irish royalist army, raised by the earl of Strafford and the marquis of Ormonde, was transported into England, and landed at Chester. The first division, about 2000 strong, composed of the regiments of Sir Michael Ernley, Colonel Gibson, Sir Fulk Hunck, and a portion of that of Colonel Byron, left Dublin on the 16th of November, and arrived at Mostyn, on the south bank of the Dee, two days afterwards. These were shortly followed by another division of the Irish army, consisting of 1300 foot and 140 horse, under Colonel Robert Byron. Nearly at the same time Major-general Lord Byron arrived at Chester from Shrewsbury, with 1000 horse and 300 foot; and by authority of the king assumed the command of the city of Chester, and of all the forces assembled there.

When Lord Byron took the command, not only the whole of Cheshire, but also the counties of Flint and Denbigh, were in the hands of the parliamentary forces. Sir William Brereton, having obtained possession of Holt bridge across the Dee, and having been reinforced by a large body of the Lancashire parliamentary troops, had marched a force of 2000 foot and 800 horse into North Wales, and, acting in conjunction with Sir Thomas Middleton, had overrun a considerable part of that country. On the arrival of the Irish army in the river Dee, Sir William Brereton issued a proclamation requiring all persons to take arms, to oppose "4000 bloody Irish rebels that were come to invade them." Although there was scarcely an Irishman in the ranks of the invading army, this proclamation produced considerable effect, and all parties prepared for a closer and more desperate struggle; those who did not believe the invading force to be either Irishmen or rebels, knowing them to be zealous and determined royalists, trained in the Irish wars, and commanded by officers of known courage and loyalty.

A few days after the landing of the Irish army at Chester, Lord Byron prepared to march against the enemy; and notwithstanding the severity of the season, he took the field with 4000 foot and 1000 horse, on the 12th of December. The castle of Hawarden had already been surrendered to the royalists, after a sharp combat; and Sir William Brereton, seeing that his forces on the Welsh side of the river were in the greatest danger of being cut off, retired rapidly into Cheshire, across Holt bridge. At the same time the parliamentary forces, which had been engaged in the blockade of the city of Chester, also retired. The object of Sir William Brereton was to withdraw with both these corps to Nantwich; and, under the cover of the fortifications of that place, to collect a force capable of making head against the Irish army, and the Cheshire and Welsh royalists assembled under the command of Lord Byron. But rapid as was the retreat of Sir William Brereton and Colonel Assheton, the royalists came up with them near Middlewich, and defeated them, with very considerable loss. The battle lasted four or five hours; and in the end the whole of the Lancashire, and a part of the Cheshire troops, under the command of Sir William Brereton and Colonel Assheton retired in the direction of Manchester, whilst a portion of them escaped southward to Nantwich, and joined the garrison of that place, under

the command of Colonel George Booth, the son of Sir George Booth, baronet, of Dunham Massey.

At the same time that Lord Byron attacked the parliamentary forces at Middlewich, his troops also appeared before the castle of Beeston, then held by a parliamentary garrison commanded by Captain Steel. This castle, the very ruins of which have an air of grandeur, was at that time a place of immense strength and importance, and capable of offering a long resistance to a regular siege. It was taken by surprise in a night attack, headed by Captain Sandford of the Royal Firelocks, a force armed with weapons not previously known in war. At the head of a very small number of daring men, Captain Sandford succeeded in climbing up the lofty rock on which the castle is built, and in entering the castle at a point where no one dreamt of an attack. The commander of the garrison appears at once to have lost heart, and after a little parley, the place was surrendered. Whether this was done from cowardice or from treachery, or merely from surprise, is uncertain; but the governor's conduct was greatly blamed, and cost him his life. What made much against Steel was that he took Sandford down into his chamber, where they dined together; that much beer was sent up to Sandford's men; and that the castle, after a short parley, was delivered up—Steel and his men having leave to march with their arms and colours to Nantwich. There Captain Steel was removed from his command, and was afterwards tried and shot.

Lord Byron next proceeded to Sandbach, from which place he compelled Sir William Breton to retire; and on the 26th of December he forced the parliamentary army to fight a battle at Middlewich, in which the latter, though strongly posted, was defeated, with a loss of about 200 men. After this victory Northwich surrendered to the royalists. The fortified house of Crewe hall also surrendered after a short but resolute resistance; as well as Doddington hall and Acton church, which had also been turned into a fortress.

There was now only one garrison in that part of Cheshire which was held by the parliamentary forces, namely, the town of Nantwich; and Lord Byron, believing that his triumph was secure, wrote to the marquis of Newcastle, the king's commander in Yorkshire, stating that he did not doubt to be able to clear the county, and, if the marquis would advance towards Stockport, to be able to set foot in Lancashire. In this letter Lord Byron said, "The rebels had



possessed themselves of a church at Bartomley ; but we presently beat them forth of it, and put them all to the sword, which I find to be the best way to proceed with their kind of people, for mercy to them is cruelty." \*

Within a very few weeks the noble lord found reason to change his opinion ; for the rumour of this and other cruelties perpetrated by Lord Byron's forces, as well as the formidable nature of their movements, induced the parliamentary leaders of Cheshire, Lancashire, and Yorkshire to unite for their overthrow ; and gave the garrison of Nantwich the resolution to defend the town to the last extremity.

The town of Nantwich, which continued firmly to support the Parliament from the beginning to the end of the civil war, was only fortified by mud walls, formed in a hasty manner by the townsmen and the people of the surrounding country. By the 29th of December, 1643, the town was completely invested by Lord Byron's army. The garrison by which it was defended was not strong in numbers, and was composed for the most part of trained bands and other local levies ; but the commander, Colonel Booth, was a man of great determination, and a member of one of the oldest and best families in Cheshire, possessing great local influence and the confidence of his soldiers. Whilst the royalists were breaking ground, the garrison made several bold sallies, and thus delayed the operations for several days. In addition to this, a body of royalist cavalry under the command of Sir Nicholas Byron, which was advancing from Shrewsbury to join in the siege, was attacked in the night by Colonel Mytton, at the head of 120 horse and the same number of foot, and was totally routed, with the loss of nearly half its numbers.

It was not until the 18th January, 1644, that Lord Byron ventured to attempt to carry the town by storm. Early in the morning of that day the royalists advanced on the town from several different points, and attempted to storm the works. At every point they were received with the most determined courage, and finally were beaten off with the loss of 300 to 400 men and officers. Amongst the slain were Lieutenant-colonel Bolton and Captain Sandford, the captor of Beeston castle, with eighteen other officers. After this repulse the siege was turned into a blockade, and provisions of all kinds soon began to be very scarce.

\* Ormerod's Civil War Tracts of Lancashire, p 154.

The delay created by the gallant resistance of the garrison of Nantwich gave the parliamentary leaders in Cheshire, Lancashire, and the West Riding time to unite their forces. These combined forces assembled at Manchester on the 21st January, and were placed under the command of Sir Thomas Fairfax, who had already begun to show the great military talents which became more conspicuous as the war advanced. On the 21st of January Sir Thomas Fairfax advanced into Cheshire, at the head of six regiments of foot and twenty-eight troops of horse, being about 2500 foot and 1200 horse. Lord Byron, on hearing of the approach of Sir Thomas Fairfax, at first supposed that his only object was to raise the siege of Nantwich; and being most anxious to obtain possession of the place, for the purpose of establishing a communication between the midland and the northern counties, continued the blockade until Sir Thomas Fairfax's army reached the immediate neighbourhood of Nantwich.

The royal army, when drawn up to receive the attack of Sir Thomas Fairfax, occupied both sides of the river Weaver, the main body being posted in the neighbourhood of Acton church, on the high road from Manchester. Lord Byron himself was on the other side of the river with the whole of his horse and part of his foot. Owing to heavy rains, and the melting of the snows, the waters of the river rose very suddenly at this critical time, carrying away the bridges by which the two wings of the royal army kept up their communications. In consequence of this accident, they were unable to render each other the prompt and effectual assistance required in battle.

Sir Thomas Fairfax, advancing rapidly through the lower part of Delamere Forest, encountered the outposts of Lord Byron's army at Barr bridge, and at once drove them in. His force had been increased on the march to 5000 foot and 3550 horse. The battle began at half-past three o'clock in the afternoon, by a fierce charge of Fairfax's army. This was met with great resolution by the royalists; but about five o'clock the garrison of Nantwich attacked the royalists furiously in the rear, and the royalists thus finding themselves between two fires, were utterly routed, and fled in confusion. Very few of the royalists would have escaped, if the night had not come on and covered their flight. About 1600 of the Irish army took refuge in and about Acton church, and defended themselves for a time, hoping for assistance from Lord Byron; but this

he was unable to render them, having to make a march of five miles before he could come to their assistance. Sir Thomas Fairfax very wisely offered quarter to the men who had been driven into Acton church, which they at once accepted, seeing no hope of relief. When Lord Byron came up, with the body of his horse, and what remained of the foot, he found that the main body of his army was either destroyed or had surrendered. On this Lord Byron retired in the direction of Chester, and reached that city with the wreck of his army, leaving in the hands of Sir Thomas Fairfax, Major-general Gibson, Colonels Sir Michael Ernley, Sir Richard Fleetwood, and George Monk, afterwards the celebrated General Monk, together with eighty other officers, and 1500 common soldiers. The effect of the battle of Nantwich was to destroy the army of Ireland, on which so many hopes and fears had been founded; and to place the whole of the county of Chester, with the exception of the city, as well as the counties of Flint and Denbigh, in the hands of the parliamentary forces. Another effect of this battle was to induce Colonel George Monk to enter the parliamentary army, which was ultimately one considerable cause of the restoration of Charles II. to the throne that his father had lost.

Very shortly after the defeat of the royal army at Nantwich, Sir William Brereton again appeared before the city of Chester at the head of the parliamentary forces. On the 13th of February the garrison of Chester made a very determined sally in the direction of Great Boughton, and after a fierce engagement, in which the royalists had 140 men slain, the parliamentary forces retired for some distance, still keeping the city blockaded on the Cheshire side, though open in the direction of North Wales. In the week following this sharp skirmish at Boughton, the royalists burnt down that village, to prevent the enemy's harbouring there and advancing on the city unawares. For the next two months the blockade continued without any event of importance.

After the victory of the parliamentary forces at Nantwich, the position of the royalist party in Cheshire and Lancashire appeared to be desperate. There was no royalist army in the field in either county, and the only places held by royalists were the city of Chester and Lathom house. Both these places were very closely pressed by the forces of the Parliament, and without relief from without it was evident that they could not hold out much longer.

In this, all but desperate, position of affairs, King Charles decided

to detach his gallant nephew, Prince Rupert, from the main body of his army, for the purpose of raising the siege of Newark castle, Chester, Lathom house, and York, all of which were at that time besieged by the parliamentary forces ; and also of restoring the confidence of the royalists in the north-western and northern counties. It was not without much hesitation that the king agreed to this step, although he was urged to it with an eagerness which rendered refusal very difficult. Prince Rupert, before leaving the royal head-quarters, received the following two letters—the one from the gallant cavaliers besieged at Chester, the other from the earl of Derby himself—both urging him to advance into Cheshire and Lancashire, for the purpose of restoring the royal cause in those counties, and of freeing the countess of Derby from her perilous position at Lathom house. The first letter was as follows :—

FROM THE CAVALIERS KEEPING GARRISON AT CHESTER TO  
PRINCE RUPERT.

“ May it please your Highness,—We have thought it worth your Highness' knowledge and this express to inform you that, since your Highness' departure from these parts, the house of Lathom (wherein your very heroic kinswoman, the countess of Derby, is) hath, by Sir Thomas Fairfax (who is yet there), been very straitly besieged, and, as we hear, assaulted (notwithstanding any rumours which were to the contrary), yet so defended by her admirable courage, as from the house there hath been killed divers of the assailants, some prisoners taken, and many arms. By these means she hath occasioned the enemy to strengthen the leager, and exasperated their malice. But she hath wasted much of her ammunition and victual, which must needs hasten the sadness of her ladyship's condition, or render her captive to a barbarous enemy, if your Highness' forces do not speedily release her. In contemplation whereof, as also of the happy effects of her gallantry, who by this defence hath not only diverted a strong party of the Lancashire forces from joining with those who would endeavour to interrupt your Highness' march or retreat, or otherwise might have joined in one body to have annoyed us here in the division of our forces, we are therefore bold, with an humble representation, to become suitors to your Highness for your princely consideration of the noble lady's seasonable and speedy relief, in which (besides her particular) we conceive the infinite good of all these northern parts will be most concerned, and his Majesty's service very much advanced.

The happy success of your Highness is now our principal hope and prayer, which, and all your Highness' designs, shall be promoted with the lives and utmost services of your Highness' most faithful servants,

(Signed)	" CARYLL MOLYNEUX,	" J. MAINWARING,
	" THOMAS TYLDESLEY,	" RICHARD GREENE,
	" ROBERT GROSVENOR,	" JAMES ANDERTON,
	" HENRY LEIGH,	" WILLIAM WALTON,
	" RICHARD MOLYNEUX,	" JOHN BENNINGHAM.
	" A. SHIPMAN,	

" CHESTER, *March 22nd*, 1643." \*

About the same time the earl of Derby, who was also in Chester, wrote to Prince Rupert, entreating his assistance for the countess of Derby. His letter was as follows:—

THE EARL OF DERBY TO PRINCE RUPERT.

" Sir,—I have followed your Highness' commands in serving the worthy bearer, Sir William Neale, concerning his government of Harden (Hawarden) castle.

" Sir,—I have received many advertisements from my wife of her imminent danger, unless she be relieved by your Highness, on whom she doth more rely than any other whatsoever, and all of us consider well she hath chief reason so to do. I was in hope to have seen your Highness here yesterday, seeing you were so resolved when last I had the honour to wait upon you; but not now knowing any certainty of your coming hither, and my Lord Byron and others most unwilling to stir hence with any forces towards her without your Highness' special direction, I do take the boldness to present you again my most humble and earnest request in her behalf, that I may be able to give her some comfort in my next. I should have waited on your Highness this time, but that I hourly receive little letters from her, who haply a few days hence may never send me more.

" There is now an opportunity, in my opinion, to take the town of Liverpool, which your Highness took notice of in the map the last evening I was with you, for there is not at this time fifty men in the garrison, neither are there many more in Warrington; also divers be drawn forth of Manchester, most to Lathom; so that if any small force be showed before any of these towns, it is thought very possible to

\* Eliot Warburton's *Prince Rupert and the Cavaliers*, I. 364.

raise the siege (of Lathom house), or so weaken it that it may be much easier to relieve the house with such things as it may want.

“Your Highness, doubtless, knows that men are newly landed here from Ireland ; but all these and twice so many are not considerable in comparison of your own appearing, which strikes a terror to that wicked party, and gives life to the half-dead true ones that are banished so long from their counties.

“Sir,—Though it becomes me to be earnest for her that is so dear to me, and for one whose great honour is to be so near to you, yet I humbly lay before you also the great advantage of his Majesty’s service if that family be preserved, and a certain inconvenience when with that all the county, and so many well affected will utterly be lost, and not likely regained but with too dear a purchase. But lest I be judged too importunate, I will only ask God to put into your heart how to help that poor soul, which deserves your favour, and so commit your Highness to the Almighty’s protection, and rest

“Your Highness’ most humble and faithful servant,

(Signed)

“DERBY.

“CHESTER, *March 7th, 1644.*”

Early in the month of May, Prince Rupert marched northward with an army of about 10,000 men, and after raising the siege of Newark, crossed over the kingdom to the southern borders of Cheshire. On the 18th of May he was at Drayton, in Shropshire, and on the following day he entered Cheshire by way of Audlem and Sandbach. On his march towards Cheshire he raised heavy requisitions, especially taking horses and men, for the royal service. On his approach, Sir William Brereton and the parliamentary forces of Cheshire, finding themselves unable to make head against the army of Prince Rupert, raised the siege of Chester, and retired towards Manchester, to join the Lancashire and Yorkshire forces, which were collecting there to meet the gathering storm.

The bridge across the Mersey at Warrington being in the hands of the parliamentary forces, Prince Rupert marched up the valley of the Mersey by way of Knutsford, and crossed the Mersey at Stockport ; the parliamentary forces collected at that point, under the command of Colonels Mainwaring and Duckenfield, being driven from that position with considerable loss. Without waiting to attack Manchester, Prince Rupert marched up the valley of the Irwell, and on the 28th May appeared with the whole of his army before the town



of Bolton. On hearing of his approach, the parliamentary forces engaged in the siege of Lathom house retired, part of them, under the command of Colonel Rigby, to Bolton, and the rest, under Colonel Moore, to Liverpool.

About two o'clock on the afternoon of the 28th of May, Prince Rupert was discovered about a mile distant from Bolton, advancing towards the town across the moor lying to the south-west. The numbers of the royal army appeared to be about 12,000 men. The garrison of the town consisted of about 2000 soldiers and 500 clubmen. As the royal army approached the town, "they appeared at first like a wood or cloud, and presently were cast into several bodies." The town being small in circuit and defended by a numerous garrison, the prince judged that he should meet with a vigorous resistance. After calling together a council of war, it was determined at once to make an attempt to carry the town by assault. This was accordingly done, but the resistance of the garrison was so desperate that the royalists were beaten back at every point, leaving the ground covered with their killed and wounded. In their retreat they were cut down in great abundance, and fell "like leaves from the tree on a winter's morning."<sup>o</sup> According to the royalist account, the garrison murdered their prisoners in cold blood; but this statement is probably only one of the common exaggerations put forth by heated partisans.

On the following day the royalists again assaulted the town, and with greater success. The assault was made in several columns, but the first body of royalists who forced their way into the town was led by the earl of Derby, and consisted of a number of his friends, tenants, and retainers. The fighting, even after the town was taken, was desperate; and it is said that as many of the parliamentary forces as 1700 men were slaughtered. About 1000 escaped, with Colonel Rigby, the commander of the garrison. The town was afterwards plundered, and the inhabitants were treated with the cruelty with which the inhabitants of towns taken by storm are usually treated. The odium of all this was subsequently thrown on the earl of Derby; and in revenge for his share in the transaction he was sent to Bolton to be beheaded.

Upwards of twenty stand of colours were taken at Bolton, and were sent to Lathom house, where it was hoped they would remain, as a "perpetual memorial" of the Prince's respect and admiration for the valour and constancy of the countess of Derby.

<sup>o</sup> Civil War Tracts of Lancashire, p. 191.

After having obtained possession of the town of Bolton, Prince Rupert marched with his army to Liverpool, and laid siege to that place. The royalists were particularly anxious to obtain possession of Liverpool, for the purpose of keeping open their communications with the royalist party in Ireland. The parliamentary forces were not less anxious to retain it, for the purpose of preventing such communications ; and to give the town the means of resistance, the garrison was strengthened with 400 English and Scotch troops, sent forward from Manchester to Warrington, and thence by water to Liverpool. The ships of war in the harbour also took an active part in the defence of the place.

The fortifications of Liverpool, at the time of the siege by Prince Rupert, consisted of a strong and high mud wall ; a ditch twelve yards wide and nine feet deep, extending from the head of the pool, which then ran up to the end of Whitechapel, to the river ; and of the ancient castle in the middle of the town, situated at the point where Castle Street and Lord Street now meet. The approaches to the town being across a low marshy ground were covered with water from the river ; and batteries were erected within the town to cover and guard against all passage over or through the water. All the street ends facing the river were closed up, and those facing the land were inclosed with strong gates defended by cannon. All useless women and children were sent out of the town. The castle, which served as a sort of citadel, was surrounded with a ditch twelve yards wide and thirty feet deep ; and from the ditch to the river was a covered way, through which the ditch was filled with water, and when the tide was out the garrison received supplies of men, provisions, and stores. In and upon the castle were planted many cannon, as well to annoy the besiegers at a distance as to cover the ships in the inner harbour, the entrance to which was defended by a fort mounting eight guns. At the time when Prince Rupert appeared before Liverpool, the place was thronged with Irish Protestants, who had been driven from their homes by the massacre in the north of Ireland. It is stated that they had brought with them great quantities of wool, and that the walls were covered with bags of wool, from behind which the defenders of the place kept up a heavy fire on the assailants, with small danger to themselves. The garrison was numerous, well supplied with arms and ammunition, and the place too strong to be taken by a mere assault.

Prince Rupert having arrived before Liverpool, established his head-quarters at Everton, which was then a rural village more than a mile from the town, and encamped his army on the high grounds that sloped down from that point towards the river. He erected his batteries on Liverpool Heath, on the ground which extends across the present Shaw's Brow to the foot of Copperas Hill, and from these batteries he kept up a heavy fire on the town, for seventeen days. During that period he made repeated and desperate attempts to storm the place, but was always beaten back with heavy loss. The town was ultimately taken in a night attack, directed against that part of the fortifications which lay at the end of Old Hall Street. Caryll, Lord Molyneux led the attack, and probably was able, from his local knowledge, to point out the weakest part of the fortifications. The royalists entered the town at three o'clock in the morning, and after some fighting, forced their way to the point where the town-hall now stands. At that point they met with a regiment of soldiers drawn up in battle array, but who beat a parley and demanded quarter. After some discussion the town and castle were surrendered; but the garrison and inhabitants were spared, except a number of them who fell in the first confusion of the attack. Upwards of 100 barrels of gun-powder, then considered a very large quantity, were expended by Prince Rupert in the siege of Liverpool.

The delay of Prince Rupert's army before Liverpool, and the exhaustion of so large a part of his powder, caused him to arrive at York, to which point he was directing his course, too late and too ill provided to be of any great use to the royal cause. Whilst at Liverpool the prince received letters from the king, urging and commanding him to proceed to York without delay to raise the siege of that important fortress, in which city the marquis of Newcastle, with the royalist army of the north, was blockaded by the English parliamentary army, commanded by Manchester, Cromwell, and Fairfax; and the Scotch army, commanded by Leven and Leslie. The king declared in his letter to Prince Rupert that he should consider the loss of York the certain precursor of the loss of his crown; and commanded the prince to lay aside all other undertakings and hasten to the relief of that city.

After appointing Sir Robert Byron, one of the brothers of Lord Byron, to the command of the town and garrison of Liverpool, Prince Rupert, collecting together the mass of the royalists of

Cheshire and Lancashire, marched towards York with the utmost speed. His course was across Lancashire, to the banks of the Ribble at Clitheroe, over the grassy hills of Craven to Skipton castle, and then down the valley of the Wharfe, by way of Otley, to Boroughbridge, and so to the east side of the city of York, which he entered without meeting an enemy or striking a blow. The parliamentary forces of Lancashire and Cheshire, under the command of Sir William Brereton, following a line of march nearly parallel to that of Prince Rupert, joined the parliamentary armies before York, and thence, on the approach of Prince Rupert, retired to what afterwards became the battle-field of Marston Moor. In this terrible battle, in which the whole strength of the parliamentary and royalist parties of the north of England was engaged, the Lancashire and Cheshire forces were commanded by Sir William Brereton, though we have no distinct information as to the position which they held in the line of battle. The Lancashire and Cheshire royalists who had accompanied Prince Rupert to the field were, no doubt, engaged in the desperate attack led by the prince in person, which for a while promised victory to the royalists, until the charge of Cromwell and Fairfax swept the main body of the royal army from the field.

After the defeat of the royal forces at Marston Moor, Prince Rupert retired into Lancashire by the same line by which he had advanced, with a force of about 6000 men. He was closely followed by a large body of the parliamentary forces, but succeeded by a very rapid march in reaching the Mersey, at Hale, and getting across to Runcorn. From Runcorn he marched rapidly southward, to join the main army of the king, and never afterwards showed himself in the north-western counties.

Immediately after the battle of Marston Moor, Parliament directed "that the Lord Fairfax should take care of Yorkshire, and send 1000 horse into Lancashire to join with the forces of that county against Liverpool (garrisoned by the royalists), as also Cheshire and Derbyshire, for the reducing the rest of Prince Rupert's broken forces." As we have already mentioned, Rupert escaped; but the parliamentary general, Meldrum, came up with the Lancashire and Cheshire royalists at Ormskirk, and put them to the rout. Lord Byron and Lord Molyneux escaped with difficulty from the field of battle, and more than thirty of their officers were taken prisoners, with some hundreds of their soldiers. About the

same time a body of royalists, commanded by Lord Oglevie and Colonel Huddleston, whilst marching towards Lathom house, were attacked by the parliamentary colonel, Dodding, not far from Preston. At first the battle was very fierce; but Colonel Shuttleworth coming up with his regiment, the royalists were defeated, a number of them were taken prisoners, and the rest driven back in confusion on Lathom house, where they fell into the hands of another body of parliamentary troops who had arrived before that celebrated stronghold. A third body of the royalists, belonging to the county of Chester, and commanded by Colonel Marrow, were defeated by Sir William Brereton, and driven back into the city of Chester.

The small bodies of the Lancashire royalists that escaped from these attacks took refuge in Liverpool, which was held by Sir Robert Byron for the king. On the 22nd of September the post of Birkenhead, opposite to Liverpool, and garrisoned by the royalists, fell into the hands of the parliamentary forces; but the town of Liverpool was very steadily defended by Sir Robert Byron, and was not taken by Sir John Meldrum until the 1st of November. A few days previously about fifty of the English soldiers made their escape out of the garrison, and drove away most of the cattle, on which the garrison relied for subsistence, bringing them to Sir John Meldrum's camp. On this the troops of the Anglo-Irish army within the garrison, perceiving that they were now in a desperate condition, inasmuch as the parliamentary forces had before refused them quarter, determined to buy their safety by the sacrifice of their officers and of the town. After some consultation they seized on all their commanders, and delivered up the town to Sir John Meldrum, in return for which service he allowed them to return to their homes. There were captured in the town two colonels, two lieutenant-colonels, three majors, and fourteen captains and other officers, besides common soldiers, ordnance, arms, and ammunition in great quantity. Amongst the prisoners were Sir Robert Byron, the governor, and Colonel Cuthbert Clifton.\*

After the capture of Liverpool the only places that held out in Lancashire were Lathom house and Greenhaugh castle, near Garstang, both belonging to the earl of Derby. The latter of these places, being of no great strength, was easily taken; but Lathom house, being strongly garrisoned and resolutely defended, held out

\* Ormerod's Civil War Tracts of Lancashire, p. 208.

to the beginning of the month of December, 1645. In this second siege Lathom was defended by Colonel Rawstorne, who had assisted in the first siege; but it does not appear certain that either the earl or the countess of Derby was present. At the recommendation of Prince Rupert, they had retired to the Isle of Man, the defence of which was considered more important to the royal cause than that of Lathom, in the then hopeless state of the royal affairs in Lancashire.

In the second siege of Lathom, Colonel Rawstorne was assisted by most of the officers who had taken part in the defence of the house during the former siege, namely, by Captains Charnock and Molyneux Radcliffe, and Lieutenants Nowel, Worrall, and Robey. Mr. Ffarington, of Worden, again assisted with his advice, and Archdeacon Rutter was also considered a valuable addition to the garrison. During the short occupation of Lathom house by Prince Rupert considerable improvements had been made, on the suggestion of his engineer, Captain Gomez, who had also planned a completely new set of fortifications for the town of Liverpool; which, however, were never actually constructed, owing to the downfall of the royal cause.

Immediately after the battle of Marston Moor a body of about 4000 parliamentary troops advanced upon Lathom house, under the command of Colonel Egerton. These troops having approached the fortress incautiously, were suddenly attacked by the garrison, and were driven back with so heavy a loss that they did not venture to resume the attack for a considerable time. It was not until the spring of the following year that the siege was resumed by the parliamentary forces, and so obstinate was the defence that the place did not surrender until the first week in December following, as appears from the following entry in the *Perfect Diurnal*, of Saturday, 6th December, 1645:—"This evening, after the house was up, there came letters to the speaker of the Commons' House of the surrender of Lathom house, in Lancashire, belonging to the earl of Derby, which his lady, the countess of Derby, proving herself of the two the better soldier, hath above these two years kept in opposition to our forces that blocked up the same; but it is now surrendered, by which means the whole county of Lancaster is absolutely freed, and reduced under the obedience of the Parliament, the enemy having not any one garrison in that county. The taking of this place gives fair probability of the more speedy reducing of Chester, whither, no doubt, these Lancashire forces will



next move, to assist the besiegers, or else against Skipton in Yorkshire, as there shall be occasion."

Whilst the second siege of Lathom house was in progress, some faint hopes were entertained by the royalists that the siege would again be raised by a royal army; and in the month of September these hopes became much more sanguine, on the advance of the royal cavalry to Chester, under the command of the king himself. It is stated that the king was anxious to have raised the siege in person, but that this having been rendered impossible by the defeat of the royal cavalry at Rowton Heath, near Chester, on the 24th September, 1645, he requested the governor of Lathom house to accept terms. Commissioners were then appointed, who obtained honourable terms for the garrison, with a stipulation that Lady Derby should have the income of a third part of the earl's estate, with conveyance of the goods of the earl of Derby for his and her use, and other stipulations in favour of the gentlemen in the mansion and the clergy beneficed by the family. These terms were ultimately agreed to. With regard to the garrison, it was further agreed that the governor should have his horse, arms, and £10 in money; and that the rest, both officers and soldiers, should be at liberty to march away, without arms or money, to the next garrison of the king's, either at Sidbury or Ashby-de-la-Zouch, or to go home to their own dwellings. "There were taken in the house," says the *Perfect Diurnal*, "twelve pieces of ordnance, all their arms and ammunition, and great store of prize and pillage."

Although comparatively few particulars have been preserved with regard to the second siege of Lathom house, yet it is evident, both from the extraordinary duration of the siege, and the honourable terms granted to the garrison, that the place must have been defended with very great resolution; and that whether the countess of Derby was personally present or not, the garrison continued to be inspired by the dauntless spirit which her presence and example had infused into them at the first siege. The language of the *Perfect Diurnal*, quoted above, as well as that of other contemporary writers, would induce us to think that the countess was present, at least for a part of the time. One of these, in describing the surrender of the house, says that Lady Derby, in the absence of the earl, had played the man at Lathom, adding—what is no small compliment—"but the best man may be conquered, and so was Lady Derby."

After the retreat of Prince Rupert from Cheshire, the position of the royalists in the city of Chester, under the command of Lord Byron, became nearly hopeless. The war in the open field was ended, so far as the counties of Chester and Lancaster were concerned, and never revived, except for a few days in the month of September, 1645, when the king advanced in person to Chester at the head of a small body of cavalry, which formed the last remains of the royal armies. But although there were no field operations except these, in the north-western counties, the war was continued in the southern and midland districts throughout the whole of the years 1644 and 1645. In the hope that some change of fortune in those districts might again enable the royal armies to march northward, and with the determination to preserve a place of strength round which the royalist party might rally if it should be again favoured by fortune, the royalists of Cheshire and the neighbouring counties again assembled within the walls of Chester, under the command of Lord Byron, and steadily refused every summons to surrender. Though suffering from famine and pestilence, as well as from incessant attacks from the besieging force, they held out with unwavering courage, until the royal cause was lost beyond recovery in every part of the kingdom, and all motive for further resistance was gone. The history of the siege of Chester, from the month of September, 1644, to the surrender of the city in the month of January, 1646, is a record of the firm and unconquerable endurance of all the evils and miseries that can be sustained by any besieged city, with this exception, that the valour of the garrison, to the very last saved it from the horrors of a city taken by storm.

Between the month of September, 1644, and the corresponding month of 1645, the city was closely blockaded or actively besieged; and during the whole of that period the garrison was sustained at the expense of the citizens, by means of a weekly levy of £100, paid either in money or money's worth. The sufferings of the citizens, who were already more than half-ruined, were almost unbearable, but those of the garrison were not less severe; for during a considerable part of the siege the only food served even at the table of Lord Byron, the governor, was boiled wheat and the flesh of the horses which were killed, or died from want of provender.

After twelve months of patient endurance the royalists of

Chester were cheered by the intelligence, that the king in person was advancing along the Welsh borders at the head of the royal cavalry; and this intelligence was in a few days confirmed by the arrival of the unfortunate Charles, with the remains of his army.

The affairs of the king having become all but hopeless after the battle of Naseby and other disasters, the king, who had retired to the borders of South Wales, formed the desperate design of marching into Scotland with the royalist cavalry, and there joining the marquis of Montrose, who was at that time at the head of a powerful royalist force. Leaving Hereford about the 20th September, 1645, the king marched with the royal cavalry, commanded by Sir Marmaduke Langdale, along the Welsh borders, by way of Chirk castle, and arrived at Chester without encountering the parliamentary forces. But his movements were well known to them, and Poyntz, the commander of the parliamentary cavalry, was sent to meet the king at Chester, and to give battle to his forces if they should attempt to proceed further north than that city. The royalists having arrived in safety at Chester, prepared to give battle, but in doing so committed the fatal blunder of dividing their forces. Sir Marmaduke Langdale, leaving the city at the head of a large body of the royal cavalry, crossed the Dee at Holt bridge, and advanced to Rowton Heath, in front of the city of Chester, where Major-General Poyntz was ready to receive him with the parliamentary horse. On the following morning Sir Marmaduke Langdale attacked the parliamentary cavalry with great determination, and drove them back for a short distance, but without being able either to break or drive them off the field. In this posture of affairs he sent urgent and repeated messages to Lord Gerard, who commanded the royal forces left in the city, to burst out and join him. They, on the other hand, were not less urgent with Sir Marmaduke Langdale to fall on the rear of the besieging force under Colonel Jones, who still remained before the city, and thus to establish the desired communication between the royalists within and the royalists without the city. Meanwhile, Colonel Jones, without losing a moment of time, collected 500 horse and 300 foot, and with these commenced a brisk attack on the rear of Sir Marmaduke Langdale's forces, at the same time that General Poyntz attacked him furiously in front. The royalists thus attacked in front and rear, were soon thrown into confusion, and fell back towards the city by way of Hool Heath, closely

followed by the enemy. There they met the rest of the royal forces advancing to their assistance, under the command of Lord Gerard and the earl of Lindsay; but such was the disorder of Langdale's forces that they blocked up the roads along which the relieving forces ought to have advanced, and at the same time a fresh body of the parliamentary musqueteers opening a heavy fire on the royalist forces, they were all thrown into confusion, and driven back into the city in utter rout. In this disastrous battle the loss of the royal army, both in killed and wounded, was very great, and with this defeat all hope of raising the siege of Chester was lost. The unfortunate king was a personal witness of the defeat of this his last army, from the leads of the Phoenix tower, one of the loftiest points of the walls of Chester. On the following day the king retired from the city, in the direction of Denbigh, with about 300 horse. Before doing so he informed Lord Byron, who was still the governor, that if after eight days they saw no further possibility of relief the garrison should treat for their own preservation. Neither days, nor weeks, nor months brought the slightest prospect of relief, for the royal cause was utterly lost in every part of England. The brave garrison of Chester, however, though thus authorized to make terms for themselves, held out for many weeks longer.

On the 25th September, the day after the disastrous battle of Rowton Heath, Charles left the city by the Dee bridge with a few hundred horse, and with some difficulty reached the castle of Denbigh, on his way to his last refuge, as a free sovereign, at Raglan castle. It is not necessary for the purposes of this work to follow up in detail, the story of his surrender to the Scottish army at Newark, his surrender by that army to the Long Parliament, the changes in his captivity, his attempts at escape, his capture, his trial, and his death. All these events were, no doubt, watched with the most intense interest by his subjects in all parts of the kingdom, and it was not long before strong differences of opinion arose, both as to the manner in which the king should be treated, and as to the method in which the kingdom should be governed. Meanwhile, the departure of the king from Chester was followed in a few months by the submission of the whole kingdom to the authority of Parliament. Lathom house, as we have already stated, surrendered in the month of December of the same year; but the city of Chester held out till the end of January, 1646. Two days

after the king's departure from Chester, the parliamentary forces again forced the outer walls at Boughton, and repossessed themselves of the suburbs up to the east gate and to the old Roman wall. On the Monday following, an attempt was made by the besiegers to scale the inner wall, near the new gate, where a breach had been formed by the parliamentary cannon; but this attempt was successfully resisted, as well as another assault made on the 1st of October, at the east gate. The failure of the latter assault was followed by a resolute sally, in which the guns of the parliamentary forces were dismantled, and several officers and men of the besieging force were made prisoners.

On the 6th of October a heavy fire was opened by the besiegers on that part of the city wall which joins the new tower, and on the 8th as many as 352 large shot were discharged against the city walls, and two large breaches were made, which, however, were partially repaired in the night. On the afternoon of the following day, the parliamentary forces made a furious assault at every point of the walls at which there appeared to be a possibility of effecting an entrance. At several points the assailants succeeded in reaching the top of the walls, but it was only to be killed or hurled down into the trenches. At every point the attack was repulsed, many prisoners and arms were taken, and the scaling ladders were dragged over the walls into the city. This was the last attempt made to storm the city, and from this time the siege was turned into a close blockade. The garrison, after struggling against famine and disease to the middle of January, agreed to surrender on honourable terms; and on the 3rd of February, 1646, the city of Chester was surrendered, after having been more or less closely besieged from the month of August, 1643. In all the history of the great civil war, there is no record of any other city that did or suffered so much for the royal cause.

The close of the contest between the king and the Parliament was not attended by the restoration of tranquillity or contentment. The power of the Crown, once so formidable, had been struck down, but no authority had been created in its place capable of exercising the powers of an executive government to the general satisfaction. For the first time in English history the House of Commons attempted to unite in its own hands all the powers of government. The effect of this attempt was to produce extreme and constantly growing dissatisfaction, not only among the royalists who had fought

for the Crown, but also amongst a large and influential portion of those who had fought for the Parliament, but had done so with a view of restraining the excessive power of the Crown, and not of destroying a monarchical form of government in England. The discontent on grounds of religion was not less decided than on account of the civil policy of Parliament. The Presbyterians had vehemently resisted the tyranny of Laud, and had overthrown the Episcopal church, but they were themselves unwilling to endure the equality of the Independents, and still less to allow the country to be governed by Cromwell and the leaders of the Independent party. In Lancashire especially, the Presbyterian system of church government had taken a very firm hold on the public mind, and the whole county was organized on the Presbyterian system as it was then practised in Scotland. For some time these differences were confined to disputes and discussion in Parliament and in the country; but in the year 1647 the public mind became greatly excited in the north of England, and in 1648 the Scottish nation rose in arms and organized a powerful army, under the first duke of Hamilton, for the purpose of settling the Presbyterian government according to the Covenant, and of liberating and re-establishing Charles I. in the kingly office. After securing the support of nearly the whole of the Scottish people, this army, consisting of about 24,000 men, entered England, and marched into Lancashire, hoping to receive a large increase of strength in that and the adjoining counties, and so reinforced to advance on London, and compel the Long Parliament to restore the king and establish the Presbyterian form of government in all parts of England.

Great and general as was the discontent then prevailing in England, there were few persons disposed to join the Scottish army on its advance into England. A national jealousy of the Scotch restrained many from doing so who were friendly to their objects; the royalists were unwilling to fight for a Presbyterian church establishment; and the English Presbyterians were not prepared to see the king restored by an armed force. Hence the number of Englishmen who joined the Scottish army was very small; and whilst the public thus stood doubtful and hesitating, Cromwell, whose great military genius caused him to be employed by the Parliament whenever real danger threatened it, was placed at the head of a powerful army, with which he fell on the duke of Hamilton's forces, on their march through Lancashire, and



routed, scattered, or drove back into Scotland the whole of the invading forces.

On hearing of the advance of the Scottish army into England, the Parliament immediately despatched forces into Lancashire to prevent a rising amongst the royalists and the Presbyterians of that county. Cromwell's own regiment was sent to garrison Manchester, where the Presbyterians were known to be very strong, and where Major-general Massey, who had successfully defended the city of Gloucester against the whole royal army, but had now become a great leader among the disaffected of Cheshire and Lancashire, calculated on receiving numerous recruits. Another regiment was also stationed at Liverpool; a strong garrison at Chester; and Cromwell himself hastened in person to the point of danger.

Cromwell was in Wales with a considerable army when he received the order of Parliament to march against the Scotch, who had entered Lancashire. He immediately moved into Yorkshire, to join another body of troops which had been collected for the same expedition. These he joined at Knaresborough and Wetherby, near York, and there, hearing that the Scotch army had advanced into Lancashire and crossed the Lune, he marched on the 13th of August, 1648, up the valley of the Wharfe, towards Craven and the head of the Ribble. At Otley he cast off or abandoned his train of waggons, and sent it to Knaresborough castle, on account of the difficulty of marching with it over the Craven hills, and in order that he might come more suddenly on the enemy. On the 15th he was at Gisburn, in Ribblesdale, and on the 16th crossed the Hodder at Hodder bridge. There he held a council of war, to consider whether he should march along the south side of the Ribble to Whalley and Chorley, to interpose between the enemy and his further progress into Lancashire; or should march along the north side of the river and engage the enemy near Preston. Having reason to believe that the Scottish army would soon be reinforced by 1200 horse and 1500 foot, which had just arrived from Ireland, under the command of General Monro, he determined to advance on Preston, and to give battle as soon as possible. The army therefore marched along the north side of the Ribble, and on the night of the 16th encamped in the fields in front of Stoneyhurst hall, "being Mr. Sherburn's house," nine miles distant from Preston.

It was fortunate for Cromwell that he came to the decision of attacking the invading army without delay; for that army, not

dreaming of any such attack, was marching through the country with very little order, the vanguard being far in advance of the main body, and part of the cavalry still farther in the rear. The night before Cromwell's army attacked the Scotch at Preston, Sir Marmaduke Langdale, the commander of the royal cavalry, who had joined the Scotch, on their advance into England, brought intelligence to the duke of Hamilton at Preston, that Cromwell's army was within a few miles of the town; but so little credit was given to the news that a body of the Scotch foot was sent on to Wigan, and the horse were allowed to remain in their quarters, ten or twelve miles distant from the town. Even when the advance guard of Cromwell appeared, it was supposed to be nothing more than an exploring party.

Very early on the morning of the 17th August, Cromwell left his encampment at Stonehurst and marched upon Preston. Sending forward a small body of 400 foot, under the command of Major Pownell, and of 200 horse, under Major Smithson—known at that time as “the forlorn of foot” and “the forlorn of horse”—to feel the way; he found part of the Scottish army on Fulwood Moor, near Preston, and part of them within the inclosures around the town. There Cromwell's advance guard fell upon the scouts and out guards, “and did behave themselves,” as Cromwell says in his letter to the speaker of the House of Commons, “with that valour and courage, as made the guards (which consisted both of horse and foot) to quit their ground, and took divers prisoners, holding this dispute with them until our forlorn of foot came up for their justification, and by those we had opportunity to bring up our whole army.”

As soon as the foot and horse were come up, which was not until the afternoon, a general attack was made. Colonel Harrison's and Cromwell's own regiments were ordered to charge up a lane, in front of the Scotch position, supported by the regiments of Colonels Read, Dean, and Pride on the right, Colonel Bright and the Lord-general's (Fairfax) on the left, and Colonel-general Assheton with the Lancashire regiments as a reserve. Two regiments of horse, under Colonel Thornhaugh and Colonel Twisseton, were also placed on the right, one regiment of horse as a reserve in the lane, and the remainder of the horse on the left. The Scotch held their ground with desperate courage for four hours, defending the hedge-rows and every point of advantage; but were at length driven into the town, and there, being attacked on all sides, were forced back to

the bridge across the Ribble. "There came no hands of your (the parliamentary) foot to fight that day but did it with incredible valour and resolution, amongst which Colonel Bright's, the Lord-general's, Lieutenant-colonel Read's, and Colonel Assheton's had the greatest work, they often coming to push of pike and to close firing, and always making the enemy to recoil; and, indeed, I must needs say, God was as much seen in the valour of the officers and soldiers of these before mentioned, as in any action that hath been performed, the enemy making (though he was still worsted) very stiff and sturdy resistance." "At last," continues Cromwell, "the enemy was put into disorder, many men slain, many prisoners taken; the duke, with most of the Scots horse and foot, retreated over the bridge, where, after a very hot dispute betwixt the Lancashire regiments, part of my Lord-general's and them being at push of pike, they were beaten from the bridge; and our horse and foot following them, killed many and took divers prisoners; and we possessed the bridge over Darwin and a few houses there, the enemy being driven up within musket shot of us, where we lay that night, we not being able to attempt further upon the enemy, the night preventing us."

The battle at Preston decided the fate of the campaign. The horse of Hamilton's army, which was straggling in the rear, ten or twelve miles distant from the field of battle, on learning that the foot had been defeated, and that the only bridge by which they could have hoped to have joined them was in the hands of Cromwell's troops, fell back to Lancaster, closely followed by the parliamentary cavalry, which pursued them nearly ten miles, "and had execution of them," besides taking many prisoners and about 500 horses. On the field of battle at Preston the greater part of the enemy's ammunition was taken, with 4000 to 5000 stand of arms. The number of slain was judged to be about 1000, and the number of prisoners taken was about 4000.

In the course of the night, Duke Hamilton drew off his army towards Wigan, and Cromwell's troops being too weary with the battle and the previous long marches to prevent them, they got a start of about three miles before they were pursued. At Chorley, Colonel Thornhaugh, at the head of two or three regiments of horse, came up with the rear of Duke Hamilton's army. "I ordered," says Cromwell, "Colonel Thornhaugh to command two or three regiments of horse to follow the enemy, if it were possible to

make him stand till we could bring up the army. The enemy marched away 7000 or 8000 foot, and about 4000 horse; we followed him with about 3000 foot and 2500 horse and dragoons; and in this prosecution [pursuit] that worthy gentleman, Colonel Thornhaugh, pressing too boldly, was slain, being run into the body, and thigh, and head by the enemy's launcers: and give me leave to say he was a man as faithful and gallant in your service as any, and one who often heretofore lost blood in your quarrel, and now his last. He hath left some behind him to inherit a father's honour, and a sad widow; both now the interest of the commonwealth."

After the check at Chorley the parliamentary horse continued the pursuit, and the same night arrived before Wigan, but too late to make any attack. "We lay that night in the field," says Cromwell, "close by the enemy, being very dirty and weary, and having marched twelve miles of such ground as I never rode in all my life, the day being very wet." On the following day Duke Hamilton's army marched towards Warrington, closely followed by Cromwell's army. "The town of Wigan," says Cromwell, "a great and poor town, and very malignant, were plundered almost to their skins by them."

The last stand made by Duke Hamilton's army was at Winwick, or, as Cromwell calls it, "a pass near Wenwick," within three miles of Warrington. "We held them in some dispute," says Cromwell, "till our army came up, they maintaining the pass with great resolution for many hours, ours and theirs coming to push of pike and very close charges, and forced us to give ground; but our men, by the blessing of God, quickly recovered it, and charging very home upon them, beat them from their standing, where we killed about 1000 of them, and took, as we believe, about 2000 prisoners, and prosecuted them home to Warrington town, where they possessed the bridge, which had a strong barricado and a work upon it formerly made very defensive. So soon as we came thither, I received a message from Lieutenant-general Baily, desiring some capitulation, to which I yielded. Considering the strength of the place, and that I could not go over the river within ten miles of Warrington with the army, I gave him these terms—that he should surrender himself and all his officers and soldiers prisoners of war, with all his arms and ammunition and horses to me, I giving quarter for life, and promising civil usage; which accordingly is done, and the commissioners deputed by me have received, and are receiving, all the

arms and ammunition, which will be, as they tell me, about 4000 complete arms, and as many prisoners; and thus you have their infantry totally ruined."

After this second great disaster the duke of Hamilton marched southward, with about 3000 horse, towards Nantwich, the gentry and the trained bands of the county of Chester rising upon them and taking more than 500 prisoners. Cromwell followed slowly, his troops being utterly worn out. He says, "Most of the nobility of Scotland are with the duke. If I had 1000 horse that could but trot thirty miles, I should not doubt but to give a very good account of them; but truly we are so harrassed and haggled out, that we can only walk an easy pace after them."

The work, however, was so completely done that the feeble remnant of the duke of Hamilton's forces soon wasted away, and the duke himself was taken prisoner at Uttoxeter. From that place he was carried to London, where he was beheaded in March, 1649.

The success of Cromwell in this campaign, as well as in all his previous enterprises, greatly increased his power and that of the army, which was devoted to him, and in the same degree diminished the power of the Parliament. At the conclusion of his despatch, from which we have quoted above, he took the liberty to give the House of Commons a little good advice, the object of which was twofold: first, to excite them to treat the military saints, of whom he was the head, with more consideration than they had hitherto done; and secondly, "to destroy out of the land those that are implacable and will not leave troubling the land," meaning, of course, the king, the duke of Hamilton, and other dangerous royalists. The whole course of public proceedings under the direction of Cromwell became increasingly offensive to moderate men; but the regular army was devoted to him, and Parliament soon after disbanded and disarmed the militia. The Lancashire militia, although they had greatly distinguished themselves in the campaign of 1648, were ordered to be disbanded, by a vote of Parliament, come to in the month of December of the same year. The disarmament took place in the month of March, 1649, but was attended with much difficulty, as it was for some time doubted whether they would consent to be disbanded. In Whitelock's Memorials, under date of March 20, it is stated as follows:—"Letters from Lancaster state that the forces of Colonel Assheton, about 4000, refuse to disband, profess for the Covenant, and are encouraged by the clergy: that Major-general Lambert is gone

to disband them by force, if there is no other way." On the 27th of March, we are told:—"The Lancashire forces submitted to disband, and quitted Clitheroe castle; orders for that castle to be demolished, and that the council of state consider what other inland castles are fit to be demolished." With the disbanding of the militia in Lancashire and other counties, the power of Parliament, as an independent body, entirely passed away; and Oliver Cromwell, at the head of a victorious army of 30,000 men, became the real governor of England, although some of the forms of parliamentary government were continued. It was by his influence that the king was tried and executed at the commencement of the following year, an event by which the seeds of another short but bloody and desperate conflict were sown.

The condition of Lancashire at the close of the campaign of 1648 was truly miserable, the whole county having been laid waste by famine, sword, and pestilence. The following paper, published in the month of May, 1649, will show to how deplorable a condition it had been reduced:—

"A True Representation of the present Sad and Lamentable Condition of the County of Lancaster, and particularly of the Towns of Wigan, Ashton, and the parts adjacent.

"*May 24, 1649.*

"The hand of God is evidently seen stretched out upon the county, chastening it with a three-corded scourge of sword, pestilence, and famine, all at once afflicting it. They have borne the heat and burden of a first and second war, in an especial manner above other parts of the nation. Through them the two great bodies of the late Scottish and English armies passed, and in their very bowels was that great fighting, bloodshed, and breaking. In this county hath the plague of pestilence been raging these three years and upwards, occasioned chiefly by the wars. There is a very great scarcity and dearth of all provisions, especially of all sorts of grain, particularly that kind by which the country is most sustained—oats—which is full sixfold the price that of late it hath been. All trade, by which they have been much supported, is utterly decayed. It would melt any good heart to see the numerous swarms of begging poor, and the many families that pine away at home, not having faces to beg—very many craving alms at other men's doors who were used to give others alms at their doors; to see paleness, nay,



death, appear in the cheeks of the poor, and often to hear of some found dead in their houses, or highways, for want of bread.

“But particularly the towns of Wigan and Ashton, with the neighbouring parts, lying at present under the sore stroke of God in the pestilence, in one whereof are full 2000 poor, who for three months and upwards have been restrained, no relief to be had for them in the ordinary course of law, there being none at present to act as justices of the peace; the collections in our congregations (their only supply hitherto) being generally very slack and slender, those wanting ability who have hearts to pity them. Most men’s estates being much drained by the wars, and now almost quite exhaust by the present scarcity and many other burdens incumbent upon them, there is no bonds to keep in the infected hunger-starved poor, whose breaking out jeopardeth all the neighbourhood. Some of them already being at the point to perish through famine, have fetched in and eaten carrion and other unwholesome food, to the destroying of themselves and increasing of the infection; and the more to provoke pity and mercy, it may be considered that this fatal contagion had its rise evidently from the wounded soldiers of our army left there to cure.

“All which is certified to some of the reverend ministers of the city of London, by the mayor, minister, and other persons of credit, inhabitants in, or well-wishers to, and well acquainted with, the town of Wigan, together with four godly and faithful ministers of Lancashire, by providence in this city at present.

“Now, if God shall stir up the hearts of any or more congregations in and about the city of London (the premises considered), to yield their charitable contribution to the necessities of these afflicted and distressed parts and places, it will be carefully sought after and thankfully received by Mr. James Wainwright, Mr. Thomas Marke-lande, Mr. James Winstanley, and Mr. John Leaver, or some of them, and faithfully disposed, according to Christian discretion, by Major-General Assheton, William Ashurst, Peter Broke, esquires, Mr. Jolly, mayor of Wigan, together with Mr. Richard Heyrick, Mr. Charles Herle, Mr. Alexander Horrockes, and Mr James Hyet, ministers of the gospel, or some of them.

“AMBROSE JOLLY, Mayor,	} <i>Of the</i> <i>Town of</i> <i>Wigan.</i>	“JAMES HYET,	} <i>Ministers</i> <i>of</i> <i>Lancashire.”</i>
“JAMES BRADSHAW, Minister,		“RICH. HOLLINGSWORTH,	
“JOHN STANDISH,		“ISAAC AMBROSE,	
“RALPH MARKLAND, } Bailiffs,		“JOHN TILSEY,	

But the war was not yet ended. The Scottish Parliament and people, partly from hatred to Cromwell and his military faction, partly from a lingering affection for their ancient line of kings, not merely opposed and resented the execution of Charles I., but also received and acknowledged his son, Charles II., as their lawful king. For some time the second Charles was known in England as "the king of the Scots," and as such he and his supporters waged a stout war against Cromwell in Scotland. When he found that his position in that country was no longer tenable, Charles marched boldly into England at the head of a powerful and well-disciplined army. In August, 1651, the Scottish army again crossed the border, and on the 12th day of that month Charles entered Lancaster, at the head of 14,000 men, and was proclaimed "king of England" at the market cross in that town. On his march southward, he slept that night at Ashton hall, near Lancaster; the next night at Myerseough Lodge, on the Wyre; the third night at Bryn hall, the ancient seat of the Gerards, between Wigan and Warrington; and arrived at Warrington bridge without having met with any part of the army of Cromwell, which was marching rapidly from Scotland to place itself between London and the Scottish army. After a march of extraordinary rapidity from the neighbourhood of Stirling, by way of Coldstream, Lieutenant-general Lambert and Major-general Harrison, two of Cromwell's best generals, succeeded in reaching the south bank of the river Mersey, at Warrington bridge, with a body of cavalry, a few hours before the Scotch army arrived there. But Cromwell's infantry was still a considerable distance in the rear; and all that Lambert could do was to check the progress of the Scottish army for a few hours. In a despatch from General Lambert, dated August 17, 1651, he gives the following account of the action at Warrington bridge:—"I lately," says he, "gave you an account of our march to Warrington, together with my thoughts of the untenableness of that passage; since which time the enemy, pressing close after us, came to Warrington town, before we could get the bridge broken. It was then thought fit to draw off, and endeavour to retreat, at least to some ground where the horse might have room to stir, the nearest ground being Knutsford Heath, eight miles off, and the way very close and full of hedges. We having got some few pioneers, cut our way through the hedges, and marched our foot on the right and left, and our horse in the lanes. Our business at first looked very ill-favouredly, the enemy having drawn up at least

2000 foot close to our rear-guards before we drew off. Yet, through God's assistance, we passed untouched for about two miles. The enemy coming on hotly, we engaged ; it not being possible to avoid it. I commanded the rear-guard, which consisted of the General's, Colonel Twisleton's, and mine own regiments, to charge, which accordingly they did, and routed them ; and their own men falling foul upon their other two bodies, routed them also. We had the pursuit of them at least a mile. We killed him who commanded the party (Colonel Bailey), and about eight more, and took six prisoners, besides divers wounded. This gave us time to ride two miles without any more trouble, and to draw out a new rear-guard of Colonel Rich his regiment, which having done, they again engaged us, and we charged them with the same success, killed, and took the same number, and afterwards marched quietly to Knutsford Heath, where we now are. We lost but one man in our retreat, who was taken prisoner in pursuing too far."

With the exception of this skirmish the royal army passed through Lancashire and Cheshire without meeting with any other enemy, and proceeded towards Worcester, where it was soon after utterly routed by Cromwell.

The earl of Derby arrived from his little kingdom of Man on the same day on which the Scottish army, with King Charles II., crossed the river Mersey at Warrington, and marched southward through Cheshire towards Shrewsbury, Worcester, and the Welsh border, where it was hoped by the king and his supporters that it would be joined by a large body of English and Welsh royalists. The force of the earl of Derby landed in Wyre Water, near the present port of Fleetwood, from three frigates, which brought over a number of officers and a few soldiers. The earl at once set up the banner of the king, and was joined by a considerable number of the Lancashire royalists. He had also expected to be joined by a large body of Presbyterians, who had become bitterly hostile to Cromwell and to his party in the Long Parliament. But before the Presbyterians could move, or the royalists could organize their forces, a regiment of horse, which Cromwell had sent into Lancashire, under Colonel Lilburne, together with the parliamentary garrisons of Liverpool and Manchester, assembled rapidly in front of the earl of Derby, as he moved southward to join the king, and compelled the earl to fight a decisive battle in the neighbourhood of Wigan. Colonel Lilburne, in describing the events which preceded that battle, says in one of

his despatches :—"The earl began to beat drums and raise men in all places where he came, and would have been very strong in a short time, not only through the access of many malignant papists and disaffected persons, but also by the assistance that the ministers and those who are called Presbyterians afforded, and would more abundantly have afforded; for they are the men who are grown more bitter and envious against you than others of the old cavalier stamp." In anticipation of the rising of the Presbyterians, Cromwell had strengthened the garrison of Liverpool, commanded by Lieutenant-colonel Birch, and had placed his own regiment of foot in garrison at Manchester, "where the earl of Derby had the assurance of the assistance of 500 men in and about the town." With his own regiment, and with the Liverpool and Manchester troops, Colonel Lilburne, on the 25th of August, attacked the earl of Derby's forces as they were advancing southward along Wigan Lane, and completely defeated and dispersed them.

In this battle Sir Thomas Tyldesley, the most distinguished of the Lancashire royalists in point of military talent, was killed, and all the other loyalists were killed, taken, or dispersed. The earl of Derby escaped from the battle, and finding that everything was lost in Lancashire, made his way southward through Cheshire to the royal army in the neighbourhood of Worcester. There he was present at the greatest of all the defeats of the royal cause, and the most signal of the victories gained by Cromwell.

After the battle of Worcester and the complete overthrow of the royalist army, the earl of Derby escaped from the slaughter and pursuit, and tried to return to Lancashire. But he was captured a few days after the battle by a parliamentary officer, named Major Edge, and was conducted as a prisoner to the city of Chester. In order to strike terror into the royalist party, the government determined to bring him to trial for the crime of high treason against the Commonwealth. He was accordingly tried at Chester before a military commission; and as there was no doubt that he had always been one of the most determined enemies of the then existing government, he was convicted and sentenced to be beheaded. In order to diminish the odium of this execution, the earl of Derby was sentenced to be executed at Bolton, the place which he had taken by storm early in the civil war, and where many cruelties had been inflicted on the inhabitants and the garrison, for which it was attempted to render him personally responsible. He died as he

had lived, with the most perfect firmness and composure, leaving as high and unsullied a reputation as any man who lived in those disastrous times, in which Englishmen stood opposed to each other in mortal strife. The whole of his vast estates were for the time confiscated; and many of the most valuable of those estates, including those of Lathom house and Hawarden castle, were never restored to his descendants. A considerable portion, however, of the estates of the family were restored after the re-establishment of the monarchy, and are still possessed by the earls of Derby. After the death of the distinguished nobleman whose melancholy fate we have mentioned, his widow, the celebrated countess, maintained possession of the Isle of Man with great determination, though not without some acts of great severity, which brought upon her the anger of Parliament, and prevented the restoration of a portion of the family estates.

The overthrow of the monarchy neither restored peace nor freedom; and although the rule of the Protector, Cromwell, was vigorous both at home and abroad, it gave little satisfaction to the mass of the nation. Numerous conspiracies and several formidable insurrections disturbed the rule of the Protector; and at the close of his life there was a general movement of opinion tending to the restoration of the monarchy. It is no part of the object of this work to trace this movement or its consequences except so far as it affected the counties of Lancaster and Chester.

The first and boldest movement towards the restoration of the monarchy made after the death of Oliver Cromwell, was that of Sir George Booth, Bart., of Dunham Massey, in Cheshire. The immediate object of this movement was to seize the city of Chester and the castle of Liverpool, as rallying points for the friends of the monarchy in the north-western counties. Sir George Booth was himself a soldier of some skill and reputation, having defended Nantwich for the Parliament in the great civil war. He was also the brother-in-law of Sir William Brereton, the great parliamentary leader of Cheshire; and from his wealth and influence, as well as his known loyalty and love of parliamentary government, possessed the confidence both of the parliamentary and of the royalist parties in the two counties. He succeeded in his first object, which was that of obtaining possession of the city of Chester; but the attempt made by Colonel Ireland and other Lancashire royalists to seize on the castle of Liverpool was unsuccessful. The whole movement,

indeed, was somewhat premature, and did not meet with any response in other parts of England. In the hope of rousing the country to arms, Sir George Booth moved from Chester with a small force that he had got together to Winnington bridge, near Northwich, which he attempted to hold against the parliamentary forces under General Lambert, one of the most skilful of the parliamentary leaders. There he was overpowered by the army of Lambert, and driven back into Chester, which was soon after taken by the parliamentary forces. Sir George Booth and some others of the leaders of the insurrection escaped for the time; but Sir George was afterwards taken and thrown into prison in London. Happily the power of Richard Cromwell was already tottering to its fall, and hence the life of Sir George Booth was spared. He survived the Restoration of Charles II., and he and his descendants afterwards received the titles of Earl of Warrington and Lord Delamere. The former of these titles afterwards passed by marriage into the family of the Greys, earls of Stamford and Warrington. Within a short time after the rising of Sir George Booth in Cheshire, General Monk, who had been taken prisoner in the royal army at the siege of Nantwich, and who had subsequently entered the army of the Parliament, in which he had risen to a distinguished command, declared in favour of the restoration of Charles II. The Restoration, which took place in the year 1660, put an end to the great civil war, though without settling the questions in which it originated. These were happily—and as far as England is concerned, peacefully—settled, a few years afterwards, by the Revolution of 1688.



## CHAPTER VII.

PROGRESS OF SOCIETY IN LANCASHIRE AND CHESHIRE, FROM THE TIME OF THE DOMESDAY SURVEY (1085-86) TO THE TIME OF THE RESTORATION OF THE MONARCHY (1660) AND THE PLANTING OF AMERICA BY THE ENGLISH RACE.

THE earliest detailed account that we possess of the now populous counties of Lancashire and Cheshire, forming the north-western division of England, founded on actual survey, is that contained in Domesday Book. The survey described in that ancient national record was made in the years 1085 and 1086, near the close of the reign of William the Conqueror, by order of the king, and after consultation with his great Council, Witten, or Parliament, assembled at Gloucester.\* The object of the government in making the survey was to obtain the information requisite for imposing a tax on all descriptions of property, for the defence of the kingdom, threatened with invasion by Cnut, king of Denmark, and Robert, count of Flanders. The survey of the north-western division of England was made under the superintendance of Robert, bishop of Chester, one of the king's clerks or secretaries of state, and of Hugh Lupus, the Norman earl of Chester. The general practice adopted in making this survey was to assemble a jury in which the different classes of the people were represented (*viz.*, the sheriffs, the lords of each manor, the presbyters of every church, the reeves of every hundred, and the bailiffs and villeins or cultivators of every village), in order to ascertain from them, or from witnesses called before them, the facts necessary for forming a correct opinion as to the yearly value of all kinds of taxable property, and of the rights of the crown in every village, town, hundred, and county in the kingdom. This appears to have been done very carefully in the western part of the county of Chester, which was then a tolerably settled and comparatively well cultivated country; and also in the south-western districts of Lancashire. But the survey was much less perfect in the mountainous districts on the eastern side of the two

\* Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Thorpe's translation, vol. ii. pp. 185, 186.

counties, where the country was naturally wild and barren, and had been much desolated in the desperate wars between the Saxons and the Norman invaders; and it was still more imperfect in the northern districts of Lancashire, which then formed almost the northern limit of the territory directly ruled by the kings of England.

At the time when the Domesday survey was made there was no shire or county known by the name of Lancashire. The two northern hundreds of the present county of Lancaster, though already bearing their present names of Lonsdale and Amounderness, were then regarded as parts of the Danish earldom of Northumberland, which extended from the Humber to the Tweed, and of the great county of York, which formed part of that earldom, and reached from the German to the Irish Sea, including that part of the present county of Lancaster which lies between Furness and the river Ribble. The territory lying to the south of the Ribble, and including the present Lancashire hundreds of Blackburn, Leyland, Salford, and West Derby, was then known, not as South Lancashire, but as "The land between the Ribble and the Mersey," and continued to be known by that name for nearly eighty years after the Domesday survey. On the other hand, the county of Chester had been well known as a separate shire or county, under the Saxon kings, almost from the time of Alfred the Great, sometimes by the name of Cestreshire, and at others by that of Legacestreshire, or the shire of the City of the Legion. At that time it not only included all the territory comprised within its present limits, but also the county of Flint to the river Clwydd. We shall describe both the county of Lancaster and that of Chester, with their present limits.

*Lancashire at the time of the Domesday Survey.*—The district of country now included in the county of Lancaster was divided, at the time of the Domesday survey, into eight hundreds, or, as they were generally called in the north of England, Wapentakes; the former being the civil, the latter the military name. The eight hundreds of Lancashire were Lonsdale, Amounderness, Blackburn, Leyland, Salford, Warrington, Newton, and West Derby. But soon after the Domesday survey the hundreds of Newton and Warrington were united to the hundred of West Derby, thus reducing the number of the Lancashire hundreds to six. In other respects the old Saxon or Danish names, as well as the limits of the hundreds, remain almost unaltered to the present day.

The Hundred of Lonsdale—naturally a wild and mountainous country, on its northern and eastern borders—at that time formed part of the county of York, and was soon afterwards made part of what was called Richmondshire; a district extending from beyond Richmond, in Yorkshire, to the Irish Sea, and governed by the earls of Richmond, who were of the family of the earls or dukes of Bretagne or Brittany, and close connections of William the Conqueror.

To the north of the hundred of Lonsdale was the earldom of Cumberland, a still wilder and more mountainous country, of which the king of England was chief lord, but which was governed in Saxon times, and occasionally after the Norman conquest, by the eldest son of the king of Scotland, who paid a nominal homage for it to the king of England. The result of this arrangement was continual discord and confusion along the border, and frequent wars, in which England and Scotland took part. After the reign of King Stephen, the earldom of Cumberland was finally united to the rest of England; and thus the scene of border warfare was removed from the northern limit of Lancashire to that of Cumberland.

At the time of the Domesday survey many of the villis or townships of North Lancashire were returned as "wasta," or waste—a terrible word, expressive of almost total desolation, and that produced by the ravages of war. It was in the northern and north-western divisions of England that the armies of the Conqueror had met with the most desperate resistance from the warlike Saxon and Danish population; and it was there that they had inflicted the most terrible ravages on the country. Lonsdale and Amounderness, being then regarded as parts of Yorkshire and of the earldom of Northumberland, had suffered greatly, especially Amounderness, which was almost totally waste, at the time of the Domesday survey.

The hundred of Lonsdale extends over an area of more than 266,970\* statute acres of land, but of that not much more than the sixth part was cultivated at the time of the Domesday survey. The whole quantity of arable land in the hundred at that time was 240 carucates, otherwise called ploughgates. The carucate was as much land as a yoke of oxen, generally consisting of four animals, could keep in cultivation throughout the whole year. This quantity of land must at first have varied very considerably, in different districts, with the nature of the soil and the strength of the cattle employed in working it. According to Fleta the carucate came to

\* Census of England, 1831.

be fixed at 180 acres; and Walter de Henley, an early writer on English agriculture, states that the carucate consisted of 180 acres on land suited for a three years' rotation of crops, and of 160 on other soils.\* In the rude husbandry of that time the carucate of arable land was usually divided into three parts, of 60 acres each, one of which was sown with wheat, and another with spring corn, whilst the third lay in bare fallow. The quantity of arable land in the Lonsdale hundred being about 240 carucates of 180 acres each, would altogether amount to 43,200 acres, in a total area of about 266,970 acres. The rest of the hundred was in forest, marsh, and mountain pasture, and was not returned as possessing any value at the Domesday survey.

There is no place described as a borough or city in the account of Lonsdale given in the Domesday survey, although we have shown that Lancaster was a station of the Romans many hundred years before. It is also supposed to be the place mentioned as *Caer Werid* by Nennius, the British historian. The town of Lancaster was still surrounded by a wall at the time of the Norman conquest, which is described as the "old wall" in a grant made by Roger Pictavensis, or Roger of Pictou, to the priory of St. Mary, in the reign of William Rufus.† But Lancaster was not at that time a county town, and it is not even spoken of as a borough in the Domesday survey. Mention is made of its church, and of the value of the cultivated land in the township or parish; and we know that the ancient castle and walls, and the rich priory established there by Earl Roger, in connection with the monastery of St. Martin de Sees in Normandy, soon after rendered it a place of importance, and caused it to be selected as the county town for the newly-formed county of Lancaster. The other places in Lonsdale mentioned in Domesday Book are named chiefly on account of the quantity of the taxable land which they contained. Halton, near Lancaster, contained the manor-house and residence of the lord of the district, with six carucates of land. Wittington was also a chief manor, with six carucates of land; Ulverstone with six carucates of land; Aldcliff with two; Slyne with six; Carnforth with two; Poulton with two; Ellet with two; Scotforth with two; and Dalton with two. The district of Lonsdale beyond the Sands

\* Agriculture and Prices in England. By Professor Rogers, M.A., Professor of Political Economy in the University of Oxford. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1866. Vol. I. p. 170.

† Dugdale's Monasticon, Priory of St. Mary's, Lancaster. Vol. vi. p. 997.

seems to have been named Hougun, or Hougennai, by the Saxons or Danes, and to have been comparatively well cultivated, along the coast of Lower Furness, where the land is of excellent quality.

The chief lord of the hundred of Lonsdale previous to the Norman conquest was Tosti, earl of Northumberland, brother of Harold, the last Saxon king of England. After his expulsion and death, and after the conquest of England by the Normans, which the treason and rebellion of Earl Tosti did much to promote, the greater part of Lonsdale was given by William the Conqueror to Roger Pictavensis. It was most of it *terra regis* at the time of the Domesday survey. The Saxon thanes or Danish drengs (almost equivalent to thanes of the lower class) who held land in this district, seem to have been allowed to retain their lands. Amongst the names mentioned are those of Ghilemichel, who held twenty carucates of land; Ernulf, who held six; and Turulf, who held six carucates of land in Ulverstone.

*The Lonsdale Hundred, according to the Domesday Survey.*—The description of the present Lancashire hundred of Lonsdale, as given in Domesday Book, is contained in the account of the lands of Roger Pictavensis, and of the king, William the Conqueror, in Urvicshire, or Yorkshire. There are also mixed up with it accounts of several manors and villis, situated in the present counties of Cumberland and Westmoreland. We have endeavoured to separate the manors and villis included in the Lancashire hundred of Lonsdale, from those belonging to the counties of York, Westmoreland, and Cumberland. The parts of Lonsdale described below are given under two heads in the Domesday survey. The first is that of the lands of Roger Pictavensis, in Yorkshire; the second is that of the lands of the king, in Yorkshire. We give first those of Roger Pictavensis, who was lord of the honor of Lancaster:—

*The Lands of Roger Pictavensis.*—Two manors:—In Lonsdale and Cockerham (Lanesdale and Cocreham); Ulf and Machel had two carucates of land to be taxed.

Three manors:—In Ashton (Eston); Cliber, Machern, and Ghilemichel had six carucates to be taxed; in Ellal (Ellhale), two; and in Scotforth (Scozforde), two.

One manor:—In Burton (Biedon), Earl Tosti had six carucates to be taxed—Roger Pictavensis now has it, and Ernuin, the priest under him; In Yealand (Jalant), four carucates; in Farlton (Farelton), four; in Preston (Prestun), three.

In the account of the land of the king, in Yorkshire, we find the following particulars as to places included in the present hundred of Lonsdale:—

*Lands of the King.*—One manor:—In Melling (Mellinge), Hornby (Horneby), and Wennington (Wenningeton), Ulf had nine carucates of land to be taxed.

In the same manor was a berewick (or subordinate manor), in which Orme had one-half carucate of land to be taxed.

One manor:—In Halton (Haltun), Earl Tosti had six carucates of land to be taxed.

In Aldcliff (Aldeclif), two carucates; Thurnham (Tiernun), two; Hillham (Hillun), one; Lancaster (Loncastre), six; Kirby Lancaster (Cheraloncastre), two.

Hutton (Hotun), two carucates; Newton (Neutune), two; Overton (Oureton), four; Middleton (Middeltun), four; Heaton (Hietune), four; Heysham (Hessam), four.

Oxcliff (Oxeneclif), two carucates; Poulton (Poltune), two; Torrisholme (Toredholme), two; Skerton (Schertune), six; Bare (Bare), two; Slyne (Sline) six.

Bolton (Bodeltone), four carucates; Kellet (Chellet), six; Stapeltontherne (Stopeltierne), two; Newsome (Neuhuse), two; Carnforth (Chreneforde), two.

All these villages belong to Halton (Haltune).

One manor:—In Whittington (Witetone), Earl Tosti had six carucates of land to be taxed.

In Newton (Neutun), two carucates; Arkholme or Arum (Ergune) six; Gressingham (Ghersinctune), two; Hutton (Hotun), three; Causfield (Cautesfelt), three.

Ireby (Irebi), three carucates; Burrow (Borch), three; Leck (Lech), three.

All these villages belong to Whittington (Witetone).

Twelve manors:—In Austwick, &c. (After mentioning several places in Yorkshire, we come to the following Lancashire names):—

Wharton (Warton), Claughton (Clacton) and Caton (Catun); these Torfin held for twelve manors. In these are forty-three carucates to be taxed (about one-fourth in Lancashire).

Four manors:—In Bentham (Benetaim), Winnington (Wininctune), Tatham (Tathaim), Farlton (Farelton), and Tunstall (Tunestalle). Chetel had four manors, and there are in them eighteen carucates to be taxed, and three churches.



One manor :—In Furness (named Hougun), Earl Tosti had four carucates of land to be taxed. In Woodlands (Chilnestreuc), three ; in Sowerby (Sourebi), three ; in Heaton (Hietune), four ; in Dalton (Daltune), two ; in Warthe (Warte), two ; in Newton (Neutune), six ; in Gleaston (Glasserton), two ; in Pennington (Pennigeton), two ; in Kirkby Ireleth (Gerleworde) two ; in Burrow (Borch), six ; in Bardsley (Berretseige), four ; in Whittingham (Witingeham), four ; in High Furness (Hougenai), six. All these villages lie to High Furness (Hougun). Ghilemichel had these ; in these are twenty carucates of land to be taxed.

One manor :—In Aldingham (Aldingham), Ernulf had six carucates to be taxed.

One manor :—In Ulverstone (Ulurestun), Turulf had six carucates to be taxed.

In Bolton (Bodeltun), six carucates to be taxed.\*

The hundred of Amounderness, also accounted in Yorkshire in the Domesday survey, contains 145,110 acres of land, and is the next in order of the present Lancashire hundreds, proceeding southward. The number of vills, or villages, in Amounderness was sixty-one. But the authors of the Survey say :—“ All the villages and three churches belong to Preston. Of these, sixteen are inhabited by a few persons ; but how many inhabitants there may be is not known. The rest are waste.” The number of carucates of land in Amounderness was 168. Taking each of these at 180 acres, it gives 30,240 acres of arable land in the whole hundred, in a total quantity of 145,110 acres ; but nearly the whole of it was then waste.

We have no particulars as to the town of Preston in the Domesday survey, except that it was the head of the hundred of Amounderness ; and that the the whole of the vills of the hundred, with three churches, belonged to it. As early as the time of King Athelstane, Amounderness was granted to the abbey of York, and appears to have been settled and improved by the priests of that abbey, from which circumstance its chief town received the name of Preston, or the “ Town of the Priests.”

The hundred of Amounderness belonged to Earl Tosti before the Norman conquest, to Roger Pictavensis after it, and to William the Conqueror at the time of the Domesday survey. But some time after it became part of Richmondshire, and probably part of the possessions of the Norman earls of Richmond and Bretagne,

\* Domesday Survey, Urveshire or Yorkshire.

† Dagdale's Monasticon, vol. v. p. 3., Ellis' Edition.

which seem to have extended from the middle of the North Riding of Yorkshire into Lancashire, and included portions both of the hundreds of Amounderness and of Lonsdale.

*Amounderness Hundred according to the Domesday Survey.*—In Preston (Prestune), Earl Tosti had six carucates to be taxed. These lands belong thereto:—Ashton (Estun), two carucates; Lea (Lea), one; Clifton (Cliston), two; Salwick (Saleuic), one; Newton (Neutune), two; Freckleton (Frecheltun), four; Ribby (Rigbi), six.

Kirkham (Chicheham), four carucates; Treales (Treueles), two; Westby (Westbi), two; Plumpton (Pluntun), two; Weeton (Widetun), three; Preese (Pres), two; Warton (Wartun), four.

Lytham (Lidun), two carucates; Marton (Meretun), six; Layton (Latun), six; Staining (Staininghe), six; Carlton (Carlentun), four; Bisham (Biscopham), eight.

Rossall (Rushale), two carucates; Brining (Brune), two; Thornton (Torentun), six; Poulton (Poltun), two; Singleton (Singleteain), six; Greenhalgh (Greneholf), three.

Eccleston (Eglestun), four carucates; another Eccleston (Eglestun), two; Elswick (Edelesuic), three; Inskip (Inscip), two; Sowerby (Sorbi), one; Nateby (Aschebi), one.

St. Michael's Church (or Michelescherche), one carucate; Catterall (Catrehala), two; Cloughton (Clactune), two; Newsham (Neuhuse), one; Plumpton (Pluntun), five.

Broughton (Brocton), one carucate; Whittingham (Witingheham), two; Barton (Bartun), three; Goosnargh (Gusansarghe), one; Haigh-ton (Haletun), one.

Threlfield (Trefelfelt), one carucate; Whalley (Watelei), one; Chipping (Chipinden), three; Alston (Actun), one; Fishwick (Fiscuic), one; Grimsargh (Grimesarge), two.

Ribchester (Ribelcastre), two carucates; Billsborough (Bileuurde), two; Swainset (Suenesat), one; Forton (Fortune), one; Crimbles (Crimeles), one; Garstang (Gherestane), six; Rawcliffe (Rodecliffe), two; another Rodecliffe (Rodecliffe), two; a third ditto, three; Hambleton (Hameltune), two.

Stalmin (Stalmine), four carucates; Preesall (Pressouede), six; Mithope (Midehope), one.

All these villages and three churches belong to Preston (Prestune); of these, sixteen have few inhabitants, but how many inhabitants there may be is not known.

The rest are waste. Roger Pictavensis had it.\*

In the six hundreds of Blackburn, Leyland, Salford, Warrington, Newton, and Derby, described as "The land between the Ribble and the Mersey," the people had fared somewhat better in the wars of the Norman conquest. At least, only a part of South Lancashire is described as "waste" at the time of the Domesday survey, chiefly in the Salford and the Leyland hundreds.

The following are the principal particulars as to the hundreds of Blackburn, Leyland, Salford, Newton, Warrington, and West Derby given in the Domesday survey:—

The hundred of Blackburn had been held by King Edward the Confessor in the Saxon times. His chief manors or mansions were at Blackburn, Huncoat (Hunnicot), Walton le Dale (Waletune), and Pendleton (Peniltune), at the foot of Pendle-hill. There were two large woods and an aerie of hawks on these manors. After the Norman conquest the manors with the hundred of Blackburn were granted to Earl Roger Pictavensis, or Roger of Pictou; but at the time of the Domesday survey they were in the hands of the king, Earl Roger having forfeited them by engaging in a treasonable conspiracy against the crown. In the time of Edward the Confessor the hundred of Blackburn was divided into twenty-eight manors, held by as many separate thancs or free tenants, and was cultivated by them or by their sub-tenants. But when the hundred was granted to Roger Pictavensis, he re-granted it to two of his Norman followers, Roger de Busli or Boiseul and Albert Greslet or Gresley, who sub-let or granted it for three years to certain men, eleven in number, who then held eleven and a half carucates of land. The number of carucates or ploughgates of arable land in the manor of Blackburn was forty, and in the other manor eleven carucates and a half, equal to 9270 acres, and eight hides of six carucates each, equal to 8640 acres, making a total of 17,910 acres of land in the 175,590 acres forming the hundred. The value of the hundred to the chief lord in the time of Edward the Confessor was £30 2s. a year—equal to from twelve to fifteen times as much of modern money.†

There is no evidence that King Edward the Confessor ever

\* Domesday Survey, Yorkshire.

† Mr. Thomas Duffus Hardy, F.S.A., in his "Description of the Close Rolls," estimates the value of the money of the Norman and Plantagenet ages at fifteen times that of our present money. Professor Rogers, in his "History of English Agriculture" (vol. 1. p. 690), makes it about twelve times as much as our modern money. By multiplying by twelve the ancient moneys will be brought nearly to ours.

resided at any of his Lancashire mansions or manors ; but his deputies no doubt did so. At most of the manors there was a hunting or hawking establishment, suited for a king whose chief delight was in the sports of the field or the forest. Especially all the thanes, as well as their tenants, were bound to attend and assist at the great hunting parties named "stabilituras," at which all the game of the district was driven into a haia or inclosure, there to be slaughtered by the royal party. The thanes were also bound to attend the hawking and fishing parties of the king.

The church of Blackburn had two carucates of land ; and the church of Whalley had also two, both free from all custom. Around these powerful churches a peaceful population gradually grew up.

Blackburn, though not described as a borough, is supposed to have existed from the time of the Angles, the termination *burn*, "a brook or beck," being Anglian, as distinguished from Saxon. Whalley is mentioned in the Saxon Chronicle, more than a hundred years before the time of the Norman conquest, as the scene of a battle between two Saxon chiefs.

*The Blackburn Hundred according to the Domesday Survey.*— In Blackburn hundred King Edward held Blackburn (Blacheburne). There are two hides and two carucates of land : the church had two bovates of this land, free from all custom, and the church of Saint Mary in Whalley had two carucates of land free from all custom. In the same manor a wood one mile in length, and the same in breadth, and there was an aerie of hawks. To this manor, or hundred, were attached twenty-eight freemen, holding five hides and a half, and forty carucates of land for twenty-eight manors. There was a wood six miles long and four broad, and there were the above-named customs.

In the same hundred King Edward had Huncoat (Hunnicot), with two carucates of land ; Walton (Waletune), with two carucates of land ; Pendleton (Peniltune), half a hide. The whole manor, with the hundred, paid to the king for farm £32 2s.

Roger Pictavensis gave all this land to Roger de Busli and Albert Greslet ; and there are as many men as hold eleven carucates and a half, whom they allowed to be exempt for three years, and therefore they are not taxed.\*

The hundred of Leyland was also held by Edward the Confessor previous to the Conquest. It was granted after the Conquest to Earl Roger, and was forfeited to the king before the Domesday

\* Domesday Survey, Inter Ripam et Mersan.

survey. The chief manors were Leyland and Penwortham. Twelve Saxon thanes or freemen held the land previous to the Conquest; but after it, the hundred was granted to Roger Pictavensis, who gave portions of it to certain of his Norman followers, named Girard, Robert, Radulf, Roger, and Walter. There were also within the hundred a presbyter or priest; six burgesses at Penwortham, opposite to Preston; four radmen or horsemen; eight farmers or villeins; six cottagers; and four herdsmen. There were also at Penwortham a fishery, a wood, and an aerie of hawks. The whole manor and hundred of Leyland paid £19 18s. 2d. of the money of that time to the chief lord, in the reign of Edward the Confessor. The quantity of arable land in cultivation in the Leyland hundred was twenty carucates, or 3600 acres, with one hide, of six carucates, equal to 1080 acres, making a total of 4680 acres of the 79,990 acres included in the hundred of Leyland.

“*The Hundred of Leyland according to the Domesday Survey.*—In Leyland hundred: King Edward held Leyland. There was one hide and two carucates of land, a wood two miles long and one broad, and an aerie of hawks. To this manor belonged twelve carucates of land, which twelve freemen held as twelve manors: in these are six hides and eight carucates; a wood six miles long and three miles and a quarter broad. The men of this manor, and of Salford, did not work as a matter of custom or duty at the hall of the king, nor did they reap in August; they only made one inclosure in the woods; they were subject to fines for wounding and violation, and had all the other customs of the other manors. The whole of the manor of Leyland, with the hundred, rendered to the king £19 18s. 2d. Of the land in this manor Girard holds one hide and a half; Robert, three carucates; Radulf, two; Roger, two; Walter, one. There are four radmen, a priest, fourteen villeins, six cottagers, and two herdsmen; between them they have eight carucates, a wood three miles long and two miles broad, and four aeries of hawks. The whole is worth 50s.; part is waste.

King Edward held Penwortham (Peneverdant); there are two carucates of land, which rendered 10d. There is now a castle there, and there are two carucates in demesne, and six burgesses, three radmen, eight villeins, and four herdsmen; amongst them they have four carucates; there is half a fishery, a wood, and aeries of hawks. As in the time of King Edward, it is valued at £3.”\*

\* Domesday Survey, Inter Ripam et Mersham.

The great hundred of Salford also belonged to Edward the Confessor before the Conquest. The only places mentioned by name in this now populous and wealthy district are Manchester (Mamecestre), Salford (Salford), Rochdale (Recedham), and Radcliffe (Radeclive). But it is stated that there were twenty-one berewicks, that is, subordinate manors or townships. There were extensive forests in this hundred, one of which was nine and a half miles long, and five and a furlong wide, with many inclosures, and aeries of hawks. The churches of St. Mary and St. Michael at Manchester held a carucate of land, free from all custom except danegelt. The hundred of Salford had been granted to Roger Pictavensis, and he had made grants out of the land of that hundred to Nigel, Warin, another Warin, Goisfrid, and Gamel. On the lands granted to the above were three thanes, one priest, thirty villeins, nine cottagers, and ten serfs or slaves; and in the manor of Salford there were two villeins and eight serfs or slaves under the thane. The whole manor and hundred of Salford was of the value of £37 in the money of that age, or upwards of twelve times as much in modern money. The quantity of arable land under cultivation in the hundred of Salford was twenty-one and a half carucates, or 3870 acres, with fourteen hides and a half, of six carucates each, equal to 15,660 acres, making a total of 19,530 acres, in the 214,870 acres included in the hundred.

Manchester is mentioned as a fortified town in the Saxon Chronicle as early as the reign of Edward the Elder, the son of Alfred the Great; but it is not described as a borough in the Domesday survey, though it appears to have been the principal place in the district. The mansion or manor of the chief lord seems to have been at Salford, on the opposite side of the river Irwell; and the hundred of Salford appears to have taken its name from the residence of the chief lord. The lord was Edward the Confessor immediately previous to the Conquest; Roger Pictavensis immediately after; and the king, William the Conqueror, at the time of the Domesday survey. Manchester itself soon after passed into the hands of the De Gresleys, who continued to be barons of Manchester for many ages, and as such were summoned to Parliament. Most of the earlier charters of Manchester were granted by members of that distinguished family.

*“The Hundred of Salford according to the Domesday Survey.—*  
In Salford hundred: King Edward held Salford. There are three



hides, and twelve carucates of waste land, a forest three miles long and the same broad, and there are many haiaas, and an aerie of hawks.

King Edward held Radcliffe (Radeclive) for a manor. There is one hide, and another belonging to Salford. The church of St. Mary and the church of St. Michael held in Manchester (Mamecestre), one carucate of land, free from all custom except danegelt.

To this manor or hundred there belonged twenty-one berewicks, which were held by as many thanes, for so many manors; in which there were eleven hides and a half, and ten carucates and a half of land, with woods nine miles and a half long and five and a furlong broad.

One of these named Gamel, holding two hides of land in Rochdale (Recedham), had them free from all fines, but the following six; viz., theft, inveigling of servants, assault on the highway, breach of peace, removal of boundary, and desertion after enrolment: the fines for these offences were 40s. Others of these lands were free from all custom except danegelt, and some were free from danegelt.

The whole manor, with the hundred of Salford, paid £37 4s. There are now in the manor in the demesne, two ploughs and eight bondmen, and two villeins with one plough. The demesne is valued at 100s.\*

The knights hold the land of this manor by the gift of Roger Pictavensis; Nigel, three hides and half a carucate; Warin, two carucates, and another Warin, one carucate and a half; Goisfrid, one carucate; Gamel, two carucates. In these lands there are three thanes and thirty villeins, nine cottagers, one priest, and ten slaves; amongst them they have twenty-two ploughs. It is valued at £7.\*

The Warrington (or Walintune) hundred was also held by Edward the Confessor before the Conquest; was granted to Roger Pictavensis after that event; and was resumed by William the Conqueror after the conspiracy of Earl Roger. The only place mentioned by name in this hundred is Warrington, where the church of St. Elfin (a Saxon saint) had half a carucate of land. But there were in the hundred thirty-four manors or townships, held by as many drenghs—the Danish word for thanes or military followers. Grants had also been made in Warrington hundred to Norman soldiers named Roger, Tetbald, Warin, Radulf, William, Adelard, and Osmond. The Butlers or De Boteillers, sprung from one of these Norman soldiers, became barons of Warrington. They afterwards

\* Domesday Survey, Inter Ripam et Mersham.

settled in Ireland, where their name is still noble and distinguished.

The value of the Warrington hundred was £14 18s. in the money of that day. The number of carucates of arable land was forty-three, equal to 7740 acres, with one and a half hide, of six carucates, equal to 1620 acres, making a total of 9360 acres.

*“The Hundred of Warrington according to the Domesday Survey.*—In Warrington hundred: King Edward held Warrington (Walintune), with three berewicks, and one hide of land. To this manor belonged thirty-four drenghs, and they had as many manors; in these manors there were forty-three carucates of land and one hide and a half. Saint Elfin had one carucate of land, free from all custom but danegelt. The whole manor and hundred paid to the king £15, save two shillings. There are now two carucates in the demesne, and eight men with one carucate.

The following hold land there: viz., Roger, one carucate of land; Tetbald, one carucate and a half; Warin, one carucate; Radulf, five carucates; William, two hides and four carucates; Adelard, one hide and half a carucate; Osmund, one carucate. The whole of this is valued at £4 10s., the demesne at £3 10s.\*

The Newton hundred had also belonged to Edward the Confessor; had been granted to Roger Pictavensis, and had returned to the king. The church of Winwick or Newton, and the shrine of St. Oswald, chiefly honoured at that place (where King Oswald, the Saxon king and martyr, was slain, and was still supposed to exercise a miraculous influence), had, the former one carucate, and the latter two carucates of land. There were in the Newton hundred thirteen manors, held by as many thanes or drenghs. But the greater part of the hundred of Newton was still in forest, there being a wood ten miles long and six miles wide, and an aerie of hawks. The rent of the whole manor and hundred of Newton was only £10 10s.—equal to from twelve to fifteen times as much in the money of present times. The number of carucates of arable land in the hundred of Newton was only seventeen, equal to about 3060 acres, with five hides, of six carucates each, equal to 5400 acres, making a total of 8460 acres.

*“The Hundred of Newton according to the Domesday Survey.*—In Newton hundred: in Newton (Neweton), in the time of King Edward there were five hides; one of these was held in demesne. The church

\* Domesday Survey, Inter Ripam et Merham.

of this manor had one carucate of land, and Saint Oswald of this vill had two carucates, free from all custom.

Fifteen men, called drenghs, held the other land of this manor for fifteen manors, but they were berewicks of this manor, and they paid altogether £1 10s. There is a wood ten miles long and six miles and two furlongs broad, and there are aeries of hawks.

The freemen of this hundred, except two, had the same customs as the men of Derby (Derbei); in addition they reaped the king's fields two days in August. Those two have five carucates of land, and forfeiture for bloodshed and violation, and the tolls of their tenants or vassals; the king had the others. The whole manor of Newton paid to the king £10 10s. There are six drenghs, twelve villeins, and four cottagers; amongst them they have nine carucates. This demesne is valued at £4.<sup>9</sup> \*

The hundred of Derby, or West Derby, was held by Edward the Confessor previous to the Norman conquest. It was granted to Roger Pictavensis by William the Conqueror, but was resumed by the crown, and was *terra regis*, or king's land, at the time of the Domesday survey. Nearly all the vills, manors, and townships in the West Derby hundred are mentioned by name, with the quantity of land in each, and the names of the thanes by whom they were held. The principal manor of Derby, or West Derby, with six berewicks or subordinate manors, was held by the king, William the Conqueror. The names of the berewicks dependent on West Derby are not mentioned, but they are supposed to have been Liverpool, Everton, Little Crosby, Garston, Thingwall, and part of the present Wavertree. The other manors were held by different thanes. The most wealthy and powerful of these was Uchtred, who held many manors. Amongst these were Lathom and Knowsley, afterwards held by the Fitzhenrys, the Lathoms, and the Stanleys. In addition to these two manors, and to a berewick dependent on the manor of Lathom, which is supposed to have been the present Ormskirk, Uchtred held the manors of Skelmersdale, Kirkdale, Roby, Allerton, Kirkby, Speke, Great Crosby, Aughton, Maghull, Litherland, Walton, Halsall, Dalton, Merton, Lidiate, and Altcar. The manor of Sefton, which now gives title to an earl, was held by five thanes, but soon after passed into the hands of the Molyneuxes, now earls of Sefton, who have held it ever since. The manor of Toxteth was held by two thanes named Bernulf

\* Domesday Survey, Inter Ripam et Mersham.

and Stainulf, but that also soon afterwards passed into the hands of the Molyneux family, who sold it to King John to make a deer park, and many ages afterwards repurchased it, when Toxteth Park was disforested. Amongst the other townships or villis was Walton, which even then had a parish church, with a carucate of land belonging to the priest, situate in the township of Bootle. There was also a priest, and probably a parish church, at Childwall, which is the head of another great parish, extending down to the banks of the river Mersey. At that time Walton was held by a thane named Winston; Litherland by another thane named Elme; Ince by three thanes; Thornton by Ascha; Meols by three thanes; Esmedune, or Smithdown, near Liverpool, by Edelmund; Allerton by three thanes; Winstanley by Ulbert; Wavertree by Leuingus; Bootle by four thanes; Formby by three thanes; Ravenmeols, now covered with the sands of the sea-shore, by three thanes; Holland by Stenulf; Melling by Godene; Barton by Teos; and Halsall by Chetel.

The extent of the arable land in the ancient hundred of West Derby was thirteen and a half hides, of six carucates each, equal to 14,580 acres, and fifty-one carucates and a half, equal to 9270 acres, making a total of 22,850 acres.

The quantity of arable land in the three ancient hundreds of West Derby, Newton, and Warrington, which form the modern hundred of West Derby, was 111 carucates and a half, equal to 20,070 acres, and 20 hides, equal to 21,600, making a total of 41,670 in the 234,730 acres, now included in the modern hundred of West Derby.

In the West Derby hundred, and in the greater part of the land between the Ribble and the Mersey, the thanes paid to the chief lord two ores of silver pennies, each ore equal to about an ounce of silver, yearly for each carucate, or 180 acres, of land. Each tenant or thane also paid £2, equal to £20 or £30, on succeeding to his holding. They also rendered certain services on the lands held by the chief lord. Thus, they all were obliged to send their reapers for one day in August, to cut the lord's corn. They also assisted in building his houses. They likewise attended at the royal fisheries, and formed the inclosures in the forest, into which the game and wild animals of the district were driven, in the great hunting parties of the king. Nearly all the lands in the district on which crimes were committed were subject to fines, payable to the crown, in addition to the personal penalties inflicted on the actual offenders. Thus the fine payable by the land or its owner,

on the commission of a theft, on an assault on the high road, on the enticing a serf or slave away from his master, or on the breaking of the king's peace, was 40s., equal to £20 or £30. The penalty for wounding a man, doing violence to a woman, or not appearing at the assembly of the freemen at the shire-mote, was 10s., equal to from £7 to £10 of modern money. The fine for absence from the hundred court, or for refusing to appear at the place of pleading, when directed to do so by the proper officer, was 5s. of the money of that day; and the fine for refusing to go on any public service when ordered to do so by lawful authority was 4s. There were, however, a few exceptions. Thus the great thane Uchtred was exempt from all forfeitures, in his manors of Crosby and Kirkdale, except for six offences—namely, breach of the peace, assault on the public way, seducing servants or slaves from their masters, desertion from the army, non-payment of debts which the reeve had ordered to be paid, and refusing to appear in a court of justice at the time fixed by law. For these offences the penalty was 40s. As for danegelt, or the tax for the defence of the kingdom against the Danes, Uchtred and his tenants paid that, like the other men of the county. The only exemptions from the payment of danegelt were in the manors of Orrell, Halsall, and Everton, where there were three hides of land free from that tax.

*The Hundred of Derby according to the Domesday Survey.*—In Derby hundred King Edward had one manor, named Derbei, with six berewicks. There were four hides, land sufficient to employ fifteen ploughs; a wood two miles long and one broad, and an aerie of hawks.

Uchtred held six manors, Roby (Rabil), Knowsley (Chenuleslei), Kirkby (Cherchebi), Crosby (Crosbei), Maghull (Maghele), and Aughton (Achetun). There were two hides of land, a wood two miles long and two broad, and two aeries of hawks.

Dot held Huyton (Hitune), and Torbock (Torbock); there was one hide discharged from the payment of all customs except danegelt; and four carucates of land, worth 20s.

Bernulf held Toxteth (Stochestede). There was one virgate of land and half a carucate, worth 4s.

Stainulf held Toxteth (Stochestede). There was one virgate of land and half a carucate, worth 4s.

Five thanes held Sefton (Sextone). There was one hide, worth 16s.

Uchtred held Kirkdale (Chirchedele). There was half a hide quit from all custom except danegelt, worth 10s.

Winestane held Walton (Waletone). There were two carucates of land and three bovates, worth 8s.

Elmae held Litherland (Liderlant). There was half a hide, worth 8s.

Three thanes held Ince (Huine) for three manors. There half a hide worth 8s.

Ascha held Thornton (Torentune). There was half a hide, worth 8s.

Three thanes held Meols (Mele) for three manors. There was half a hide, worth 8s.

Uchtred held Woolton (Uluentune). There were two carucates of land, and half a mile of wood, worth 5s. 4*d*.

Edelmund held Smethom (Esmedune). There was one carucate of land, worth 2s. 8*d*.

Three thanes held Allerton (Alretune) for three manors. There was half a hide, worth 8s.

Uchtred held Speke (Spec). There were two carucates of land, worth 5s. 4*d*.

Four radmen, or horsemen, held Childwall (Cilduelle) for four manors. There was half a hide, worth 8s.; a priest there having half a carucate of land, held in alms.

Ulbert held Winstanley (Wibaldeslei). There were two carucates of land, worth 5s. 4*d*.

Two thanes held Woolton (Uetone) for two manors. There was one carucate of land, worth 2s. 6*d*.

Levingus held Wavertree (Wauretreu). There were two carucates of land, worth 5s. 4*d*.

Four thanes held Bootle (Boltelai) as four manors. There were two carucates of land, worth 5s. 4*d*. A priest had a carucate of land, belonging to the church of Walton (Waletone).

Uchtred held Ashton or Aughton (Achetun). There was a carucate, of land, worth 2s. 8*d*.

Three thanes held Formby (Fornebei) as three manors. There were four carucates of land, worth 10s.

Three thanes held Ainesdale (Einuluesdel). There were two carucates of land, worth 5s. 4*d*.

Sternulf held Holland (Hoiland). There were two carucates of land, worth 5s. 4*d*.

Uchtred held Dalton (Daltone). There was one carucate of land, worth 2s. 8*d*.

The same Uchtred held Skelmersdale (Schelmeresdele). There was one carucate of land, worth 2s. 8*d*.



The same Uchtred held Litherland (Literland). There was one carucate of land, worth 2s. 8*d*.

Wibert held Ravens Meols (Erengermeles). There were two carucates of land, worth 8s. This land was exempt from all customs except danegelt.

Five thanes held Orrell (Otegrimele). There was half a hide, worth 10s.

Uchtred held Lathom (Latune), with one berewick. There was half a hide of land, a wood one mile long and half a mile broad, worth 10s. 8*d*.

Uchtred held Tarleton (Hirletun), and half of Martin (Merretun). There was half a hide, worth 10s. 8*d*.

Godene held Melling (Melinge). There were two carucates of land, a wood one mile long and half a mile broad, worth 10s.

Uchtred held Lidiate (Leiate). There were six bovates of land, a wood one mile long and two furlongs broad, worth 5s. 4*d*.

Two thanes held six bovates of land for two manors in Holland (Hoiland). The value was 2s.

Uchtred held Altcar (Acrer). There was half a carucate of land; it was waste.

Teos held Barton (Bartune). There was one carucate, worth 2s. 8*d*.

Chetel held Halsall (Haleshale). There were two carucates of land, worth 8s.

All this land was liable to pay danegelt, and fifteen manors paid King Edward nothing but danegelt.

This manor of West Derby (Derbei), with the hides above mentioned, paid King Edward for rent £26 2s.; of these, three hides were exempt, the rent of which was granted to the thanes that held them; these paid £4 14s. 8*d*.

All these thanes were accustomed to pay two ores of pennies for each carucate of land; and by custom they built the king's houses, and what belonged to them, as well as the villeins; attended the fisheries, built the haies in the woods, and attended the hunting parties; and whosoever did not go where he was bound to do, was fined 2s., and afterwards obliged to attend, and to work till the business was completed; every one of them, moreover, sent his reapers for one day in August to cut the king's corn, and if he failed he paid 2s.

If any person committed a theft, or an assault on the highway, enticed a servant away, or broke the king's peace, he paid 40s.

If any one wounded a person, or violated a woman, or absented himself from the shire-mote without a reasonable excuse, he paid, 10*s*.

If he absented himself from the hundred court, or went not to the place of pleading directed by the reeve, he forfeited 5*s*.

If he (the reeve) ordered any one to go on a service, and he did not, he was fined 4*s*.

If any one wished to retire from the king's land, he paid 40*s*., and went wherever he wished.

If any one wished, on the death of his father, to succeed to his land, he paid a relief of 40*s*.

If he was not willing, then the king had the land and all the money of the father.

Uchtred held Crosby (Crosebi), and Kirkdale (Chirchedale), for one hide, and it was exempt from all forfeitures but these six—breach of peace, assault on the highway, inveigling of servants, desertion after enrolment, and if the sheriff had adjudged a debt to be paid at a certain day, and the defendant did not keep the time given him, he was to be amerced 40*s*. As for danegelt, this they paid like other men of the country.

In Orrell (Otringemele), and Halsall (Herleshal), and Everton (Hiretun), there were three hides exempt from paying danegelt, fines for wounding, and for violation ; but they were liable to other customs.

By the grant of Roger Pictavensis, the following men now hold the land of this manor of Derby :—Goisfrid, two hides and half a carucate ; Roger, one hide and a half ; William, one hide and a half ; Warin, half a hide ; Goisfrid, one hide ; Tetbald, one hide and a half ; Robert, two carucates of land ; Gislebert, one carucate of land. These have four ploughmen in demesne, and forty-six villeins, and one radman, and sixty-two cottagers, and two bondmen, and three bondwomen ; they have twenty-four carucates amongst them ; their wood is three miles and a half long, and one mile and a half and forty perches broad ; and there are three aeries of hawks. The whole is worth £8 12*s*.; in each hide there are six carucates of land.

The demesne of this manor, held by Roger, is worth £8 ; there are now in demesne three ploughmen, six herdsmen, one radman, and seven villeins.

In these six hundreds, Derby, Newton, Warrington, Blackburn, Salford, and Leyland, there are one hundred fourscore and eight manors, in which there are fourscore hides, save one, to be taxed. In the time of King Edward they were valued at £145 2*s*. 2*d*.

When Roger Pictavensis received them from the king they were valued at £120. The king now holds them and has in the demesne twelve carucates and nine knights holding a fee; between them and their vassals there are one hundred and fifteen carucates, and three bovates. The demesne which Roger held is valued at £23 10s., and what he gave to the knights at £20 11s."

It is stated in the account of the West Derby hundred, given in the above extracts from the Domesday Book, that there were six carucates in each hide of land; but it is impossible to reconcile this with the statement given above, that the number of hides in the six hundreds of (West) Derby, Warrington, Newton, Salford, Blackburn, and Leyland, was seventy-nine, and the number of carucates was 115. This does not give one and a half carucate to each hide. If we take all the carucates mentioned in North and South Lancashire at 180 acres each, and all the hides at six carucates each, the whole quantity of land mentioned as 'arable' is about 100,000 acres in an area of 1,117,260. But large quantities of this land were lying waste, especially in the hundreds of Amounderness, Leyland, and Salford; and it is doubtful whether there were 50,000 acres of land in cultivation at that time. There is not the slightest evidence of the working of mines or the existence of manufactures. There were no towns described as boroughs in any of the six hundreds. The scattered inhabitants, not amounting to more than 5000 to 6000 persons, lived entirely by husbandry, and were clothed in garments spun and woven at their own houses. Of all the districts described in the Domesday survey, that included in the present wealthy and populous county of Lancaster was the poorest and the most thinly peopled. The county of Chester was probably the next, not so much for want of natural fertility, as from the desolation produced by a murderous war and a ferocious conquest. We now proceed to describe that fertile and beautiful county.

*Cheshire at the Domesday Survey.*—The present names of the seven hundreds of Cheshire were most of them unknown at the time of the Domesday survey. At that time the present Macclesfield hundred was known as the hundred of Hamstan; the Bucklow hundred was known as the hundreds of Bochelau and Tunendune; the Nantwich hundred was called the hundred of Warmundestrou; the Northwich hundred was named the hundred of Mildestvic; the Eddisbury hundred included the hundreds of Riseton and Roelau; the Wirral hundred was known as the hundred of Wilavestan; and

the Broxton hundred was known as the hundreds of Dudeston and Cestre. These changes of name are supposed by Sir Peter Leycester\* to have taken place about the reign of Edward III. Much later—in the year 1507, the 23rd of Henry VII.—the Chester hundred was made a county of itself, as the county of the city of Chester, except the castle and its precincts. Still later—in the 33rd Henry VIII., 1541—the hundreds of Atiscross and Exestan, which had always really belonged to North Wales, were united with each other, and were recognized as the county of Flint. The twelve Cheshire hundreds have thus decreased to seven, or to eight, if we include the county of the city of Chester, though without losing any territory, except that which is now comprised in the county of Flint. The modern hundreds do not of course correspond with the old ones in their limits or extent; but they come sufficiently near to enable us to give a general description of the condition of each of them in ancient times.

The revolution through which the county of Chester passed at the time of the Norman conquest was much more sweeping in its consequences than that which was experienced in South Lancashire; and the changes in the ownership of property were more complete.

We have seen that in the country between the Ribble and the Mersey most of the Saxon thanes were still in possession of their estates, almost to the end of the reign of William the Conqueror, who died a year after the Domesday survey was completed; and there is reason to believe that their tenants, the actual cultivators of the soil, were not disturbed in the possession of their farms. In Cheshire, on the contrary, nearly all the Saxon thanes were either killed in battle with the Normans, or were driven from their estates, which were given to the Norman followers of Hugh Lupus and to their military dependents. After the expulsion of the Saxon thanes the whole country was converted into a great military earldom, subject to the earl and to seven or eight barons holding large tracts of land under the earl, with numerous military dependents subject to them. The following is a sketch of the tenure and ownership of lands which prevailed in each of the hundreds of Cheshire, before and subsequent to the Norman conquest, drawn up from the Domesday survey, with the aid of Sir Peter Leycester's "Antiquities of Cheshire," and other works of authority. There is some difficulty, in a few cases, in identifying the old names,

\* Leycester's Antiquities of Cheshire, p. 437.

The hundred of Macclesfield, known at the time of the Domesday survey as the hundred of Hamstan, belonged before the Conquest to the Saxon Earl Edwin, the son of Algar, earl of Mercia, more frequently called earl of Chester. After the Conquest it was given by the Conqueror to Hugh Lupus, the Norman earl of Chester, who retained considerable portions of it in his own hands, but granted the larger part of it to his military followers. The portions of the hundred of Macclesfield or Hamstan which the earl retained in demesne—that is, in his own hands—included the manors of Macclesfield, Adlington, Gawsworth, Merton, Chelford, Henbury, Capesthorne, Henshall, Tintwisle, Hollingworth, Werneth, and Romiley. The rest of the hundred was divided among his barons as follows:—Robert Fitz-Hugh, baron of Malpas, held Butley, near Adlington; Richard de Vernon, another baron, held Bredbury; William Fitz-Nigel, the first baron of Halton, held one-half of Over Alderley; Hugh de Mara held Bosley and Marton; Hamo de Masci held Bromhall; another Norman, named Bigot, held Norbury, half of Over Alderley, Siddington, and Rode; Uluric, another Norman of lower rank, held part of Butley, near Adlington, Mottram, and Alretune; and Gamel held Chadkirk and part of Mottram. Previous to the Norman conquest the manors or townships of the Macclesfield hundred had been held by Saxon thanes, named Bernulf, Godric, Godwin, Brun, Hundin, Haccom, and eight or ten others. The whole of these thanes are described as having been freemen, to distinguish them from the villeins and serfs who cultivated the land. After the Conquest the Saxon thanes were supplanted by Normans, named Robert, William, Hugo, Gamel, and by other Norman soldiers. The classes of men existing in this hundred, in addition to the earl, were knights, thanes, villeins or farmers, radmen or horsemen, millers, herdsman, ploughmen, and “servi,” serfs or slaves. The thanes are all described as freemen; but none of the other classes, most of whom were serfs bound to the soil, and many absolute slaves.

The number of carucates of arable land in the hundred of Macclesfield was 105, equal, if we take them at 180 acres, to 18,900 acres; but very little of this was under actual cultivation at the time when the survey was made. The whole quantity of land in Macclesfield hundred is 150,440 acres. In the time of Edward the Confessor the value of the Macclesfield hundred to the chief lord had been £24 10s. a year, equal to from twelve to fifteen times as much of modern money. But in the wars which followed

the Conquest it had been so completely wasted, that it was only valued at about £4, of the money of that time. Amongst the kinds of property mentioned as existing in the Macclesfield hundred were arable land, meadows, woods, a corn mill, oxen, and horses. There were also aeries of hawks at the principal manors.

The Bucklow hundred, known at the time of the Domesday survey as the Bockelau and Tunendune hundreds, also belonged before the Conquest to Earl Edwin, and under him to numerous Saxon thanes. But after the Conquest all these had perished or been driven from their lands. The Norman earl, Hugh Lupus, held Oullerton, Nether Alderley, and Antrobus; the church of St. Werburg held Mid Aston, and Clifton; Richard de Vernon held Cogshall in Over Whitley; William Fitz-Nigel held Halton, Warburton (half of it), Millington, Knutsford, Over Tabley, Nether Pever, and Tatton, with Weston, near Halton, Aston, near Sutton, Norton, Dutton (part of), Little Legh, Aston, near Budworth, Great Budworth, and Whitley; Hamo de Masci held Dunham Massey, Bowden, Hale, Ashley, and Oullerton (one-half); Bigot held Mobberley; Gislebert de Venables held Lymme (one-half), High Legh, Wincham, Mere, near Over Tabley (part of), Over Pever, and Rosthorne; Gozelinus held Nether Tabley; Ranulf held Tatton (one-half), Nether Pever (part of), Warford, part of Over Pever and Owlarton, Snelston, and Cogshall (one-half); Osborn Fitz-Tezzon held part of Lymme and part of Warburton, Dutton (some part), Appleton, and Grappenhall; Odard held part of Dutton; Mundret held Barnton; Ranulf and Bigot held Norden; Gislebert, Ranulf, and Hamo held Sunderland in Dunham Massey and Baggeley. Previous to the Conquest these manors or townships had been held by Saxon thanes, named Godric, Carle, Erne, Leuinus, Segred, Ulse, Edward, Lewric, Uched, Tochi, Wache, Alward, Ulviet, Lewin, and Godrid, and Dot or Dod. All these had been dispossessed by Norman soldiers.

The quantity of arable land in the Bucklaw hundred was 119½ carucates, equal to 21,510 statute acres; but half this land had been laid waste in the war. The value of the Bucklaw hundred in the time of Edward the Confessor was £11 1s. of the money of that time. But it had suffered so much in the wars of the Conquest that it was considered worth only £5 18s. 4d. at the time of the Domesday survey.\* The quantity of land in the Bucklaw hundred is 107,710 acres.

\* Domesday Survey, Cestrescire. Sir P. Leicester; p. 401.



The Eddisbury hundred includes the greater part of the ancient hundreds of Riseton and Roelau. Previous to the Conquest it belonged to Earl Edwin. After the Conquest Earl Hugh Lupus held Weaverham, Kennardsley, Dunham on the Hill, Elton, Hapsford, Manley, Helsby, and Frodsham; the bishop of Chester held Tarvin, Burton, Idenshall, part of Hapsford and Ince; Robert Fitz-Hugh held Beeston, Tilston, Bunbury, Tiverton, Spurston, and Peckforton; Richard de Vernon held Ashton near Tarvin; Walter de Vernon held Winfleton; William Malbedeng held Ulvre; William Fitz-Nigel held Barrow; Hugh de Mara held Wardle; Baldric held Coshull near Wyrven, or perhaps Kelsall; Gislebert de Venables held Tarpoley, Wetnall, and Harford, near Northwich; Ranulf held Winnington, near Northwich (one-half); Isbert held Clotton, near Utkinton; and Osburn held Winnington, near Northwich (one-half); Nigel held Oulton; Dunning held Kingsley, which the earl added to his forest; and Leuric held Alvanley, which in modern times gave title to a baron. Among the Saxon thanes who were dispossessed in this hundred were Ulfac, Tochi, Grym, Leuric, Gutlac, and Ernut.

The number of carucates of arable land in the Eddisbury hundred was 144, equal to 25,920 acres; but nearly half of it was lying waste. The value in the time of Edward the Confessor was £15 14s., but at the Domesday survey only £9 11s. Much of the land of the Eddisbury hundred was afterwards included in the great forest of Delamere, which extended across the county of Chester from Frodsham and Helsby, on the Mersey, to Beeston, and along the Peckforton hills nearly to Malpas and Overton. On these great hunting grounds were numerous haies, or inclosures, one of which was for goats and kids. There were also aeries of hawks for falconry. The hundred of Eddisbury contains 90,000 statute acres.

The Nantwich hundred was then known as the hundred of Warmandestrou. It chiefly belonged to Earl Edwin before the Conquest. In this hundred William Malbedeng held Acton, Wilaston, near Nantwich, Wrenbury, Chorlton, Marbury, Norbury, Wreyswell, Walkerton, Bosford, Hatherton, Wistaston, Barlesford, Bertherton, Worleston, Bartumley, Titley, Stapeley, Westerton, Bromhale, Poole, near Worleston, Baddily, Coppenhall, Poole, Aston, near Poole, and Cholmston. The bishop held in this hundred Wybunbury; Richard de Vernon held Audlem, Crewe, near Haslington, and Shavington; Gislebert de Venables held Blakenhall,

near Chorlton. Amongst the Saxons dispossessed in this district were Earls Morcar, Edwin, and Harold, as well as the thanes Edwin, Osmer, Dot, Ulviet, Fran, Gundwic, Alden, Godwin, Seward, Derth, Hacon, Elric, Elward, Edric, and many others.

In the Nantwich hundred were  $116\frac{1}{2}$  carucates of arable land, equal to 20,970 acres; but a part of it was waste. The value of the hundred in Edward the Confessor's time was £20 16s., and at the time of the Domesday survey £16 8s. in the money of those days. This was independent of the value of the salt works, which we shall speak of separately. The area of the hundred of Nantwich is 87,640 statute acres.

The Northwich or Mildestvic hundred belonged, previous to the Conquest, to Earl Edwin. After the Conquest Earl Hugh Lupus held Arclid, Sandbach, Clive, Sutton, near Middlewich, Wimboldsby, Weaver, and Occleston; Richard de Vernon held Shipbrook, Sturlach, Leftwich, Moulton, Warton, near Bostock, Davenham, and Bostock; William Malbedeng held Etshal, Church Minshull, Minshull-Vernon, and Sproston, near Middlewich; William Fitz-Nigel held Goostrey and Leghs, near Crannach; Hugh de Mara held Lawton, another Lawton, and Byley near Kinderton, and one-half of Goostrey; Hugh Fitz-Osborne held Somerford; Bigot held Congleton, part of Sandbach, Sutton, Wimboldsly, and Weaver; Gislebert de Venables held Newbold-Astbury, Brereton, Kinderton, Daneport, and Witton-cum-Twam-brook; Gozelinus held Newton, near Middlewich, and Croxton; Ranulf held Wheelock and Tetton; Moran held Leese near Crannach; and Hugh and William held Rode. Among the Saxons dispossessed were Ulric, Osmer, Edward, Bers, Alsi, Hergrim, Godric, Derth, and Elmar.

The number of carucates of arable land in the Northwich hundred was eighty-four and a half, equal to 15,210 acres; but there was much waste land. The value in the time of Edward the Confessor was £8 5s. 7d., and at the time of the Domesday survey £5 17s. 2d. The area of the hundred of Northwich is 69,468 statute acres.

The hundred of Wirrall was then known as the hundred of Wilaveston. The Earl Hugh held Eastham, Thanford, Upton, and Stanney; the bishop held Sutton in Wirrall; the church of St. Werburg held Wyrven, Cloughton, Sutton in Wirrall, Saughall, near Shotwick, Shotwick, part of Neston, and part of Raby; Robert Fitz-Hugh held Sutton; Robert de Rodelent or Ruddlan held Mollington,

Leighton, Thornton, Gayton, Haswell, Thurstaston, Caldý, Meoles, and Wallasey; Robert the Cook (Cocus) held part of Neston and Hargreve in Wirrall; Richard de Vernon held Picton and Hooton; Walter de Vernon held Nesse, Ledsham, and Prenton; William Malbedeng held Wyrvin, Poole in Wirrall, Saughall, Landecan, Upton, near Bidston, Thingwall, and Noctorum; William Fitz-Nigel held Neston, Raby, Capenhurst, and Barnston; and Osborn Fitz-Tezzon held Poulton. The principal Saxon and Danish thanes dispossessed in Wirrall were Ordric, Ragnel, Tochi, Godwin, Ulchattel, Uchtred, Osgot, Edric, and Ermen, with many others.

The Wirrall hundred contained 174 carucates of land, equal to 31,320 acres. The value of the hundred in the time of Edward the Confessor was £72 9s., and at the time of the Domesday survey £49 5s. 10d. The area of the hundred of Wirrall is 63,320 statute acres.

The Broxton hundred, then known as the hundreds of Dudeston and Cestre, belonged in Saxon times to Earl Edwin, whose chief residence seems to have been at Eaton, near Chester. After the Norman conquest Earl Hugh Lupus held Eaton, Lea, Farndon, Rushton, Little Budworth, Olton, and Over, in his own hands; the bishop of Chester also held a portion of Farndon; the church of St. Werburg held Saughton, Cheveley, Huntingdon, Boughton, and Pulford. Robert Fitz-Hugh held Bettlesfield in Flintshire, and Worthenbury in the same county. He likewise held Malpas, Tilton, Criselton, Cholmundley, Edge, Hampton, Larkdon, Dokinton, Chowley, Broxton, Overton, Cuddington, Shocklach, Tussingham, Bickley, Bickerton, Burwardesley, and Crewe hall, near Codynton; William Malbedeng held Tatnall and Golborne; William Fitz-Nigel held Newton, near Chester, and Handbridge, or Beyond Bridge, a suburb of Chester, as well as Clutton, near Farndon; Hugh de Mara held Lee and Radclive; Hugh Fitz-Osborne held Calcot and part of Pulford; Bigot held part of Farndon and Lea, and Torinton; Gislebert de Venables held Eccleston and Alpran; Ranulf Venator or Grosvenor held Stapleford; Ilbert held Warton, near Chester, and part of Eaton; and Osborn Fitz-Tezzon held Hanley and Golborne.

The Broxton hundred contains 77,470 acres, of which 208 carucates or 37,440 acres were cultivated at the Domesday survey. The value at that time was £56 4s. 7d.

*The Salt Springs and Saltworks of Cheshire.*—The brine springs of Cheshire were worked previous to the Norman conquest, though the rock-salt from which they draw their saline particles was not

discovered till more than 500 years after that time. They had probably been worked from the Roman and the British period, for the Roman roads ran through the principal points of the Cheshire salt field, and several of them met at Kinderton, near Middlewich. The latter place was at the time of the Domesday survey what its name indicates—namely, the middle wych, or saltwork, of the Cheshire district. The salt manufacture was already one of the most valuable trades in England.

When Hugh Lupus was created earl of Chester, the saltworks belonging to the crown and the earl, at Middlewich and Northwich, had been abandoned. They had previously paid a rent of £16 a year. Other saltworks at Nantwich, whence the king and Earl Edwin had received £20 a year, equal to £300 to £400 of modern money, were nearly unproductive and disused, there being then in use only one saltwork, out of eight which had been worked previously.

At the time of the Domesday survey the saltworks of Cheshire had somewhat recovered their value. Those at Nantwich—then the principal works—were let to farm by the crown at £10 a year, those at Middlewich at £1 5s., and those at Northwich for £1 15s. The Domesday survey gives the particulars of the duties paid for each waggon load and horse load of salt, which varied in amount according as the salt was sold in the hundred or county, or carried out of them. The customs of the different *wyches* varied also. The earl had a salt pit at Nantwich for the use of his own household, toll-free; but if he sold any of the salt made from it, he had to account to the king for two-thirds of the toll. The proprietors of private saltworks were also permitted to have salt toll-free for the use of their families; but they had to pay toll to the king and earl for all the salt that they sold.

The following is the account of the saltworks of Cheshire as described in the Domesday survey:—

“In the time of King Edward (the Confessor) there was in Nantwich (*Warmundestrou*) hundred one wych in which was a well for making salt; and there were eight saltworks (divided) between the king and Earl Edwin; so that from all outgoings and incomings of salt the king had two parts, and the earl the third. But the earl, besides these, had one saltwork of his own, which was in his manor of Aghton (*Acatone*). From this saltwork through the whole year, the earl had salt sufficient for his own household: but if he sold any from it, the king had twopence of the toll, and the earl one penny.

“In the same wych many men of that district had saltworks, to whom this was the custom:—From the day of the Ascension of our Lord to the Feast of St. Martin, any one having a saltwork was allowed to convey his own salt to his own house; but whoever sold salt from thence to any one, either there or in any part of the county of Chester, paid toll to the king and the earl. After the Feast of St. Martin whoever carried salt thence, whether it was his own or purchased, paid toll except it was from the above-named saltwork of the earl, using his custom. Those eight above-named saltworks of the king and the earl, in every week in which they boiled and worked on the Friday yielded sixteen boilings; of which fifteen made one load of salt. The saltworks of the other men, from the day of the Ascension of our Lord to the Feast of St. Martin, did not give these boilings on Friday: but from the Feast of St. Martin to the day of the Ascension they paid all customs on boiling, as the saltworks of the king and the earl.

“All these saltworks and communes and lordships were surrounded, on one part, by a certain river (the Weaver) and by a certain fosse or ditch, on the other. Whoever committed an offence within these bounds could atone for it by paying 2s. or thirty boilings of salt, except for homicide or theft, for which the offender was adjudged to death; these offences if there committed, were atoned for, as throughout the whole shire.

“If any one from the prescribed boundary of the saltworks, anywhere through the whole county, carried off the toll, it being proved, he brought it back, and was fined 40s. if he was a freeman; if not free, he paid 4s.

“In the time of King Edward this wych, with all the pleas of the same hundred, paid £21. When Earl Hugh received it, it was waste, except only one saltwork. Now William Malbedeng holds the same wych from the earl, with all the customs pertaining to it, and to the whole hundred, which are valued at 40s., of which 30s. belong to the land of the said William, the remaining 10s. to the land of the bishop and to the lands of Richard and Gislebert, which they have in the same hundred: the wych is at farm for £10.

“In Northwich (*Mildestrich*) hundred there was another wych held between the king and the earl. These were not demesne saltworks, but they had the same laws and customs there, which are spoken of in the above-named wych; and in the same manner the king and the earl shared them. This wych was farmed for £8: and

the hundred in which it was situated for 40s. The king had two parts, the earl the third. When Earl Hugh received it, it was waste. Now the earl himself holds it, and it is farmed for 25s. and two cartloads of salt. The hundred is worth 40s.

“In these two wyches any one buying salt and carrying it away in a cart gave 4*d.* for toll, if he had four oxen or more to his cart. If two oxen, he gave 2*d.* toll (for each load) if there were two loads of salt. A man of another hundred gave 2*d.* for a horse load, but a man of the same hundred only gave one halfpenny for a load of salt. Any one who loaded a cart so heavily, that the axle broke within the circuit of a mile of either wych, gave 2*s.* to the officer of the king or earl, if he could be overtaken within a mile. In like manner any one who loaded a horse so heavy that it broke its back, paid 2*s.* if overtaken within the mile: beyond that limit nothing. Any one who made two loads of salt out from his one forfeited 40*s.*, if the officer could overtake him. If he could not be taken, nothing was to be forfeited by any one else.

“Men on foot from another hundred, buying salt there, for eight man-loads paid 2*d.* Men of the same hundred, for eight loads, paid 1*d.*

“In the same Northwich (*Mildestvic*) hundred was a third wych, which was called Northwich (Nor-wich) and was at farm for £8: the laws and customs were the same there as in the other wyches, and the king and the earl in the same way divided the returns. All the thanes who in this wych had saltworks, throughout the whole year did not pay on boilings of salt on Friday.

“Whoever from another shire brought a cart with two oxen or with more paid 4*d.* toll. A man of the same shire gave for a cart load 2*d.* if he returned within the third night to the place from which he had set out: if he exceeded the third night he was fined 40*s.* A man from another shire paid 1*d.* for a horse-load of salt; but from the same shire one farthing, within the third night as is said above.

“A man residing in the same hundred, if he kept a cart to sell salt through the same county, for each cartload paid 1*d.* however many times he might load it. If with a horse he carried salt to sell, he gave 1*d.* at the Feast of St. Martin. Whoever did not pay at that time was fined 40*s.*

“All other things in these wyches are alike: this one when Earl Hugh received it was waste: now it is worth 35*s.*”



*The City of Chester at the Norman Conquest.*—The city of Chester was the only considerable port and place of trade in the north-western parts of England, at the time when the Domesday survey was made. In the Saxon times it had contained nearly 500 burgages and houses—436 belonging to the earl, and fifty-six to the bishop. The city was considered equal, for the purposes of taxation, to fifty hides of land. We have already described Chester as it was in the time of the Romans; and after their retirement from Britain it was the chief place in the north-west of England, and one of the barriers and bulwarks of the kingdom. The walls built by the Romans, and restored by Edward the Elder and Ethelfleda, the son and daughter of Alfred the Great, still stood, and were repaired at the cost of the landowners of the county and the city. They rendered Chester a secure place of refuge against the pirates who infested all the western seas, in great numbers. They thus enabled trade and commerce to flourish there, to an extent unknown at any other point on the north-western coast of England.

The account of Chester, and of its trade, customs, and local laws, contained in Domesday Book, is so curious that we give it at length. It may be regarded as the commencement of the history of the cities and boroughs, and also of the trade and commerce, of the north-western district of England.

*The City of Chester at the Domesday Survey.*—"The city of Chester, in the time of King Edward was gildable (*i.e.*, taxable) for fifty hides of land, three and a half hides of which are without the city (that is, one hide and a half beyond the bridge, and two hides in Newton and Redcliffe, and in the borough of the bishop); these were gildable with the city.

"In the time of King Edward the Confessor there were in the city itself 431 gildable houses, and besides these the bishop had fifty-six gildable houses. This city then paid ten and a half marks of silver, (equal to £100 of modern money); two parts were the king's, and the third the earl's; and these were the laws there.

"The peace, given by the hand of the king, or by his writ, or by his minister, if it was broken by any one, then the king received a fine of 100s.; but if the peace of the king, given by his order by the earl, was broken, of the 100s. which were paid for this offence the earl had the third penny; but if the same peace, given by the minister of the king, or the minister of the earl, was broken, a fine of 40s. was paid, and the third penny belonged to the earl.

"If any freeman, breaking the king's peace, slew a man in his house, all his land and money belonged to the king, and he himself became an outlaw (*utlagh*); the earl had the same only from his own man committing this forfeiture; but to any outlaw, no one was able to restore peace but the king.

"Whoever shed blood from the morning of the second day (Monday) to the ninth hour on Saturday, paid a fine of 10*s.*; but from noon on Saturday to the morning of the second week-day (Monday), the shedding of blood was fined 20*s.* In like manner he paid 20*s.* who did this (shed blood) in the twelve days of the Nativity, and on the day of the Purification of the Blessed Mary, and the first day of Easter and the first day of Whitsuntide, and on the day of the Ascension, and on the Assumption, or the Nativity of the Holy Mary, and on the feast-day of All Saints.

"Whoever slew a man on these sacred days paid a fine of £4, but on other days 40*s.* Likewise he who made *heinfar* (*i.e.*, took a serf away from, or caused a loss of a servant or slave to, his master) or forestel (assault on the highway) on these feast-days, or on the Lord's day, he paid £4; on any other days, 40*s.*

"A person committing *hangenuitham* (*i.e.*, executing a felon without trial, or allowing him to escape from justice) in the city paid 10*s.*; but the king's or earl's bailiff committing this offence paid a fine of 20*s.*

"He who committed *revelach* (rapine, or robbery, or theft), or offered violence to a woman in her house, for each of these offences paid 40*s.*

"A widow, if she cohabited with any one unlawfully, paid a fine of 40*s.*; and an unmarried woman, for the like cause, 10*s.*

"He who seized the land of another in the city, and could not prove that it was his own, paid a fine of 40*s.*; and in like manner he was fined who made a claim to land and could not prove that it was his own property.

"He who wished to enter on possession of his own land, or that which had been given up by his relation, paid 10*s.*; but if he was not able, or was unwilling to do so, the bailiff took it into the hand of the king.

"He who did not pay what *gabel* (tax, rent, service) was due, at the time appointed, was fined 10*s.*

"If a fire happened in the city, he from whose house it broke out was fined three ores (each of an ounce of silver), and he paid 2*s.* to his next neighbour.

“Of all these forfeitures two-thirds belonged to the king, and one-third to the earl.

“If ships came into or went out of the port of the city without the king’s license, the king and earl had 40s. for every man who was in the ships.

“If, against the king’s peace, and contrary to his prohibition, a ship entered the port, the king and earl had, as well the ship as the men, and all things which were therein. But if a ship came with the peace and license of the king, they who were in it sold what they had without interruption; but when it departed, the king and earl had 4*d.* for every lesth (*i.e.*, last). If the king’s bailiff commanded those who had martens’ skins, that they should not sell to any one until he had first purchased those that were shown to him, they who disregarded this injunction paid a fine of 40s.

“Any man or woman detected in giving false measure in the city paid 4s. In like manner the brewer of bad ale was placed in a chair of filth (*i.e.*, *cathedra stercoris*), or gave 4s. to the bailiffs.

“The king’s and earl’s ministers in the city received this forfeiture on whose lands soever it might be, whether of the bishop or any other man; and in like manner if any one detained the toll above three nights, he forfeited 40s.

“In the time of King Edward there were seven mint masters in this city, who gave £7 to the king and earl above the farm, when the money was coined.

“There were then twelve judges (judices) or magistrates in the city, and these were chosen from among the men of the king, and the bishop, and the earl; if any of these kept away from the hundred (*i.e.*, hundred court) on the day when it sat, without a clear excuse, he paid a fine of 10s., divided between the king and earl.

“For the purpose of rebuilding and upholding the wall and bridge of the city, the præpositus (the bailiff) commanded one man to come from each hide of land in the county; whosoever’s man did not come, his lord paid a fine of 40s. to the king and earl; this forfeiture was over and above the farm.

“This city then paid £45 of farm rent, and three timbers (one timber contained ten skins) of martens’ skins; the third part belonged to the earl, and two parts to the king.

“When Earl Hugh received it (the city), it was only worth £30, for it was greatly wasted; there were 205 houses less than

there were in the time of King Edward; now there are as many as he (Earl Hugh) found.

"Mundret held this city from the earl for £70, and one mark of gold.

"He farmed all the fees of the earl in the county and hundred, except those of Inglefield (Flintshire), for £50, and one mark of gold.

"The ground on which stands the church of St. Peter, which Robert de Rodelent claimed for teinland (*i.e.*, the land of a thane or nobleman), as the county proved (*i.e.*, upon trial), never belonged to the manor"—probably the manor of Handbridge without the city; "but belongs to the borough, and was always in the custom of the king and earl, as well as of the other burgesses."

The bishop of Chester has these customs in the city of Chester:—

"Any freeman doing work on a holy day, the bishop has from him a fine of 8s.; a slave or a female servant breaking a holy day pays to the bishop 4s.

"A merchant or tradesman coming into the city and bringing a truss of goods, if he opened it, without permission of the officer of the bishop, from the ninth hour on Saturday until Monday, or on any holy day, the bishop had a fine of 4s.

"If one of the bishop's men shall find any man carting goods within the bounds of the city, the bishop had a fine of 4s. or two oxen."

*The Manors, Townships, and Villages of the County of Chester at the Domesday Survey.*—Nothing can give a clearer view of the actual condition of society in the county of Chester, soon after the Norman conquest, than the following extracts from the Domesday survey. They show who had been the holders of the principal manors and villages in the Saxon times; into whose hands they had passed after the Norman conquest; what was the extent and value of the arable land in each, and what the amount of population, at the time when the Domesday survey was made. It will be seen that in almost every case the Saxon landholders had been driven from their estates by Norman soldiers, and that the whole country had either been laid waste or greatly diminished in value, in the terrible struggle in which the Saxons had been overcome. The hides of land of Cheshire are not computed at the rate of six carucates to the hide, as in the land between the Ribble and the Mersey, but they vary greatly; some of the hides being equal to one carucate, or 180 acres, and others to five times as much, or nearly 1000 acres. We give the principal manors alphabetically, for greater convenience of reference:—

*Adlington in Macclesfield Hundred.*—The Earl (Hugh Lupus, of Chester) holds Edulvintune; Earl Edwin held it: there four hides and a half of taxable land; the land is ten carucates: there two radmen and six villeins and three cottagers with three ploughs; there twenty-one acres of meadow; a wood two miles long and two wide; and there seven inclosures and four series of hawks. In the time of King Edward it was worth £8; now 20s. It was found waste.

*Alderley in Macclesfield Hundred.*—The earl holds Aldredelie; Carle held it: there three hides of taxable land; the land is six carucates: it was waste, and is now in the forest of the earl. In the time of King Edward it was worth 30s.

*Alderley (Over) (half) in Macclesfield Hundred.*—Bigot holds Aldredelie; Godwin held it as a freeman: there one hide taxable; the land is eight carucates; in demesne is one, with two herdsmen and three villeins and one radman with one plough; there one acre of meadow; a wood one mile and a half long and one mile wide; and there two inclosures (*haie*). In the time of King Edward it was worth 20s. now 10s. It was found waste.

*Alderley (Over) in Macclesfield Hundred.*—William Fitz Nigel holds from the earl Aldredelie; Brun held it and was a freeman: there one hide taxable; the land is four carucates; it was and is waste; a wood two miles long and two wide; in the time of King Edward it was worth 20s.

*Aston near Mondrum in Nantwich Hundred.*—William Malbedeng holds Estone; Ravenote held it and was free: there one virgate taxable; the land is one carucate: there one radman has half a carucate with two cottagers; there one acre and a half of meadow; a wood one mile long and half a mile wide; it was worth 5s.; now 3s. It was waste.

*Audlem in Nantwich Hundred.*—Richard de Vernon holds Aldelime; Osmer held it: there two hides taxable; the land is five carucates; in demesne is one: one slave, one villein, one radman, and one cottager with one plough; there two acres of meadow. A wood two miles long and one mile broad; and three inclosures (*haie*) and an acerie of hawks. In the time of King Edward it was worth 20s.; now 3s. It was found waste.

*Barnston in Wirrall Hundred.*—William Fitz Nigel holds Bernestone and Randulf from him; Rauesuar and Levret held it for two manors, and were freemen: there one hide taxable; the land is two carucates; in demesne is one; and two herdsmen and three cottagers. It was worth 10s. It was found waste.

*Bartumley in Nantwich Hundred.*—William Malbedeng holds Bertemeleu, Semardus held it, and was a freeman: there one hide taxable; the land is three carucates; in demesne is one; and two herdsmen, a priest and one radman and one villein and two cottagers with two ploughs; there one acre of meadow; a wood one mile long and half a mile wide; and one inclosure (*haia*), and an acerie of hawks. It was worth, and is worth 20s. It was found waste.

*Bedesfeld in Ezeetan Hundred.*—In the manor of Robert Fitzhugh at Bedesfeld the bishop of Chester claims two hides which belonged to the bishopric in the time of King Canute (Cnut); and the county bears witness to him that St. Chad (*Sedda*), the patron of the diocese of Lichfield and Chester, lost it unjustly.

*Beeton in Eddisbury Hundred.*—Robert Fitzhugh holds Buistane; Vluoi held it, and was a freeman: there one hide taxable; the land is two carucates and a half; in demesne is one, with two herdsmen. In the time of King Edward it was worth 10s.; now 5s. He found it waste.

*Bickerton in Broxton Hundred.*—Robert Fitzhugh holds Biceretone, and Drogo of him: Dot, Edwin, and Eruwin, three thanes, freemen, held it for three manors: there three hides taxable; the land is four carucates; there two villeins with one carucate; a wood half a mile long. In the time of King Edward it was worth 18s., now 11s. It was waste, and still is in the greater part.

*Blakenhow in Wirrall Hundred.*—Ranulf holds, from Earl Hugh, Blachehell; Toret held it, and was a freeman: there two hides taxable; the land is four carucates: in demesne are two, and four herdsmen and four villeins and four cottagers have one carucate; there a fishery. In the time of King Edward it was worth 14s., now 40s.

*Boughton, in the City of Chester.*—The church of St. Werburg holds Boestone, and held it in the time of King Edward : there three hides of taxable land ; the land is five carucates ; two are in demesne, and four slaves, five villeins, and four cottagers, have three carucates. In the time of King Edward it was worth 20s. a year ; now it is worth 16s.

*Bowden in Bucklow Hundred.*—Hamo holds Bogedon ; Eluuard held it : there one hide taxable ; the land is two carucates ; there two Frenchmen have one carucate ; there a priest and a church, to which belongs half a hide ; there a mill pays 16d. ; it is worth 3s. It was waste ; and thus it was found.

*Bredbury in Macclesfield Hundred.*—Richard de Vernon holds Bretberie, and Uluric from him, who also held it as a freeman : there one hide taxable ; the land is three carucates ; there one radman, six villeins, and two cottagers have one carucate ; the wood there is a mile long and half a mile wide ; and three inclosures (*haie*) and one aerie of hawks. In the time of King Edward it was worth 10s. ; now the same.

*Bramhall in Macclesfield Hundred.*—Hamo holds Bramale ; Brun and Haecun held it for two manors and were freemen : there one hide taxable ; the land is six carucates ; there one radman and two villeins and two cottagers have one carucate ; a wood there half a mile long and as much wide ; and half an inclosure (*haie*) ; and an acre of meadow ; in the time of King Edward it was worth 32s., now 5s. It was found waste.

*Broxton in Broxton Hundred.*—Robert Fitzhugh holds Brosse, and Roger Picat of him ; Brismere and Raven, two freemen, held it for two manors : there five hides taxable ; the land is six carucates ; in demesne is one carucate, and three villeins with one carucate : a wood of one mile. In the time of King Edward it was worth 10s. 8d. ; now 15s. 8d.

*Budworth (Great) in Bucklow Hundred.*—William Fitz Nigel holds Budwurde, and Pagen from him ; Edward held it as a freeman : there one hide taxable ; the land is two carucates ; in demesne is half a carucate, and one slave and a priest and two villeins and one cottager with one carucate, and a mill serving the hall ; there one acre and a half of meadow. In the time of King Edward it was worth 6s. ; now 8s.

*Bunbury in Eddisbury Hundred.*—Robert Fitzhugh holds Boliberie ; Dedol held it, and was a freeman : there one hide taxable ; the land two carucates ; one in demesne ; a priest with two villeins have one carucate : a wood one mile long and one acre wide ; was worth 4s. ; now 13s.

*Caldey in Wirrall Hundred.*—Hugo de Mara holds Calders ; Erniat held it, and was a freeman : there one hide taxable ; the land is three carucates ; in demesne is one with one cottager. It was worth 5s. ; now 10s.

*Caldey in Wirrall Hundred.*—Robert de Rodelent holds Calders ; Levenot held it, and was a freeman : there three hides taxable ; the land is ten carucates ; there five villeins and five cottagers have two carucates, and one Frenchman with one servant has two carucates ; in demesne two bovates or carucates, and two acres of meadow. In the time of King Edward it was worth 50s., afterwards 10s. ; now 24s.

*Capenhurst in Wirrall Hundred.*—William Fitz Nigel holds Capeles, and David from him : there half a hide taxable ; Erne held it ; the land is one carucate ; there one villein and two cottagers. In the time of King Edward, and afterwards, it was worth 5s. ; now 8s.

*The City of Chester.*—In the city of Chester the church of St. Werburg has thirteen houses free from all custom ; one belongs to the keepers of the church, the other to the canons.

*Cholmondeley in Broxton Hundred.*—Robert Fitzhugh holds Calmundelei ; Edwin and Dot, freemen, held it for two manors : there two hides taxable ; the land is four carucates ; Edwin and Drogo hold it of Robert : in demesne is one carucate ; and five slaves and one villein and three cottagers and one reeve and a smith have one carucate ; and a wood one mile and a half in length and one in breadth : there three inclosures (*haie*). In the time of King Edward it was worth 13s. ; now 6s. 3d.

*Chrisleton, near Chester, in Broxton Hundred.*—Robert Fitzhugh holds Crisleton ; Earl Edwin held it : there seven hides taxable ; the land is fourteen carucates ; in demesne is one carucate, and two female servants (*ancilla*), twelve villeins, five cottagers, and two Reeves



with eight carucates: a mill worth 12s.: and two radmen. Ranulph holds of Robert two hides of this manor, paying 12d. for it. The whole in the time of King Edward was worth £6, now worth £3: it was found waste: has a wood two miles long and one broad.

*Church Minshull in Nantwich Hundred.*—William Malbeding holds Manessele; Levenot held it and was a freeman: there one hide taxable; the land is one carucate; there one radman, two slaves, and two cottagers have one carucate; there one acre of meadow; a wood one mile long and one broad; and four inclosures (*haia*) and an acerie of hawks; it was and is worth 4s. It was waste.

*Clifton or Rocksavage in Bucklow.*—The church of St. Werburg held and holds Cliftune, and Witham from it: there one hide of taxable land: the land is two carucates; one is in demesne, and two herdsman, one radman, and one cottager have one carucate; it is worth 10s. It was waste.

*Congleton in Northwich Hundred.*—Bigot holds Cogeltone; Godwin held it: there one hide taxable; the land is four carucates; there are two villeins, and four cottagers; a wood there one mile long and one broad, and two inclosures (*haia*). It was waste; and was found so. It is now worth 4s.

*Creve in Nantwich Hundred.*—Richard de Vernon holds Creu; Osmer held it: there one hide taxable: the land is two carucates: there one radman, and one villein and two cottagers with one plough: there one acre and a half of meadow: a wood one mile long and half a mile wide. In the time of King Edward it was worth 10s., now 5s. It was found waste.

*Davenham in Northwich Hundred.*—Richard de Vernon holds Deveneham; Osmer held it, as a freeman: there half a hide taxable; the land is two carucates; in demesne is one carucate, and two slaves, and a priest with a church, and one villein and one cottager with half a carucate. It was worth 8s.; now 5s.

*Dunham Massey in Bucklow Hundred.*—Hamo holds Doncham; Elward held it, and was a freeman: there one hide taxable; the land is three carucates; in demesne is one, and two herdsman and two villeins and one cottager; and one acre of wood, and in the city (of Chester) a house. In the time of King Edward it was worth 12s., now 10s.; it was waste.

*Eastham in Wirrall Hundred.*—The earl holds Eastham; Earl Edwin held it: there twenty-two hides of taxable land; the land is of the same number of carucates (22). There are two carucates in demesne, and four slaves, fourteen villeins, and ten cottagers with six carucates: there is a mill and two radmen and one priest. Of the land of this manor Mundrit holds two hides and Hugo two hides, William one hide, Hamo seven hides, Robert one hide, Robert half a hide, Walter half a hide: in demesne are four ploughmen and eight herdsman and twenty-two villeins and two cottagers, and five radmen and two Frenchmen, with nine ploughs. The whole manor in the time of King Edward was worth £24 and afterwards £4; now the demesne of the earl is worth £4, and that of his men £5 12s.

*Eaton near Chester in Broxton Hundred.*—The Earl holds Eaton; Earl Edwin held it: there one hide and a half of taxable land; the land is of two carucates: one is in demesne and two herdsman and two villeins have one carucate: there is a fishery which pays 1000 salmon, and there are six fishermen; and one acre of meadow. In the time of King Edward it was worth £10, and afterwards 8s.; now £10.

*Eccleston in Broxton Hundred.*—Gislebert de Venables holds Eccleston from Earl Hugo; Edwin held it, and was a freeman: there five hides taxable; the land is six carucates; in demesne is one, and two slaves and four villeins and one cottager with a carucate; there a boat and a net, and half an acre of meadow. In the time of King Edward it was worth 10s., now 50s. It was waste.

*Eddisbury in Eddisbury Hundred.*—The earl holds Eddisbury; Godwin held it as a freeman: there two hides of taxable land; the land is six carucates: it was and is waste. The wood is a mile long and as much wide.

*Eitune in Exestan Hundred.*—St. Chad (*Sedde*) held Eitune. In the time of King Edward there was there one hide of land. In Eitune has the Saint himself one villein and half a fishery and half an acre of meadow and two acres of wood, worth 5s. King Edward gave to

King Griffin (of North Wales) all the land across the water which is called Dee; but after Griffin offended against him, he took this land from him, and restored it to the bishop of Chester, and to all his men who had held it before.

*Farndon in Brocton Hundred.*—The bishop of Chester holds Ferentone, and held it in the time of King Edward: there four hides of taxable land; the land is five carucates; in demesne there are two carucates, and seven villeins with one carucate; the wood is one mile long and half a mile wide: of this land two priests hold one hide and a half from the bishop: there one carucate in demesne, and two Frenchmen and two villeins and their cottager with one carucate and a half and four slaves: the priest of the town has the half of a carucate and five cottagers with one carucate. In the time of King Edward it was worth 4s. a year, now it is worth 60s. a year: it was waste.

*Frodsham in Eddisbury.*—The earl holds Frodsham; Earl Edwin held it: there three hides of taxable land; the land is nine carucates. In demesne there are two and one slave, eight villeins, and three cottagers with two ploughs.

*Gavesworth in Macclesfield Hundred.*—The earl holds Govesurde; Benulf a freeman held it: there a hide of taxable land; the land is six carucates. It is waste. In the time of King Edward it was worth 20s.; there a wood two miles long and two wide, and two inclosures (*haia*).

*Gayton in Wirrall Hundred.*—Robert de Rodelent holds Gaitone, and William from him; Levenot, a freeman, held it: there one hide taxable; the land is two carucates; there two villeins and three cottagers have one carucate; and there two fisheries: it was worth 15s. afterwards 2s.; now 3s.

*Hale in Bucklow Hundred.*—Hamo de Masci holds Hale; Edward held it: there one hide taxable; the land is two carucates and a half: there three villeins with one radman have two carucates; there a wood one mile long and half a mile wide, and an inclosure (*haia*) and an acre of hawks and half an acre of meadow. In the time of King Edward it was worth 15s., now 12s. It was found waste.

*Halton in Bucklow Hundred.*—William Fitz Nigel holds Heletune; Orme held it, and was a freeman: there ten hides, of these five (were) taxable and the others not taxable; the land is twenty carucates; in demesne are two carucates, and four herdsmen and four villeins and two cottagers and two priests, with five carucates among all; there two fishermen pay 5s.; and one acre of meadow; a wood one mile long and half a mile wide; there two inclosures (*haia*).

*Handbridge (Beyond bridge) near Chester.*—William Fitz Nigel holds one carucate of land in Bruge taxable; Erne held it for a manor: there three cottagers having half a carucate. It was worth 10s., now 4s.

*Hertford in Eddisbury Hundred.*—Gislebert de Venables holds Herford; Dodo held it for two manors, as a free man: there two hides taxable; the land is two carucates; there are four villeins and two cottagers and a smith having one carucate.

*Haswell in Wirrall Hundred.*—Robert de Rodelent held Eswelle, and Herbert from him; Ulchel held it, and was a freeman: there two hides taxable; the land is four carucates; in demesne is one carucate; and two herdsmen, three villeins, and one cottager with one carucate. In the time of King Edward it was worth 16s. and afterwards 20s.; now 22s.

*Henbury and other Manors in Macclesfield Hundred.*—The earl holds Henbury (*Hamiteberie*) for half a hide, Capesthorpe (*Copestor*) for half a hide, Henshall (*Hofinchel*), Tintwistle (*Tengestwisse*) for one virgate, Hollinworth (*Holifurd*) for one virgate, Wernith (*Warnet*) for one virgate and Romiley (*Rumilie*) for one virgate, and Laitone for one virgate. They all paid. These lands eight freemen held as manors. The land amongst them all is sixteen carucates. It was and is all waste. In Henshall there is a wood two miles long and two wide: in Tintwistle a wood four miles long and two wide; in Wernith a wood three miles long and two wide. In the time of King Edward this hundred was worth 40s., now 10s.

*Hooton in Wirrall Hundred.*—Richard de Vernon holds Hotone; Foci held it: there one hide and a half taxable; the land is three carucates; there four radmen and one villein and

four cottagers with two carucates. In the time of King Edward it was worth 30s., afterwards 5s.; now 16s.

*Huntingdon in Broxton Hundred.*—The church of St. Werburg holds Hunditone, and held it in the time of King Edward: there three hides gildable; the land is six carucates; in demesne are two, and four slaves and two villeins and two cottagers with one carucate; there one acre of meadow and a boat and a net. In the time of King Edward it was waste; now it is worth 16s.

*Ince in Wirrall Hundred.*—The church of St. Werburg held and holds Ince: there three hides taxable; the land is five carucates; in demesne is one carucate, and two slaves and eight villeins and one cottager with one carucate. In the time of King Edward it was worth 30s., now 16s.: there two acres of meadow.

*Knoctorum in Wirrall.*—William Malbedeng holds Chenoterie, and Richard from him; Colben held it and was a freeman: there a half hide taxable; the land is one carucate, which there is in demesne; with two herdsmen and two villeins; it was worth 15s.; now 10s. It was waste.

*Knutsford in Bucklow Hundred.*—William Fitz Nigel holds Cunetesford, and Erchbrand from him, and who held it as a freeman: there half a hide taxable; the land is two carucates; it was and is waste: a wood half a mile long and two acres wide. It was worth 10s.

*Lache (near Chester in Atiscros Hundred.*—The church of St. Werburg holds Lache; there one virgate taxable; the land is half a carucate. It was and is waste.

*Landican in Wirrall Hundred.*—William Malbedeng holds Landechene; Essul held it, and was a freeman: there seven hides taxable; the land is eight carucates; in demesne is one; and one priest and nine villeins and seven cottagers and four Frenchmen with five carucates amongst all. In the time of King Edward it was worth 50s.; now 40s. It was found waste.

*Lea Newbold in Broxton Hundred.*—The earl holds Lai; Godwin, a freeman, held it: there one hide and a half taxable; the land is four carucates: and one herdsman and eight villeins with one carucate; there one acre of wood.

*Lee in Wirrall.*—William Fitz Nigel holds Lee; Erne held it: there one virgate taxable; the land is half a carucate: there three villeins. It was worth 5s.; now 8s.

*Leftwich in Northwich Hundred.*—Richard de Vernon holds Wice; Osmer and Alsie held it for two manors, and were freemen: there one hide taxable; the land is three carucates; one is in demesne, and two slaves and three villeins with one carucate: and four acres of meadow. In the time of King Edward it was worth 12s.; now 6s.

*Legh (High) in Bucklow Hundred.*—Gislebert de Venables holds Lege; Ulviet and Dot held it for two manors, and were freemen: there one hide taxable; the land is two carucates; there a man of his has half a carucate and three slaves; there a priest and a church with one villein and two cottagers, having half a carucate; there a wood one mile long and half a mile wide; and there an inclosure (*haia*). In the time of King Edward it was worth 10s.; now 5s.

*Lidsham in Wirrall Hundred.*—Walter de Vernon holds Levetssham; Ermet held it: there one hide taxable; the land is two carucates: in demesne is half a carucate; and one slave and one radman and one cottager with half a carucate among all.

*Limme (one-half) in Bucklow Hundred.*—Gislebert de Venables holds Lime; Ulviet held it and was free: there one hide taxable; the land is two carucates; there are three cottagers; there a church with half a virgate of land; a wood half a mile long and the same wide. In the time of King Edward it was worth 10s.; now 12*l*. It was found waste.

*Macclesfield in Macclesfield Hundred.*—The earl holds Macclesfield; Earl Edwin held it: there two hides of taxable land; the land is ten carucates; in demesne is one carucate and four slaves; there a mill serving the Court; a wood six miles long and four wide, and there seven inclosures (*haize*) and a meadow for oxen. The third penny from the hundred belongs to this manor. In the time of King Edward it was worth £8; now 20*l*. It was waste.

*Malpas in Broxton Hundred.*—Robert Fitzhugh holds Depenbech (the Saxon name for Malpas); Earl Edwin held it: there eight hides taxable; the land fourteen carucates; three

are in demesne and one cottager, and half an acre of meadow. Of this land five knights (*milites*) hold from Robert five and a half hides, and they have three ploughmen and seven villeins with two and a half carucates. There two acres of meadow.

*Meoles Magna in Wirrall Hundred.*—Robert de Rodelent holds Melas; Levenot held it: there one hide taxable; the land is one carucate and a half; there one radman and two villeins and two cottagers have one carucate. In the time of King Edward it was worth 15s.; now 10s. It was found waste.

*Meoles Parva in Wirrall Hundred.*—Robert de Rodelent holds Melas; Levenot held it: there one hide taxable; the land is three carucates; there one radman and three villeins and three cottagers have one carucate. In the time of King Edward it was worth 10s., and afterwards 8s.; now 12s.

*Minshull Vernon in Northwich Hundred.*—William Malbedeng holds Maneshale; Derth and Aregrim held it for two manors, and were freemen: there one hide taxable; the land is two carucates; there are five radmen and two cottagers; there one acre of meadow; and a wood half a mile long and half a mile wide: and an inclosure (*haia*) and an aerie of hawks: it is (it was) worth 4s.; now 8s.

*Mollington Touroud in Wirrall Hundred.*—Robert de Rodelent holds Molintone, and Lambert from him; Gunner and Ulf held it for two manors, and were freemen: there one hide taxable; the land is two carucates; one is in demesne with two slaves: there two acres of meadow worth 14s. It was waste, and was found waste.

*Mollington Bannester in Wirrall Hundred.*—Robert de Rodelent holds of Earl Hugh Molintone; Godwin held it, and was a freeman: there a hide and a half taxable; the land three carucates: one is in demesne, and three slaves, three villeins, three cottagers, two acres of meadow and two acres of wood. In the time of King Edward it was waste: when Robert received it, it was worth 20s.; now 15s.

*Nesse in Wirrall Hundred.*—Walter de Vernon holds Nesse; Erniel held it: there one hide and a half taxable land; the land is two carucates; in demesne is one: and one herdsman and five villeins and three cottagers with three ploughmen; there half an acre of meadow. In the time of King Edward it was worth 20s.; now 16s.

*Neston in Wirrall Hundred.*—The church of St. Werburg held and holds Nestone, and William under it; there the third of two hides of taxable land; the land is one carucate. It yielded and still yields 17s. 4d. of rent (*de firma*).

*Neston in Wirrall Hundred.*—William Fitz Nigel holds Nestone; Erne held it, and was a freeman: there two parts of two hides taxable; the land is four carucates; in demesne are two carucates; and one slave, a priest and four villeins, and two cottagers have there three carucates. In the time of King Edward it was worth 20s., and afterwards about the same; now 25s.

*Neston in Wirrall Hundred.*—Robert the Cook (*cocus*) holds Nestone from the earl; Osgot held it and was a freeman: there one hide taxable; the land is three carucates; in demesne are two; and one slave and one villein and four cottagers with one carucate; and one Frenchman there. In the time of King Edward it was worth 13s. 4d., now 16s. It was found waste.

*Nether Peover (one-half) in Bucklow Hundred.*—William Fitz Nigel holds Pevre; Edward held it (there two parts of one hide taxable), and was a freeman; the land is one carucate; it was and is waste; a wood there one mile long and an acre wide; it was worth 5s., now 12d.

*Newton (near Chester) in Cestre Hundred.*—William Fitz Nigel holds from Earl Hugh Newentone; Erne held it: there one hide taxable; the land is of three carucates: in demesne are two; and four herdsmen and six villeins with one carucate. In the time of King Edward it was worth 20s., afterwards 10s.; now 20s.

*Norton in Bucklow Hundred.*—William Fitz Nigel holds Nortune, and Ansfrid from him; Uctred and Tochi held it for two manors, and were freemen: there two hides taxable; the land is six carucates; in demesne is one, and two slaves and three villeins with one carucate; there one fisherman and two acres of meadow; and four acres of wood; and two inclosures (*haie*); in the time of King Edward it was worth 16s.; now 9s. 4d. It was found waste.

*Oulton in Eddisbury Hundred.*—The earl holds Altetone; Stein held it, and was a freeman: there one hide taxable; the land is two carucates. It is waste.

*Oulton in Eddisbury Hundred.*—Nigel holds from Earl Hugh, Altetone; Dunning held it, and was a freeman: there half a hide taxable; the land is one carucate; it pays a rent of 5s. 4d. In the time of King Edward it was worth 20s. It was found waste.

*Over Tabley in Bucklow Hundred.*—William Fitz Nigel holds Stabelei; Leuinus held it, and was a freeman: there a third part of a hide taxable; the land is one carucate; it was and is waste; a wood half a mile long and forty perches wide; it was worth 10s.

William Fitz Nigel holds in the town itself one carucate of land and a third part of one hide taxable; Segrid and Ulsi held it for two manors, and were free: the land is one carucate: it was and is waste. In the time of King Edward it was worth 7s.

*Overton in Broxton Hundred.*—Robert Fitzhugh holds Ovretton; Vluoi held it, a freeman: there one hide and a half taxable; the land is two carucates; one is in demesne; a wood two acres long and one wide: was worth 5s.; now 6s.

*Pecforton in Eddisbury Hundred.*—Robert Fitzhugh holds Pevretone; Vluric, a freeman, held it: there one hide taxable; the land two carucates; there one villein with one carucate. Was worth 8s.; now pays 20s.

*Picton in Wirrall Hundred (?).*—Richard de Vernon held Pichetone; Tochi held it, and was a freeman: there one hide taxable; the land is three carucates; one is in demesne; and two herdsman, one radman, and three cottagers have one carucate; there half an acre of meadow. In the time of King Edward it was worth 40s., afterwards 5s.; now 20s.

*Pontone.*—Richard Pincerna holds Pontone from the earl; Edwin held it, and was a freeman: there one hide taxable; the land is five carucates: in demesne are three carucates, and six herdsman and a bailiff (*propositus*) and three cottagers with two carucates; there eight acres of meadow. In the time of King Edward it was worth 40s., and afterwards as much; now £4.

*Pool in Wirrall.*—William Malbedeng holds Pol; Ernuin held it for a manor: there four carucates taxable; there one villein and one cottager have half a carucate. It was worth and is worth 4s.

*Prenton in Wirrall Hundred.*—Walter de Vernon holds Prentune; Ulvriet, Edric, and Senvede held it for three manors and were freemen: there a hide and a half taxable; the land is three carucates; in demesne is one, and two herdsman and two cottagers: there a mill serving the hall. A wood one mile long and one broad. Was worth 7s.; now 5s.

*Pudinton in Wirrall Hundred.*—Hamo de Masci holds Potitone from Earl Hugh; Uluric held it, and was a freeman; there two hides and a half taxable; the land is three carucates: in demesne is one, and one slave and four villeins and four cottagers and one radman with one carucate. It was worth 20s. It was waste.

*Pulford in Broxton Hundred.*—The church of St. Werburg holds Pulford, and held it in the time of King Edward: there half a hide of taxable land; the land is of one carucate; there is one villein and one cottager. It was worth 4s.; now 5s.

*Pulford (one half) in Broxton Hundred.*—Hugo Fitz Osborne holds Pulford; Uluric held it as a freeman: there one hide and a half taxable; the land is one carucate; and there are two radmen and one villein and two cottagers. This land was waste; now it is worth 5s.

*Raby in Wirrall Hundred.*—William Fitz Nigel holds Rabie, and Harduius from him; Erni held it: there half a hide taxable; the land is one carucate in demesne; there are one slave and two villeins and two cottagers with one carucate. In the time of King Edward it was worth 10s., and after 14s.; now 20s.

The church of St. Werburg held and holds Rabie, and William under it: there half a hide of taxable land; the land is of one carucate; it yielded, and still yields, 6s. 8d. of rent.

*Redclive, near Chester.*—The bishop held and holds in Redclive two parts of one hide of taxable land. In the time of King Edward it was worth 13s., now 2d.; formerly it belonged to the church of Saint John. In the monastery of the Blessed Mary, which is outside the church of Saint John, are two bovates of land, which were waste and are so now. The

church of Saint John in the city has eight houses free from all custom ; one of these is of the pupils (*matricularii*) of the church. The other belong to the canons.

*Sandbach in Northwich Hundred.*—Bigot holds Sanbec; Dunning held it, and was free: there one hide taxable; and one virgate and a half likewise taxable; the land is two carucates; there is one Frenchman with half a carucate and three slaves; and two villeins with half a carucate; there a priest and a church: a wood half a mile long and forty perches wide. In the time of King Edward it was worth 4s.; now 8s.

*Sandbach in Northwich Hundred.*—The earl holds Sanbec with two and a half virgates of taxable land: and Cliffe (*Clive*) with one virgate, and Sutton near Middlewich (*Sutone*) for four bovates of land, and Wimboldsley (*Wibaldelai*) for one virgate, and Weever (*Weeve*) for one virgate, and Occleston (*Aculvestune*) for one hide. These lands six freemen held for six manors: the whole land is sixteen carucates. It was and is entirely waste. In Wimboldsley there is an acre of meadow, and the fourth part of a wood one mile long and four perches broad. In Weever there is half an acre of meadow and the fourth part of a wood, which is one mile in length and as much in breadth.

*Sanghall in Wirrall Hundred.*—William Malbedeng holds Salhale; Leving held it, and was a freeman: there six hides taxable; the land is six carucates: in demesne is one and a half, and one slave and seven villeins and one radman and four cottagers with three carucates and a half; there a fishery. In the time of King Edward it was worth 20s., and afterwards 22s.; now 45s. shillings.

*Shavington in Nantwich Hundred.*—Richard de Vernon holds Calvintone (?); Dot held it, and was a freeman: there two hides taxable; the land is two carucates. It was waste and was found waste; now it is let for 60s.

*Shipbrook in Northwich Hundred.*—Richard de Vernon holds Sibroc; Osmer held it; he was a freeman: there two hides taxable; the land is five carucates: in demesne is one, and two slaves and two villeins with one carucate; there three acres of meadow and two acres of wood. In the time of King Edward it was worth 20s.; now 10s. It was found waste.

*Stanney in Wirrall Hundred.*—The earl holds Stanei, and Restald from him; Ragenal held it as a freeman; there one hide taxable; the land is two carucates: in demesne is one and two herdsmen and two villeins and two cottagers and one fishery. In the time of King Edward it was worth 12s.; now 14s. Of this land the fifth acre was and ought to be in the church of St. Werburg: the county bears witness. The canons complain because they have been unjustly deprived of it.

*Stapleford in Broxton Hundred.*—Eadulf Grosvenor (*Venator*) holds of Earl Hugh, Stapleford; Ulsi held it, and was a freeman: there two hides taxable; the land is three carucates: in demesne is one; and one radman, two villeins, and five cottagers with three ploughs: there a wood two acres long and one wide, and a mill. It was and is worth 16s.

*Stocklach in Broxton Hundred.*—Robert Fitzhugh holds Socheliche, and Drogo from him; Dot, a freeman, held it: there three hides taxable; the land is four carucates; in demesne are two, and two villeins with one carucate; there half an acre of meadow. In the time of King Edward it was worth 8s.; now 12s.

*Summerford in Northwich Hundred.*—Hugo de Mara holds Sumreford from the earl; Godric held it as a freeman: there half a hide taxable; the land is one carucate. It was and is now waste.

*Sutton in Wirrall Hundred.*—The bishop of Chester held and holds Sudtone; there one hide of taxable land; the land is three carucates; one is in demesne; five villeins and two cottagers with one plough; there six acres of meadow. In the time of King Edward it was worth 40s. a year; now 20s.

Robert Fitzhugh holds Sudtone; Tochi held it, and was a freeman: there one hide taxable; the land three carucates; one in demesne and three cottagers with one villein: there six acres of meadow. In the time of King Edward it was worth 40s., afterwards 6s.; now it pays 5s. 4d. rent.

*Tarporley in Eddisbury Hundred.*—Gislebert de Venables holds Torpelei; Ulviet held it, and was a freeman: there two hides taxable; the land is four carucates; in demesne is one,



and two slaves and four villeins and two cottagers with one carucate; a wood one mile long and one broad; and one acre of meadow. In the time of King Edward it was worth 20s.; now 10s. It was found waste.

*Tarvin in Eddisbury Hundred.*—The bishop of Chester held Terve, and still holds it: there six hides of taxable land; the land is twenty-two carucates; there are three carucates in demesne, and six herdsman, three radmen, seven villeins and seven cottagers with six carucates; a wood of a mile in length and half a mile in breadth. Of the land of this manor William holds two hides from the bishop; and there is half a carucate and four villeins and three cottagers with three carucates and a half. The whole in the time of King Edward was worth £8; now £4 10s. It was waste.

*Tatton (one-half) in Bucklow Hundred.*—Ranulf holds Tatune from the earl; Lewin held it: there the sixth part of a hide taxable; the land is half a carucate: there is one radman, two slaves, two villeins, and four cottagers; the wood is a mile long and as much wide. In wych there is one house waste. It is worth 3s.

*Tatton (one-half) in Bucklow Hundred.*—William Fitz Nigel holds Tatune; Erchbrant, a freeman, held it: there one hide taxable; the land is three carucates and a half; there three villeins and four cottagers. It is worth 4s.

*Thingwall in Wirrall Hundred.*—William Malbedeng holds Tuigvelle, and Durand from him; Winterlet held it, and was a freeman: there one hide taxable; the land is two carucates; in demesne is one, and two slaves and one villein and one cottager have another. In the time of King Edward it was worth 8s.; now 5s.

*Thornton in Mayow Wirrall Hundred.*—Robert de Rodelent holds Torintone, and William from him; Ulchetel held it, and was a freeman: there half a hide taxable; the land is two carucates; there one radman and one villein, one cottager and half a carucate. Was worth 10s.; and afterwards and now 5s.

*Thurstaston in Wirrall Hundred.*—Robert de Rodeleut held Turastaneton, and William from him; Levenot held it, and was a freeman: there two hides taxable; the land is four carucates; in demesne is one, and two herdsman, four villeins, four cottagers with one and a half carucate. In the time of King Edward it was worth 30s., afterwards 8s.; now 16s.

*Tilston near Malpas in Broxton Hundred.*—Robert Fitzhugh holds Tillestone; Earl Edwin held it: there four hides; the land is eight carucates; one is in demesne, and two slaves, four villeins, two cottagers, four radmen, a bailiff, a smith, and a miller, with four carucates among them; there a mill worth 8s. Of this land Ranulf holds half a hide of Robert, paying 6s. 8d. The whole in the time of King Edward was worth £6, now 30s.: it was found waste: it has a wood a mile long and a mile wide. Of this manor the bishop of Chester claims half a hide, but the county does not confirm this claim.

*Upton in Broxton Hundred.*—The earl holds Optone; Earl Edwin held it: there four hides and a half; the land is twelve carucates; one is in demesne, and two herdsman, twelve villeins, and two radmen, have five carucates. In the land of this manor Hamo holds two parts of one hide, Herbert half a hide, and Mundret one hide; there four carucates in demesne, and eight herdsman, two villeins, and two cottagers with one carucate; there an acre of meadow. The whole manor in the time of King Edward was worth 60s.; now the demesne of the earl is worth 45s.; that of his men 40s.

*Upton in Bidston Wirrall Hundred.*—William Maldebeng holds Optone, and Colbert from him: who also held it as a freeman: there three hides taxable; the land is five carucates; in demesne is one, and four slaves and two villeins and one radman and four cottagers with one carucate; there two acres of meadow. In the time of King Edward it was worth 25s.; now 20s.

*Wallasey in Wirrall Hundred.*—Robert de Rodelent holds Walea; Uctred held it, and was a freeman: there one hide and a half taxable; the land is four carucates; there one villein and one cottager with half a carucate; and one Frenchman has one carucate with two herdsman, one radman, and one cottager.

*Warburton (half) in Bucklow Hundred.*—William Fitz Nigel holds Wareburgetune; Ernu

held it, and was a freeman ; there half a hide taxable ; the land is one carucate ; there is one radman, with two oxen. It was worth 5s.; now 2s.

*Weston near Hailton in Bucklow Hundred.*—William Fitz Nigel holds Westone; Griffin held it as a freeman : there two hides taxable ; the land is five carucates. Orlard and Britric hold from William ; there they have two carucates in demesne, and three herlsmen and five villeins and three cottagers with three carucates, and two fishermen, and two acres of meadow ; a wood one mile in length and half a mile in width ; and an inclosure (*haia*). In the time of King Edward it was worth 58s.; now 20s.

*Weaverham in Eddisbury.*—Earl Hugh holds in demesne Wivreham ; Earl Edwin held it : there thirteen hides of taxable land ; the land is eighteen carucates ; in demesne are two, and there are two herdsman, two slaves, ten villeins, one cottager, and one radman with one villein : amongst them all they have three carucates : there is a church and a priest and a mill serving the hall, and one acre of meadow ; the wood is two miles long and one mile wide : there are two inclosures (*haie*) of young goats : to this manor belong ten burgesses in the city : of these six pay 10s. 8d. and four pay nothing ; a Frenchman holds it from the earl. In wych were seven salt pits belonging to this manor ; one of them now supplies salt to the hall, the others are waste.

*Whitley in Bucklow Hundred.*—William Fitz Nigel holds Witelei, and Pagen and Ordard from him ; Levenot held it as a freeman : there two hides taxable ; the land is two carucates, in demesne is one with one slave ; there an acre of meadow ; a wood one mile long and half a mile broad. It is worth 6s.

*Wervin in Broxton Hundred.*—The church of St. Werburg holds Wivrevene, and held it in the time of King Edward : there one and a half hides of taxable land ; the land is three carucates ; there four villeins and two cottagers have one carucate and a half : there half an acre of meadow. In the time of King Edward it was worth 30s.; now 20s.

*Wervin in Broxton.*—William Malbedeng holds Wivrevene ; Colbert held it and was a freeman : there a third part of one hide taxable : the land is one carucate ; there are two villeins with half a carucate. Was worth 8s.; now 4s.

*Population of Cheshire and Lancashire at the Domesday Survey.*—The number of persons mentioned in the Domesday survey, in the account of Lancashire and Cheshire, is stated by Sir Henry Ellis, in his General Introduction to that survey, to be not more than 2349. But that is the number of the men only, and if we add the usual proportions of women and children, which may be done with tolerable correctness by multiplying the amount by five, we shall obtain a population of about 12,746 souls, for the two counties, which now contain 3,000,000 inhabitants. The following are the numbers, with the positions and the occupations, of the population of Lancashire and Cheshire at the time of the Domesday survey, as stated by Sir Henry Ellis:—

	Numbers.
Tenants in capite, holding from the king, . . . . .	2
Under tenants of the crown, . . . . .	167
Ancillæ, or female servants, . . . . .	8
Bordarii, or cottagers, . . . . .	638
Bovarii, or herdsman, . . . . .	172
Burgesses of the city of Chester belonging to the manor of Dodeslune, . . . . .	15
Burgesses in Rodelent (Rhuddlan), . . . . .	18
Burgesses in Peneverdent (Penwortham), . . . . .	6
Drengs, military followers holding manors, . . . . .	6

	Numbers.
Fabri, workmen or artizans . . . . .	4
Francigenæ, Frenchmen, . . . . .	41
Homines, followers, . . . . .	27
Hospites, persons in hospitals, . . . . .	3
Liberi homines, freemen, . . . . .	42
Molinarius, a miller, . . . . .	1
Piscatores, fishermen, . . . . .	14
Præpositi villarum, reeves or bailiffs, . . . . .	6
Presbyteri, priests, . . . . .	29
Radmen, horsemen, . . . . .	145
Servi, slaves, . . . . .	193
Villani, villeins or cultivators of the soil, . . . . .	797
Total, . . . . .	2334

To these numbers we should be disposed to add about 250, for the burgesses of Chester, resident within the city, at the time when the survey was made, who are omitted in Sir Henry Ellis' enumeration; and also about thirty for drengs, or the smaller class of thanes, underestimated in his summary. In round numbers, the male adult population of the two counties, at the Domesday survey, may be taken at about 2600. This is the number of men, exclusive of women and children. Supposing the whole population to have been five times as great as the adult male population, this would make the population of Lancashire and Cheshire, in the year 1086, 13,000. This is a smaller number, in proportion to the extent of the two counties, than was found at that time in any other district in England. The male adult population of the different English counties, at the time of the Domesday survey, as ascertained by Sir Henry Ellis, from a careful examination of the whole of the returns in that great record, was as follows:—

## POPULATION OF THE ENGLISH COUNTIES AT THE DOMESDAY SURVEY.

	Area in Acres.	Male Population.	Total Population.
Bedfordshire, . . . . .	295,582	3,875	19,375
Berkshire, . . . . .	451,210	6,324	31,620
Buckinghamshire, . . . . .	466,932	5,420	27,100
Cambridgeshire, . . . . .	525,182	5,204	26,020
Chester and Lancaster, . . . . .	2,000,000	2,349	11,745
Cornwall, . . . . .	873,600	5,436	27,180
Derbyshire, . . . . .	658,803	3,041	15,205
Devonshire, . . . . .	1,657,180	17,434	87,170
Dorsetshire, . . . . .	632,025	7,807	39,035
Essex, . . . . .	1,060,549	16,060	80,300
Gloucestershire, . . . . .	805,602	8,366	41,830
Hampshire, . . . . .	1,047,220	10,373	51,865
Herefordshire, . . . . .	534,825	5,368	26,840
Hertfordshire, . . . . .	391,141	4,927	24,635

	Area in Acres.	Male Population.	Total Population.
Huntingdonshire, . . . . .	229,544	2,914	14,570
Kent, . . . . .	1,039,419	12,205	61,025
Leicestershire, . . . . .	1,219,221	6,672	33,360
Lincolnshire, . . . . .	1,775,457	25,305	126,525
Middlesex, without London, . . . . .	180,136	2,302	11,510
Norfolk, . . . . .	1,354,301	27,087	135,435
Northamptonshire, . . . . .	630,358	8,441	42,205
Nottinghamshire, . . . . .	526,766	5,686	28,430
Oxfordshire, . . . . .	472,714	6,775	33,875
Rutlandshire, . . . . .	95,805	862	4,310
Shropshire, . . . . .	82,655	5,080	25,400
Somersetshire, . . . . .	1,047,220	13,764	68,820
Staffordshire, . . . . .	728,468	3,178	15,890
Suffolk, . . . . .	728,468	20,491	102,455
Surrey, . . . . .	478,792	4,393	21,965
Sussex, . . . . .	936,911	10,410	52,050
Warwickshire, . . . . .	563,946	6,547	32,735
Wiltshire, . . . . .	865,092	10,150	50,750
Worcestershire, . . . . .	472,165	4,625	23,125
Yorkshire, . . . . .	380,666	8,055	40,275
		286,926	1,435,630

Supposing the numbers of persons in the first column to have been heads of families, each consisting of five persons, this would make the whole number of the population of the English counties included in this survey 1,435,630 persons, or, in round numbers, a million and a half. The counties of Northumberland, Durham, Cumberland, and Westmoreland were not included in the Domesday survey, which only extended to the northern boundaries of Yorkshire and Lancashire, and to a few townships in Westmoreland and Cumberland.

Such was the condition of the north-western division of England at the time of the Domesday survey, made about twenty years after the Norman conquest. It was at that time the poorest, the most uncultivated, and probably the most thinly-peopled district of England. In several of the southern counties the wealth, and no doubt the population, of districts of equal extent was four or five times as great in the same age. In the north-western district, with about 2,000,000 acres of land, less than the fifth part of the soil was of sufficient value to be taken into account in this enumeration of the national resources. Yet the soil and its produce were almost the only sources of wealth. In that part of the district which includes the county of Lancaster this was almost entirely the case, the only sources of wealth spoken of being the land with its produce, and the fines imposed on the owners of the soil for offences com-

mitted within their limits. In the county of Chester also the land was likewise much the greatest source of wealth, though not the only one. In that county the saltworks possessed a certain value; and there was also one considerable city with some hundreds of houses, and some rude branches of trade and of commerce. With these exceptions the north-western division of England, where it was not a forest, was at that time an agricultural or pastoral country, thinly inhabited by a population, chiefly consisting of serfs or slaves in the country districts, though with a few freemen and burgesses in the only considerable borough of the district.

The progress of a community so composed and so situate was naturally very slow, from want of skill, capital, means of transport, and markets for the sale of produce; and was rendered still slower than it need have been by the continual prevalence of war and tumult, the frequent ravages of disease, and by occasional famines, caused by the inability of the people to store up the abundance of one year to meet the deficiencies of another, or even to transport the abundance of one district to meet the local deficiencies of another. In that age the whole population was liable to be called out for military service at the shortest notice, and on the most frivolous pretences; and during the 200 years which followed the Norman conquest, there was seldom a period of more than two or three years in which the cultivator was not called away from his peaceful and useful labours, to shed his blood in some quarrel in which he had comparatively little or no interest.

For more than two hundred years after the conquest of England by the Normans, the Scandinavian kings and chiefs commanded all the seas and islands between England, Scotland, and Ireland, and either plundered or exacted tribute from all who frequented those seas. Their principal position, in what were called the Southern or Sodor Islands, was the Isle of Man, though their dominion extended as far south as the Scilly Islands, all over the Irish Sea, and northward to the Hebrides, the Orkneys, the Shetlands, the Faroe Islands, and even to Iceland, in one direction, and to Norway and Denmark in another. We learn from the Chronicles of the Kings of Man,\* that the chiefs in these seas frequently collected hundreds of small vessels for the purpose of making war on or plundering the people of the neighbouring coasts, or each other. In the year 1098,

\* *Chronicon Reges Mannie: Camden's Britannia.*

the king of Norway visited these seas with a fleet of one hundred and sixty vessels. In the year 1158, another chief came to the Isle of Man with a fleet of fifty-three ships; and in the year 1164, Sumerled, a third chief, had a fleet of a hundred and fifty ships in the same seas. No English ships of war are mentioned in the Irish Sea previous to the year 1171, when Strongbow, earl of Pembroke, crossed with a fleet into Ireland. He was soon followed by the De Courcys, the De Lacys, the Le Butlers, and other English adventurers. But it was not until the year 1210, that King John of England crossed over into Ireland, with a fleet of five hundred ships. He sent a division of that fleet, under the command of one of his earls, named Fulke, to the Isle of Man, who laid waste the island for fifteen days, and took hostages from the inhabitants, before returning to England. But it required another hundred years, and a much greater chief, namely King Robert Bruce of Scotland, thoroughly to break the power of the Scandinavian chiefs in the western seas. This he effected, in the year 1313, by overrunning the Isle of Man, and capturing the strong fortress of Castle Rushin. After that time, the Scandinavian sea-kings ceased to infest the Western seas, and soon died out. The Isle of Man was afterwards united to England. It was first governed by the Montacute family; then by the Scropes; afterwards by the Percys; and ultimately by the Stanleys, kings of Man, and afterwards earls of Derby, who ruled the island for upwards of 300 years.

Incessant wars abroad or at home were amongst the principal causes which retarded the progress of society in those turbulent ages. Not one of the Norman kings ascended the throne without having to fight with a rival for its possession; and few of the Plantagenet kings reigned in peace even within their own dominions. The Norman and Plantagenet kings, as we have seen, were a race of conquerors, who aspired to almost universal dominion, not only among the nations within the British islands, but also over those in the neighbouring countries of the continent. More especially, however, were the earlier kings bent on the conquest of the principality of Wales, and the kingdoms of Ireland and Scotland. At that time the whole of the land of the kingdom was held from the crown by military service, and the holders of it were compelled to follow their lords to the field whenever called on to do so. In the feudal armies of those ages the kings were the commanders-in-chief, the earls were their field-marsals, the barons were the generals, the



knights the officers, the smaller gentry the cavalry, and the yeomen peasants and cottagers, as well as the poorer burgesses and their labourers, were the infantry and the archers, who at an early time acquired a high reputation in the wars of Europe. With a view to military service men of every rank were trained to the use of arms from their earliest years, and were liable to serve from the age of fifteen to that of sixty. By the celebrated statute of Winton, passed in the thirteenth year of the reign of Edward I., which reduced the long-established military customs of England to law, it was provided that every man should at all times have arms in his own house, suited to his rank and his estate, and be at all times ready for military service. There appear to have been no exceptions to this law, though the clergy, including the inhabitants of the religious houses, were probably excused in point of fact, even in an age when some of the clergy of the highest rank, including bishops and archbishops, were at least nominally commanders of armies. With regard to all classes of laymen, the statute of Winton provided, that every person who had land of the value of £15 a year, or goods of the value of forty marks, should at all times be provided with a horse, a breastplate of iron, a sword, and a knife or dagger. Those having £10 in land, or twenty marks in goods, were required to have the arms above described, though without the horse. The small proprietor who had land of the value of £5, was required to have a sword, a knife, a breastplate of iron, and a strong leathern doublet. Yeomen of an inferior class who had land of the value of from £2 to £5 a year were required to have swords, bows, and arrows; and those who had less than £2 in land were required to have knives and spears. He who had less than twenty marks in goods was required to have a sword and a knife. All other persons, without exception, were required to have bows and arrows, if residing outside the royal forests; and crossbows and bolts if residing within them. A public inspection took place twice a year to ascertain that all classes of men had the arms and armour prescribed by law, and knew how to use them. The object of this and of other laws of a similar kind was to make a nation of soldiers; and the result was what was desired. In a few years after the Norman conquest the whole nation was trained to arms, and was able not only to defend itself, but to carry on most extensive wars within the British islands, on the continent of Europe, and even as far as the Holy Land.

But while the people in all parts of the kingdom were liable to military service, the actual pressure of war fell most severely on the inhabitants of the districts residing nearest to the borders, and to the seats of war. For the first 200 years the conflicts with the brave mountaineers of Wales seldom ceased for more than a few years at a time; and hence the county of Chester, and the other counties bordering on Wales, were little else than camps and garrisons, the people always either waiting for an attack or preparing to make one. In general the English, having greatly the superiority in numbers, succeeded in keeping the war from their own borders; but this was not always the case. On several occasions the Welsh armies succeeded in forcing their way to the suburbs of Chester, and in burning them to the ground; and in the reign of Henry III. the Welsh overran the greater part of the county of Chester, and even destroyed the saltworks at Northwich and Nantwich. During the whole of these wars there was a continual drain of the population of Lancashire and Cheshire, for the purpose either of conquest or of defence.

A not less destructive drain, both of money and of blood, commenced in the reign of Henry II. with the attempts to conquer Ireland. In the reign of King John the burden of the Irish wars became so oppressive in Lancashire, that the knights and thanes paid a large sum of money to the king, that they might be excused from serving beyond the sea. But this was only a temporary relief, for the wars with Ireland never ceased, nor did the drain of gold and blood wasted and expended in carrying them on.

At a still later period a still greater drain on the population and resources of the northern counties of England was occasioned by the unavailing efforts of Edward I., and of his son and grandson, to conquer the kingdom of Scotland. Nearly all the supplies, and much the greater part of the men, consumed in those wars were raised in the northern counties. The demands for archers and men at arms, for knights, for seamen, and for ships to assist in carrying on the wars with Scotland, seldom ceased during the reigns of the first three Edwards; and on more than one occasion the whole of the male population of the six northern counties was ordered to assemble at Berwick and march into Scotland. The waste of lives and of resources in the wars of Wales, Ireland, and Scotland, fell with excessive severity on the northern counties. Nor did those counties escape without heavy loss in what was called the Hundred

Years' War with France—that is to say, the wars commenced in the reign of Edward III. and continued almost to the close of the reign of Henry VI. In these destructive wars the dukes of Lancaster prided themselves in taking the field with as large a force as possible, and a considerable portion of their forces were drawn from the counties of Lancaster and Chester, in which they were the lords of vast estates, and the virtual rulers of the people.

Nor was it in these foreign wars only that the resources of the kingdom were exhausted. Within the kingdom civil strife seldom ceased for more than a few years. The Norman kings—that is to say, William the Conqueror and his two sons, William Rufus and Henry I.—had to fight for their crowns against rivals, enemies, and insurgents. The reign of King Stephen was twenty years of bloodshed and anarchy; and ended in his agreeing to accept Henry Plantagenet as his successor, instead of his own son, William de Blois. Stephen, both as earl of Morton, before he ascended the throne, and as nominal king of England, was the lord of the honour of Lancaster, which was wasted and impoverished in his struggles for the crown. It passed along with the rest of his private estates to his son, William de Blois; on his death to King Henry II.; and afterwards to his son John, earl of Morton. It is at this time that the history of this district begins to assume an interest connected with the affairs of ordinary life. From the Domesday survey to the reign of King John it is a mere mass of confusion, in which it is scarcely possible to form any opinion of the habits of the people and their modes of life, except from the fact that they and their chiefs were engaged in incessant warfare either at home or abroad.

Yet in the midst of all this strife and contention the condition of the people was slowly improving, and in the reign of King John there sprung up a strong desire for the restoration of what they believed to be the ancient liberties of the English people. This feeling pervaded the barons, as well as the commons, and led to those great struggles which ultimately established the freedom of the nation. The wars of the barons and the people with King John, with his son Henry III., and the more peaceful, though scarcely less determined, struggles with Edward I., ended in the establishment of the English parliament, and to a gradual improvement in the condition of the people. The policy of King John, whether intentionally or not, had great influence in bringing about this result. He was one of the principal granters of charters to towns and cities; and under

these charters a free population grew up, which soon made common cause with the barons, and thus established the freedom of England. All the boroughs of the kingdom began to fill with men who became personally free under the protection of these charters, many of which provided that any one who lived within their limits for twelve months, without being challenged as a serf, became free, and remained free against all further claim, even of his former master.

*The Forests of Lancashire and Cheshire.*—The first great improvement effected in the north-western division of England, as in the kingdom generally, was the clearing away of the vast forests which extended over the greater part of the island, and had probably never been cleared since the time of the Roman dominion in Britain—if then. Some of the natural forests of Lancashire and Cheshire were nine or ten miles in length, even in the more level parts of the two counties,\* and the whole of the hills and mountains were covered with heath, grass, and thickets of trees or underwood. These forests and wastes were infested by wolves and wild boars, as well as by deer and wild cattle, down to the time of the Tudors, when Leland speaks of the wild cattle as having recently become extinct in the more hilly districts about Bury.† The clearing, or, as it was then called, the “assarting,” of forest lands commenced in the south of England previous to the Norman conquest, and is mentioned in Domesday Book.‡ But the early Norman kings, like Nimrod, were mighty hunters of wild beasts, as well as of men; and the cruel laws which they established to preserve the deer, the wild cattle, and even the smaller game of their forests, rendered it impossible for the holders of the land to clear it with safety, and for their tenants to cultivate it peacefully even when cleared. In addition to this, the Norman and the early Plantagenet kings claimed the right to extend the old forests and to form new ones; and this pretended right seems to have been grossly abused in the county of Lancaster by the early kings and the earls of Morton, who were princes of the royal blood, both in the times of Stephen and John; and in the county of Chester, under the Norman earls of Chester, who possessed all the rights of the crown in that county. Amongst the acts prohibited under the forest laws was the clearing of the woods, and the breaking down of the underwood, which sheltered the game. The villeins, or farmers, were also forbidden to dig

\* Domesday Survey: Inter Ripam et Mersham.

† Leland's Itinerary, vol. v. p. 94.

‡ Sir Henry Ellis' General Introduction to the Domesday Survey: Leominster.

ditches on their own land within the limits of the forest, to sink marl-pits, to drive swine through the forest, or to gather wild honey. To disturb the deer, even without the intention of chasing them, was punished with heavy fines; and the chasing and killing of the deer was in some cases punished with mutilation, and even with death. Even the clergy, whose power at that time was almost unlimited, were severely fined for offences against the forest laws. In the sheriff's accounts or pipe-roll for Lancashire of 21 Henry II. (1174), we have an account of numbers of the clergy and others punished for offences against the forest laws. Amongst these were the archdeacon of Chester, fined 100s.; Humphrey, the priest, the brother of Albert de Boiseul, baron of Penwortham; Stephen, parson of Walton; Ralph the parson, and Adam the priest, of Preston; Robert, priest of Childwall; Adam, priest of Meols; and Jordan, dean of Manchester. We have also reports of some of the forest assizes held in the county of Lancaster in later times, with the nature of the offences committed or charged. In the 15 Edward I. (1286-87), Adam de Carleton, Roger, the son of Roger of Roucliffe, with Richard his brother, were indicted for capturing three wild oxen with the dogs of Richard le Botiller, in the forest of the king, in the moss of Pilling. At the same assizes, Richard de Lee, John the son of Simon, John of Arkelbeck, Roger his brother, and William the son of Julia de Heysham, were accused of capturing deer and wild cattle with bows, arrows, and hunting dogs. On this occasion the parties pleaded that they had a right to do so, under a charter granted by King John to the thanes of Lancashire. At a still later forest assize, in the 11 Edward III. (1337), before William Basset and Robert de Hungerford, we have a variety of other convictions. Thus twelve jurors of the forest of (West) Derbyshire made a presentment that William de Ryding and Hugh his brother, Henry the son of Ranulf, Richard de Acres, William de Hethe, and John Spellowe, had broken down the underwood in the wood of (West) Derby, near the forest, whilst passing through it. At the same assizes Gilbert de Haydok, Alan de Eltonhead, and Richard de Alvauleigh, verderers, with a jury, made a presentment that, on a certain Monday, Reginald de Yoxall entered the park of Toxteth, and there in a certain place, which is called Holly Hurst, concealed himself with bushes and branches of trees, in order to deceive the wild animals feeding there; and that he shot at the deer, and killed two does, which he carried away in the night. A person of much

greater standing, William Blundell of Ince, was presented, for that he and others concealed themselves in Maghull wood, and afterwards with their dogs took a doe in the water of Alt, near Ingwath. Another very distinguished delinquent, Sir Adam de Houghton, knight, himself the master forester, was presented for taking a stag and a doe in the park of Toxteth. A Cheshire gentleman of standing, Henry de Dutton, was prosecuted for taking a doe in the same park, in the presence of the steward of the forest. Nor were the clergy spared on this occasion : Ranulf de Dacre, the parson of Prescott, was presented for breaking into the park of Toxteth and taking a doe. With regard to Ranulf de Dacre and his companions, the presentment further stated, that they were common malefactors of the forest ; that Robert de Barton, the priest, encouraged them in their crimes, by entertaining them at his house in Smethedon-subtus-Toxteth ; and that Adam Atil also received and entertained them, at his house in Aigburth (Aykbright, the Bright Oaks).

In the reign of King John, that needy monarch, who was always willing to sell anything for money, sold to the thanes and free tenants of the honour of Lancashire, for the sum of fifty pounds of silver, permission to clear and thin, and also to sell and grant their own woods, and to hunt and take hares and foxes, and all manner of wild animals, except deer, wild cattle, roebucks, and wild boars, in all parts of his forests in the said county, except in his demesne woods and inclosures. This charter was originally granted by John whilst he was yet earl of Morton, but was afterwards confirmed by him in the first year of his reign, and by his son, Henry III., in the thirteenth year of his.

But a great check was given to the practice of forming new forests, and of extending the limits of the old ones, by the great Charter of the Forest, granted during the minority of Henry III. by the regents of the kingdom, Hugh de Burgh, earl of Kent, William Mareschal, earl of Pembroke, and Ranulf, earl of Chester, who at that time had the government of the kingdom in their hands. That charter greatly mitigated the severity of the forest laws, and removed most of the penalties for clearing away the woods and cultivating the land on private estates, even within the limits of the forest. But beside that, it prohibited the forming of new forests, and declared all forests to be illegally formed which had been made subsequent to the accession of the young king's grandfather, Henry II., who came to the throne in the year 1154. In conse-



quence of the passing of this law a general order was issued, that inquiry should be made in each county, by a jury of knights or gentlemen, as to the whole of the existing forests, in order that the boundaries of the ancient forests, formed before the accession of Henry II., might be clearly ascertained and described, and that the forests formed subsequent to the accession of Henry II. might be thrown open and disforested. It appears from this inquiry that the only Lancashire forests which the jurors recognized as having existed previous to the accession of Henry II., were those of Quernmoor, near Lancaster; Bleasdale, in the upper part of the valley of the Wyre; Fulwood, near Preston; Toxteth, near Liverpool; West Derby, near the same place; and Burton Wood, near Warrington. With regard to the other forests, the commissioners of inquiry stated that they were illegal; and they mentioned amongst the illegal forests those of Croxteth—the present residence of the earls of Sefton—Altcar, Hale, and Simonswood. In spite of this declaration, however, Croxteth and Simonswood continued to be regarded as forests to the reign of Henry VIII., when they were sold to the Molyneux family. An attempt was also made, in the time of the earls of Lancaster, to extend the bounds of the forest of West Derby over the greater part of the hundred lying to the west of Sankey Brook.

The following is the report of the commissioners appointed to inquire into the origin and limits of the then existing forests of Lancashire, in the twelfth year of the reign of Henry III., 1228, with an account of the limits of each of those forests:—

“The following are the twelve knights of the county of Lancaster who made perambulation of the forests, by the precept of the lord king, to wit:—William Blundell, Thomas de Bethum, Adam de Bury, William de Tatham, Adam de Coupynwra (Caponwray), Adam de Molyneux, Gilbert de Kellet, Paulinus de Gairstang, Patrick de Berwyk, Henry de Lee, Grymebald de Ellale, Thomas de Burnhull; who say, that the whole county of Lancaster ought to be disafforested, according to the tenor of the Charter of the Forest, except the woods underwritten:—In the first place, Quernmore, by these bounds, to wit: just as Langtwayt stretches itself towards the Erlesgate, descending as far as to the bridge of Musart sikets (ditch), descending to the Frithbrok, descending to the Lone (river Lune), following the Lone (Lune), upwards, to the Eskbrok, ascending and following Maybrigge, ascending to Hankedame, following the siket (ditch)

of Hankedame, ascending to the sikets (ditch) which is under Ullethwayt, and from that siket to Storchag, and from Storchag to the east part of the head of Brounesgate; following Brounesgate, ascending to the top of the head of Cloghok, and from the top of the head of Cloghok to the top of the head of Damerisgele, descending thence to the siket which is between two marked oaks ("marbres accas"); following the Silcok to Blemes, following the sikets to Condone, following the sikets to the moss under Eghlotesheved; following that moss ascending to the road (*iter*) of Stokthwayt, following the road ascending to the Erlesgate. And, moreover, beyond these bounds, John the king gave a certain part of that forest by his charter to Matthew Gernet and his heirs, paying therefor, yearly, half a mark (6s. 8d.), saving his venison: and therefor the lord the king may do his will.

"And, moreover, Couet and Blesedale, by these bounds, to wit: from the head of Calder (river) on the south part, to Ulnsty, and from Ulnsty to the top of the head of Pirllok, and from that summit, following the Merleigh, descending to where the Merleigh falls into the Broke (river Brock) at Thorpin Lees, following the Brok, and descending to the watercourse (*ductū*) in the east part of Wonesnape, following Wonesnape to Stayngile, and from Stayngile to Comistis, and following Comisty descending to the Calder, following it ascending to the aforesaid Ulnsty.

"And, moreover, Fulwode, by these bounds: from Haya Rainsgil, to the way of Sepal, and thence as far as to the watercourse (*ductus*) that goeth from Sepedale to Fulwode, and thence as the watercourse falls into Havasick gate, and thence as the way goes from Coleford in le Ferms, and thence as it goes to Codelische, and thence to the haia of Rannislyt. And the men of Preston ought to have timber for building and for burning, and pasture for their cattle.

"Toxteth, by these bounds: as far as where Oskelesbrok (Otterspool) falls into Mersee, following Oskelesbrok, ascending to the park of Magewom, and from the meadow to Bromegge; following the Bromegge to the Brounlawe (Brownlow hill), and thence crossing to the old turbaries between two marshes to Lambisthorn (the Beacon), and from Lambisthorn descending to the waterfall at the head of Stirpull (probably Lirpull), following and descending to the Mersee. Near these bounds the lord John the king placed Smethdoun with its appurtenances in the same forest; and gave Thyngwall

to a certain poor man, in exchange for it [therefor]: therein the king may do his will.

“Further, moreover, the wood of Derby, by these bounds: from Bradistone in Hargunkar as far as, by the midst of the kar, to Hassihurst, and so to where the path goeth out of the grove (*nemore*), to Longlegh, which stretches from Derby into Kyrkeby, and so beyond Longlegh into Mikkyll brok, and ascending from Mikkyll brok to Blakbrok, ascending from Blakbrok into Throuthornedalebrok, and so ascending (?) to the plains. And the men of the place (*vicum*) have common and herbage, and other things in the aforesaid wood; and the men of Derby have all necessaries in the aforesaid wood.

“Also, moreover, Burton Wode, by these bounds, to wit: from Hardisti to Sonky, and from Raveslache to Bradeleghebroke; so that William Pincerna (Butler) and his heirs may have common of pasture for their store cattle (*staurum*), and pasnage for their swine, and timber for their castle and buildings, and for burning.

“Further, we the jury say, that Croxteth Park was put within pales after the coronation of King Henry your grandfather, and belongeth to Knouselegh, to the heir of Robert (Lathom), son of Henry, and ought to be disafforested according to the tenor of the Carta de Foresta.

“We further say, that Altekarak was put within pales after the coronation of King Henry your grandfather, and belongs, a certain part, to the vill of Ines (Ince), and to Ramsmelis (Ravensmeols), and to Fornoby (Formby), and to Holand, and to Lydgate, and ought to be disafforested.

“Also, we say, as to the vill of Halis (Hale), that it was shown that your grandfather, the king, took an unfenced part of it from the wood after his coronation, from Flaxpolis to Quayntebliche, and the king gave the said vill of Halis in entirety, with its appurtenances, to Richard de Mide (or de Hibernia, Ireland), by his charter of forest, and that it ought to be disafforested, according to the tenor of the Carta de Foresta.

“Also, we say, that Symondes Wode was inclosed with pales after the coronation of King Henry your grandfather, and belongs to Kyrkeby, to the heir of Richard, son of Roger, and ought to be disafforested, according to the Carta de Foresta,” &c.

The above bold and manly report of the twelve Lancashire knights and gentlemen, appointed to make inquiry into the extent of the

royal forests in that county, if acted upon, would have reduced those forests within very reasonable limits. But there was a continual struggle on the part of the crown and the earls and dukes of Lancaster to extend the bounds of their forests; and so late as the reign of Edward III., the duke of Lancaster attempted to include most of the western townships of the West Derby hundred within the forest of West Derbyshire.

It appears from a Report of the Pleas of the Forest, held before William Bassett and Robert de Hungerford, in 11 Edward 3 (1337), that the following townships were then claimed as within the forest, and that their whole lands were at the mercy of the king (or the duke), for various offences against the forest laws:—

“Sankey, Kuerdeleigh, Bolde, Apulton, Dutton, Crounton, Parr, Sutton, Raynhill, Eccleston, Knowselegh, Kyrkeby, Wyston, Huyton, Torbok, Hale, Garston, Spek, Allerton, Parva Wolveton, Magna Wolveton, Childwall, Ayntree, Walton, Derby, Kirkedale, Lytherpool, Wavertree, Eveton, Bothull, Lytherlond, Parva Crosseby, Magna Crosseby, Thornton, Ins, Sefton, Aghton, Maghul, Mellinge, Lydiate, Down Holland, and Forneby.” The ancient spelling is curious, and in some cases throws light on the origin of the name.

It is clear from the report of the Lancashire knights, given above, that the above claim was an usurpation, except as relates to West Derby, Toxteth, and Burton's Wood.

The forests of the county of Chester were of greater extent, in proportion to the size of the two counties, than those of Lancashire; and it does not appear that any of them were disafforested under the *Charta de Foresta*. At that time the earls of Chester were earls palatine, and possessed within their own earldom all the rights of the crown, without being subject to the general laws of the kingdom.

There were three great forests in Cheshire, belonging to the Norman earls of Chester, and which afterwards became the property of the princes of Wales, who were also earls of Chester. These forests were those of Delamere, otherwise known as Mara and Mondrem; the forest of Wirral, which at one time extended over great part of that peninsula; and the forest of Macclesfield, which stretched far and wide over the lofty hills on the borders of Derbyshire.

The forest of Delamere, when it was at its greatest extent, covered the whole of that range of red sandstone hills, which rises at some points to a height of 600 feet, and extends across the county of Chester, from Helsby Hill, on the banks of the river Mersey, to

Overton, not far from the banks of the river Dee, and nearly to Aston in Mondrem, near Nantwich. This forest probably took its names of Delamere and Mara from the number of beautiful meres which are found in different parts of it, all of which were formerly well stocked with fish. That part of the forest which was anciently called the forest of Mondrem seems to have been the south-eastern part, which extended nearly to Nantwich. The rangership of the forest of Delamere belonged to the ancient Cheshire families of the Dones and Kingsleys, from whom it descended to the equally ancient family of the Ardens or Ardernes, the ancestors of the Barons Alvanley. They were the bow-bearers of the forest. Thomas, Lord Stanley, the ancestor of the earls of Derby, was made master forester in fee, surveyor and ranger, in the year 1461, on the accession of King Edward IV. The following townships are described, in an ancient manuscript, as belonging to the forest of Delamere, when it was at its greatest extent, viz.:—Bridge Trafford, Wimbalds Trafford, Thornton, Ince, Elton, Hapsford, Stoney-Dunham, Alvanley, Manley, Helsby, Newton, Kingsley, Norley, Crowton, Codington, Amston, Acton, Winnington, Castle-Northwich, Hartford, Horton, Witenhall, Oulton, and Lowe; Budworth, Rushton, Eaton, Tarporley, Church-Minshull; Aston, Woleston, White-Pool, Cholmondiston, Stoke, Rudheath, Wardle, Calverley, Alpraham, Tilston-Fernall, Tiverton, Utkington, Willington, Clatton, Dutton, Ashton, Great Molesworth, Little Molesworth, Horton-juxta-Ashton, Great Barrow, and Little Barrow. All these townships are described as being within the limits of the forest, and they include nearly the whole of the hilly central region of Cheshire. The townships of Tarvin, Hackinghall, and Kelsall, it is stated, were not within the forest, being in the liberties of the bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, who at that time was also bishop of Chester. The townships of Weaverham, Merton, and Over were not within it, being in the liberties of the abbey of Vale Royal. Frodsham, Overton, Netherton, Bradley, and Woodhouses were also excluded from the forest jurisdiction, as having been parcel of the ancient demesnes of the earls of Chester.\*

The forest of Wirral was also of very great extent, and reached nearly from the city of Chester to the sea. So late as the year 1334 (27 Edward III.) the prior of Birkenhead, with his servants, were obliged to receive and to feed six foresters, who went round the forest of Wirral to enforce the forest laws.†

\* Harleian MSS., British Museum, No. 1215. † Pleadings In Quo Warranto at Chester (27 Edward III.)

The foresters of Wirral were the Silvesters, the Bamvilles, and the Stanleys of Hooton. The forest of Wirral was disforested—that is to say, was thrown open, and freed from the forest laws, so early as the year 1376. This was done by King Edward III., in consequence of a request made by his son, the Black Prince, who was also earl of Chester, in behalf of the inhabitants of that part of Cheshire, who complained that they had sustained many damages, grievances, and suits, by reason of the said forest.

The forest of Macclesfield, known in ancient times as Lyme Forest, was described even in Camden's time as forming the boundary between Cheshire and Derbyshire. In the reign of Edward I. it was much infested with wolves, as appears from the sheriff's accounts, in which an allowance was made for the cost of constructing wolf traps in that forest. In the year 1461 (1 Edward IV.) Thomas, Lord Stanley, was made master forester of Macclesfield, the office being granted to him and his heirs. The office of chief sergeant of the forest was granted by Ranulf de Blundeville, earl of Chester, to Vivian de Devonport and his heirs.\*

The following townships were within the purlieu of the forest of Macclesfield:—North-Rode, Basley, Gawsworth, Sutton, Downes, Hurdsfield, Tetherington, Upton, Bollington, Prestbury, Butley, Rainow, Pott Shrigley, Adlington, Poynton, Norbury, Offerton, Torkington, Marple, Disley, Taxal, Ketelshulme, and Whaley.†

*The Administration of Justice in Lancashire and Cheshire.*—The county of Lancaster appears to have been organized as a shire or county in the reign of Henry II., soon after the honour of Lancaster, together with the earldom of Morton, came into the hands of the king, by the death of William de Blois, earl of Boulogne and Morton, the son and inheritor of the private estates of King Stephen. We hear first of the sheriff of Lancashire in the year 1164 (11 Henry II.), and a few years later, 1176 (22 & 23 Henry II.), we find that the judges of assize included Lancashire in their iters or circuits.‡ Previous to the formation of the county of Lancaster by Henry II. the six hundreds of which it is composed had been governed separately, by officers known as the chief bailiffs or high stewards of the hundreds. This office appears to have been hereditary in certain families, who held their estates, on condition of governing the respective hundreds and superintending the execution of justice,

\* Harleian MSS., No. 1215.

† Harleian MSS., British Museum, No. 1215.

‡ Spelman's Glossary, p. 320.



as was afterwards done by the sheriff of the county. Thus we find that Henry de Walton, the high bailiff of the hundred of West Derby, caused criminals to be brought to justice, and to be executed with the forms of law; and this was no doubt a part of the duty of the chief bailiffs of the other hundreds.\* The names of the high bailiffs of the six Lancashire hundreds were as follows—Orme or Ormus de Kellet, the lord of a manor near Lancaster, was the high bailiff of the hundred of Lonsdale, or, as it was then generally called, the wapentake of Lonsdaleshire. The family is very distinguished in the history of that part of the county, and probably sprang from Earl Orme, a great Scandinavian sea-captain, who ruled in the western seas previous to the Norman conquest, and from whom the promontories of the Great and Little Orme's Head, on the coast of Wales, are supposed to have been named, as well as the town of Ormskirk, and the vill of Urmston in South Lancashire. At the time of the Domesday survey a descendant of this chief, merely described as Orme, was one of the principal landowners in Lonsdale; and more than 150 years afterwards, at the time when the account of the king's possessions and tenants in Lancashire was drawn up, which has been preserved and published under the title of "Testa de Nevill," we find that Ormus de Kellet, or Orme of Kellet, was the high bailiff of the hundred of Lonsdale. From the same authority we find that Alan de Singleton, otherwise described as Alan the son of Roger, was the high bailiff of the hundred of Amounderness and also of that of Blackburn. The office of high bailiff of the hundred of Leyland was held by Richard de Cleyton, the head of a family which still holds estates in that hundred. The same office was held in Salfordshire by Richard de Hulton, the head of a family which also still possesses large estates in the hundred of Salford. In West Derbyshire the office of high bailiff of the hundred was held by the ancient family of the Waltons, of Walton, near Liverpool, who held the office in the reign of King Stephen, and in those of Henry II., King John, Henry III., and Edward I., as we learn from records of those early times.

In the account of Roger Pictavensis, in Domesday, one of his followers is mentioned under the title of the vice-comes, a term which was afterwards applied to the bearers of the old Saxon office of sheriff or reeve of the shire. But the first person who held the office of high sheriff of Lancashire, as we now understand the term,

\* Quo Warranto before Hugh de Cressingham at Lancaster, 20 Edward, 1292.

was Galfridus de Valonis, who filled it in the eleventh year of Henry II. (1164). The honour of Lancaster having come into the hands of the king about that time by the death of William de Blois, the son and heir of the private estates of King Stephen, of which the royal earldom of Morton, with its great appendage the honour of Lancaster, was one; the high sheriff, or vice-comes, was the acting representative of the king in the administration of justice, and the guardian of the royal rights and property. He was subordinate to the earl or comes when there was one; but there was no earl of Lancaster until towards the close of the reign of King Henry III., when Edmund Plantagenet, the younger son of the king, was raised to that honour. The high sheriff was appointed by the king, except in counties palatine, of which Cheshire was one from the Norman conquest, and Lancashire from the reign of Edward III.

The office of high sheriff, or vice-comes, as it was then called, existed in Cheshire as early as the reign of King Stephen. In that reign Ranulfus, vice-comes or sheriff, was witness of a deed of the second Randle, earl of Chester, to the church of St. Werburg. In the next reign, Gilbert Pipard is mentioned as sheriff of Cheshire, in the year 1183, and Bertram de Verdon in 1184 (30 and 31 Henry II.) Amongst the high sheriffs of the reign of Henry III. Sir Peter Leycester mentions Sir William Thebaud, Richard Pierpoint, Richard Fitz-Lidulf, Richard de Sandbach, David de Malpas, Robert Buckley, Sir Thomas Dutton of Dutton, and Richard Wilbraham. In that of Edward I. he names Richard de Massey, William de Hawarden, Robert Grosvenor of Hulme in Allostock, Philip de Egerton, and Robert Bressey.

The judges or chief justices of Cheshire, who presided over the administration of justice throughout the whole county of Chester, were of great antiquity. Amongst the witnesses of a deed of William, constable of Chester, to the abbey of St. Werburg, of Raby in Wirral, early in the reign of King Stephen, is Johannes Adams, *justiciarius comitis*. Raufe Mainwaring was judge of Chester in the reigns of Henry II. and Richard I.; Philip Orrebej in the reign of King John; William Vernon, Richard Fitton, John Grey, Alan de Zouch, Lucas de Tanai, James de Audley, and Reginald Grey, in the reign of Henry III. All these were previous to the year 1270. In the reigns of Edward I., II., and III., were Gaucelinus de Badelsmere, Richard Massey, William Trussell, William Ormsby, Robert de Holland, Hugh de Audley, Oliver Ingham, William Clinton,

Bartholomew Burghursh, and Thomas Abbot of Vale-Royal, with others.\*

*The Tenure and Ownership of Lands in Lancashire and Cheshire under the early Plantagenet Kings.*—During the first fifty years of the thirteenth century, between the years 1200 and 1250, another great national survey of England was made, which is described in the volume known by the title of “Testa de Nevill.” This survey was commenced in the reign of King John, who is spoken of in it, as “the earl of Morton, who now is king;” and was completed in the reign of his son Henry III., probably about the year 1247, that being the year in which William and Agnes De Ferrers, earl and countess of Derby, died, who are named in it as holding the lands “between the Mersey and the Ribble,” which had previously belonged to the king. The object of the survey described in “Testa de Nevill” was to ascertain what lands and rights the king possessed in the different counties of the kingdom; how far the rights and estates of the crown had been made over to the great tenants of the crown, and what were the conditions on which the grants to those tenants had been made. It must be remembered that at this time the king was the lord of all the land of the kingdom; that all lands, without exception, were originally held, either by or from the crown, generally by barons or knights, on the performance of certain services; and that the rents, service, fines, and other revenues, payable by the holders of the land to the crown, formed the principal fund for carrying on the government of the country, and for maintaining the royal dignity.

It is one great merit in the returns given in “Testa de Nevill,” and in the National Records of that age generally, that they all bear evidence of having been made from information collected in public, in the presence of juries, witnesses, and open courts. At the commencement of the inquiry in the whole county, and in each hundred, we are informed who were the jurors of commissioners of inquiry, before whom the facts stated in the return were deposed to, and most of the returns commence with the words—“The Jurors declare”—*Juratores dicunt*—then going through each item of their statement. In “Testa de Nevill” we have the names of what may be considered the Grand Jury, or Grand Inquest of the whole county of Lancaster, in the reigns of King John and of his son Henry III., between the years 1200 and 1250; and also the names of the jurors

\* *Leycester's Antiquities of Cheshire.*

in each of the six hundreds, or as they were then called, wapentakes, into which the county was, and still is, divided. In those lists are the names of several of the early representatives of old families which are still in existence, or which have merged into other distinguished families, still well known in the county. We have unfortunately no particulars, in "Testa de Nevill," respecting the county of Chester, which is not mentioned in that return, except incidentally, for the reason stated above; namely, that all the rights of the crown in that county had been surrendered to the earl of Chester. But we obtain similar information respecting part of the county of Chester from other sources.

The Report of the Inquisition or Commission of Inquiry of the whole County of Lancaster commences with these words:—

"This is the inquest made on the oath of faithful knights, concerning tenements given and alienated within the limits, *infra limam*, in the county of Lancaster, that is to say, by Roger Gernet of Burg, Robert de Lancaster, Adam de Middleton, Richard of Burg, Walter Fitz-Osbert, Walter Fitz-Swaine, William of Winwick, Richard Fitz-Swaine, Richard Fitz-Robert, William Blundell, Robert de Ainesdale, Richard de Orhull, Richard de Pierrepont, Alan de Rixton, William de Radcliffe, Alexander de Pilkinton, and Henry de Trafford, who say that Gilbert Fitz-Reinfrid holds one knight's fee in the county of Lancaster, and that William de Lancaster gave in his time in marriage, or as marriage portions, five carucates of land in the two Ecclestons and in Lairbrec, which Richard de Mulas (Molyneux), William Blundell, and Rudolf de Eccleston, and Walter and Godfrey Fitz-Swaine hold.\*

The jurors then proceed to report on the principal fees of the crown, in the county of Lancaster, and perhaps on some others in the ancient honor of Lancaster, or earldom of Roger Pictavensis, which included many large fees not within the present county of Lancaster.

Another jury or body of commissioners was appointed to make inquiries respecting the manor of Hornby, the chief manor and castle of the Montbegon family. The honor of Roger Montbegon extended to several counties. The names of the jurors as to the manor of Hornby were Richard de Burg, Benedict de Hergun (probably Hougun, the old Saxon name for Furness), Adam de Farlton, Simon de Farlton, Adam Clericus de Clatton, Roger de Tunstal, William Aaron, of Farlton, Roger de Farlton, John, the son of Eve de Tunstal,

\* Testa de Nevill, p. 401.

Henry de Wenington, Henry Fitz-Robert de Wenington, Adam, the son of Andrew of Farlton, John, the son of Benedict de Farlton, William, the son of Reginald of Stordis, Robert, the son of Walter of Hergun, Thomas, the son of Alan of Hergun, Gilbert, the son of Huttred (Uchtred) of Hergun, Adam, the son of Martin of Farlton, John Makeles, and Simon, the son of Thomas of Hergun; who say that Hugh de Burg holds the manor of Hornby from Henry de Mundene (Montbegon), and he, *in capite* from our lord, the king. And they further say that they do not know by what service Hubert holds from Henry, or by what service Henry holds from the king, because that barony is divided into many parts, in many counties.\*

The names of the jurors in the wapentake or hundred of Amounderness were:—William de Pres, Warin de Wyttingham, Adam de Hotton, William de Merton, William de Grimsharg, Richard de Newton, Adam de Stalmin, Gilbert de Meel, John de Staynole, William de Eston, Robert de Eston, and Richard Kotun.†

The jurors in the hundred of Blackburn were:—Simon de Hery, Adam de Blackburn, Adam Noel (Nowell), Henry de Cleyton (Clayton), Adam de Billington, William de Caldecotes, John de Winkesley, and Richard de Katelowe. ‡

In the Leland hundred we find that the names of the jurors were:—Robert Bussel, or Boiseul (the name of the barons of Penwortham), Warin de Walton, Robert de Cleyton, Richard Banastre, Walter de Hole (or Hoole), Richard de Thorp, William de Wordinton, Richard de Chernoc, John de Cophul, John de Cleyton, and Robert de Wythull. §

In the Salford hundred the names of the jurors were:—Awardus Tagun, Rade de Anekotes, Richard de Chorlton, Robert de Snisworth, William de Eccles, and Thomas de Pul; || and

In the West Derby hundred we find the names of the jurors appointed to inquire into the Gascon scutage or tax, in the 26 Henry III., 1242, which were as follows:—Henry de Tyldesley, Adam de Westeleye, William de Litherland, Mathew de Bolde, Alan de Windel, Robert de Torington, Richard de Wilfal, Adam de Garston, Richard de Quichund, William le Noreys, and Thurstan de Holand. ¶

When the survey described in "Testa de Nevill" was made, the king (Henry III.) appears to have held in his own hands the castle of Lancaster, which the early kings of England and earls of Morton

\* Testa de Nevill, p. 400. † Ibid. p. 399. ‡ Ibid. p. 399. § Ibid. p. 399. || Ibid. p. 399. ¶ Ibid. p. 396.

occasionally visited ; the forests of the county, which we have seen were extensive, and no doubt full of game ; and a great store farm for breeding cattle, in that part of the fertile district of the Fylde which lies immediately to the south of Rossall Point,\* the returns of which were made to the vice-comes or high sheriff.† Around the castle of Lancaster many portions of land were held on condition of supplying provisions, and performing various services at the castle. Thus Nicholas of Torrisholme, near Lancaster, and afterwards his daughter Matilda, held land in Torrisholme, on condition of supplying the larder of the castle. William, the gardener, held seven acres of land in Lancaster, by service of supplying vegetables to the castle (*olera et porrecta*). Rudolph Barum held half a bovate of land, by service of being mason (*cementarius*) in the castle, or of paying 5s. a year, at the choice of the king. Adam, the son of Gilemichael, held half a carucate of land in Slyne, near Lancaster, by service of being carpenter to the king ; the land was worth 16s. a year. Roger, carpenter, also held ten acres of land in Lancaster, by service of being carpenter in the castle of Lancaster. This land was worth 5s. a year—that is to say, 6*d.* an acre, which was equal to a rent of about 6s. a year of present money. Roger de Gernet, of Halton, near Lancaster, was the chief forester for the county of Lancaster. He and several others of the Gernet family held lands on condition of attending the king in his occasional visits into these very remote parts. In addition to the Gernets, William and Benedict of Gresingham held two bovates of land in Gresingham from the king, by service of being foresters ; and Alicia, the daughter of Galfred de Gresingham, had six bovates of land in that place, which she held by service of keeping or nursing the young hawks or falcons of the king, found in Lonsdale, until they were strong, and when they were strong, of presenting them to the sheriff of Lancaster, who took charge of them for the king. This Alicia was one of the wards of the crown, whose marriage was in the gift of the king, and whom King John had married to Thomas de Gresingham.‡

These appear to have been the principal lands in the county of Lancaster held by the crown, or for the personal service of the king, at this period of the reign of Henry III. The great mass of the royal estates in the county of Lancaster, namely, those situated between the Mersey and the Ribble, he had given to Ranulf de Blundeville,

\* Testa de Nevill, p. 404.

† Rossall in manu domi Regis, cum stauo suo unde vic. respondet.

‡ Testa de Nevill, p. 371.



earl of Chester, from whom they had descended to the earl's sister, Agnes, the wife of William de Ferrers, earl of Derby. But the castle of Lancaster was held by the king until the fiftieth year of his reign, when he created his second son, Edmund, earl of Lancaster, giving to him the castle of Lancaster, and all the royal estates in the county, along with the great forfeited estates of Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, and Robert de Ferrers, earl of Derby—as we have already stated.\*

According to the following return, given in "Testa de Nevill," there were in the reign of King Henry III. the following knights' fees belonging to the honour of Lancaster, situated within the county, and held *in capite* from the crown:—William de Lancaster, baron of Lancaster, held one knight's fee. Adam de Middleton held the fourteenth part of a knight's fee. The heir of Aumeric Pincerna, or le Botiller, baron of Warrington, held three knights' fees. Adam de Merton held the fourth part and the twentieth part of one knight's fee. The heir of Theobald Walter, baron of Amounderness, held the half of a knight's fee. The heirs of Richard Fitz-Roger held the fourth part of one knight's fee. The earl of Lincoln (De Lacy), in the whole county of Lancaster, held twelve knights' fees. The heir of Richard Banastre, baron of Newton, held one knight's fee. Adam de Molyneux, held half a knight's fee. The heir of Richard de Hulton held a sixth part of a knight's fee. Thomas Gretley (or Gresley), baron of Manchester, held five and a half knights' fees. Roger Gernet held one knight's fee, "but says that he holds it by forestry." John de Mara held one knight's fee. Henry de Muleden, baron of Montbegon, held two knights' fees.†

The quantity of land contained in a knight's fee varied greatly in different parts of the county of Lancaster. In the northern hundreds of Lonsdale and Amounderness, which were much exposed to the ravages of war, a knight's fee consisted of twenty-four carucates of land; in the southern hundreds, of twelve or ten carucates; and in one case of six carucates.‡ This last, at the time of the Domesday survey, was the quantity of land contained in the Saxon division of a hide, in the same district of Lancashire. Supposing the knight's fee to be twenty-four carucates of 180 acres each, it would thus amount to 4320 acres; at twelve carucates, to half that extent; and at six carucates, to a fourth. The smallest extent would be upwards of 1000 acres. The knights' fees were

\* Patent Rolls, 50 Henry III.

† Testa de Nevill, p. 400.

‡ Ibid. p. 400.

subdivided and regranted in halves, fourth parts, tenth parts, twenty-fourth parts, and even forty-eighth parts, when granted to subtenants holding by knights' service. These knights' fees and subdivisions of knights' fees seem to have been permanent, and to have created a tenure only inferior to freehold, in the military service attaching to them. When there was a money rent, that also was fixed and permanent.

Under the feudal system all the land of the kingdom was considered to belong to the king, and was held chiefly by the performance of military service. Hence, during the minority of the male heir, and not only during the minority, but during the widowhood of heiresses, the king was considered to have the right to the management of all estates held from the crown. He was also considered to have the right of directing and controlling the marriages of minors of the male sex, and of females at all periods of their lives. Thus, we are told in the account of the Lonsdale hundred that Alicia, the daughter of Godfrey de Gersingham, had been in the gift of the king, and had been married to Thomas de Gersingham by King John, and that they held six bovates, or carucates, of land in Gersingham, by the service of keeping the falcons of the king in Lonsdale. The land was worth two marks a year. We are further told, that Godfrey, above named, had given two bovates of land to Bernard de Gersingham, and five acres to the prior of Lancaster. With regard to Alicia de Gersingham, it is stated that she was dead, and that she had left one daughter by her marriage with the said Thomas, named Crispina, who was in the gift of the king, and who had been forbidden to marry without the permission of the king, but that Adam de Coupmanwra, her grandfather, had offered to the king 100*s.* to have the marriage, that is to say, the disposal of his granddaughter in marriage. Several other similar cases are mentioned. Thus, it is stated that Elewisa de Stuteville, the daughter of a great northern earl, was in the gift of the king, but she was not married, and that her land in Lonsdale was worth 100*s.* a year, and in Amounderness 10*s.* A widow of an equally celebrated family is also mentioned, namely, Oliva, who was the wife, or rather the widow, of Roger de Montbegon, the lord of Hornby castle. She also was in the gift of the king, but we are told that she had no land in that wapentake. Also, it is stated that Agnes de Clopwayt ought to be in the custody of the king, for two bovates of land which she holds from the king in Blothelay, for 1*s.* 7½*d.*, and for finding the sixth part of a judge, that is, of his

salary; and the rest of the land belongs to herself, and is worth 2s. a year. Another, named Matilda, a daughter of Nicholas de Thoroldeholm, was in the gift of the king, and held her land, by the service of supplying the larder of the king.

*The Lordship of Sir Michael le Fleming in Furness, or Lonsdale beyond the Sands.*—In the district of Furness, or Lonsdale north of the Sands, the two great tenants of the crown were, the representative of the ancient Norman or Flemish family of Le Fleming, and the powerful abbot of Furness. At the time when the survey described in "Testa de Nevill" was made, William, the son of Nicholas de Furness, or le Fleming, held from the king *in capite*, twenty and a half carucates of land in Furness, and paid for it yearly the sum of £10, in addition to knight's service in the field. Taking a carucate at 180 acres, this would render the quantity of arable land held by William de Furness, or le Fleming, about 3700 acres. This is probably independent of the wastes and woods of the lordship, which were still more extensive. The yearly rent paid by William le Fleming to the crown was £10. That, assuming money to have been from twelve to fifteen times as valuable as it is at present, would make the rent to the crown equal to from £120 to £150. In addition to this the king, as chief lord, was entitled to the usual fines for the relief of the estate—that is to say, for the transfer and confirmation to each succeeding heir. The king was also entitled to the possession of the income of the estate during the minority of the heir, and to the disposal in marriage of the heir when a minor, and the heiress and the widow at every age, to any one on whom he might choose to confer their hands and estates. In the case, for instance, of Lady Ada de Furneys, who was probably an heiress of this family, we are told, in "Testa de Nevill," that she had paid a fine to King John to be allowed to marry at her own pleasure; that she was married to William Pincerna or le Botiller, and that her land was worth five marks a year. With regard to the sub-tenants on the estates of the Le Flemings, it is stated that Michael—that is, Sir Michael le Fleming, the ancestor of William le Fleming named above—had given three carucates of land, in Adgarslith, in marriage with his daughter Godith; that he had given to William, the son of Eward, half a carucate of land, in Urswick, in marriage, Eward paying 5s. of rent, according to his charter; that he had given to Adam, the son of Bernulf, two bovates of land in the same township by charter, and the payment of 2s. 8d. per annum; that he had also given to

William de Thorburn two bovates of land in Bellehive for 10s. per annum ; and to Adam, the son of Gerard, one bovate of land in the township of Aldingham, for a rent of 5s. per annum. In all these cases military service was included, as well as a money rent or payment. We are further informed that William, the son of Michael le Fleming, had given to Gilbert Fitz-Reinfrid two bovates of land in Urswick for £1 12s. per annum ; and that Michael le Fleming had given to Gamul, the forester, one carucate of land in Urswick on payment of 10s. per annum. All these payments may be turned into modern money with tolerable correctness by multiplying them by twelve.\*

*The Lordship and Estates of the Abbots of Furness.*—But the abbots of Furness were still more powerful than the Le Flemings, having estates of equal, if not greater extent, and possessing all the influence which high religious rank gave in those days. At the time when this survey was made the abbot of Furness held twenty and a half carucates of land in Furness in alms (*elemosyna*) of the gift of King Stephen, the founder of the abbey of Furness. The same abbot also held from the king two carucates of land in Staplethorne, for which he paid 40s. a year. He also held half a carucate of land in Belmont, in alms, from the gift of Warin. This was the commencement of the great wealth of the abbey.†

Amongst the great landowners who held lands from the abbots of Furness, was William de Lancaster, who held half a knight's fee in demesne in Ulverston, which was worth 30s. a year ; John de Nevill, who held the mills of Ulverston from the abbot, and paid 30s. a year for them ; Christopher de Broughton, who held Stannerley from the abbot by knight's service and an annual rent of 2*d.* ; and William de Heton who held Rosset from the said abbot, by military service, and the payment of 6½*d.* per annum.

In a subsequent part of this work we shall give an account of the rise and fall of the great abbey of Furness.

Conishead Priory, in this district, was founded by William de Lancaster, of whom we shall have to speak further ; or perhaps, more correctly, by Gabriel de Pennington, an ancestor of the present barons of Muncaster. He erected a hospital there, with the consent of his lord, William de Lancaster, for the relief of poor, decrepit, indigent persons, and lepers. For this purpose, Gabriel de Penning-

\* Testa de Nevill, pp. 401, 406.

† Ibid. p. 406.

ton endowed the hospital, which he gave to God and St. Mary, with all the land on both sides of the road which leads from Bardsea to Ulverston; and from the great road to Trinkeld to the sea-banks. This hospital was afterwards converted into a priory, and held amongst its possessions the church of Ulverston, with its chapels and appurtenances, together with forty acres of land in Ulverston, and a saltwork between Conishead and Ulverston, with other possessions and immunities.

Cartmel, in this district, was given by King Henry III. to William Mareschall, earl of Pembroke, who gave it to the canons of Bre de Nostoc in alms, that is to say, nine carucates of land, as the charter of the said William and the confirmation of the king and his ancestor state.\*

*The Barony of the Montbegons in Lonsdale and Salford Hundreds.*—In Lonsdale, south of the Sands, there were three great fees or estates held from the crown, namely, those of Montbegon, Gernet, and Lancaster. An inquiry was made by a jury respecting the manor of Hornby, the seat of the Montbegons. Their report was that it “was held by Hubert de Burg (either the earl of Kent or one of his family) from Henry de Mundine (a corruption of Montbegon), who held it *in capite* from the king;” and they further state “that they did not know by what service Hubert holds of Henry, nor by what service Henry held from the king, because that barony (Montbegon) is divided into many parts in many counties.” But we find it stated, in another part of the same report, that Roger de Montbegon held eight knight’s fees in the county of Lancaster—*infra linam et ext.*† Of these large possessions we are told that Adam de Montbegon, his ancestor, gave to Henry de Roksby two carucates of land for knight’s service in Wenington; that the same Adam gave to Galfred de Valonis six carucates, in Farelton and in Cancfeld, to be held by knight’s service; that Roger de Montbegon gave to the canons of Hornby Priory, 100 acres of land in alms; and that the same Roger gave to Elye de Wenington one bovate of land, in Farelton, to be held by knight’s service.

We have a number of particulars with regard to estates belonging to the fee of Roger de Montbegon in the hundred or wapentake of Salford, which we give here, with the account of that part of the fee that was situated in the neighbourhood of Hornby castle. It is stated that Roger de Montbegon held eight knights’

\* Testa de Nevill, p. 407.

† Ibid. p. 406.

fees within and without the line (*lineam*). Adam de Bury, we are told, held one knight's fee of this great baronial fee, *de antiqua tenura*; Roger de Middleton also held one knight's fee, *de antiqua tenura*. It is further stated that the predecessors of Roger de Montbegon gave to the ancestors of Gilbert de Notton twelve bovates of land, as part of one knight's fee, and that Gilbert de Notton holds that land; that Adam de Prestwich held four bovates of land in Alkinton for 4s. a year, *de antiqua tenura*; that Adam de Montbegon gave to Edward de Bury four bovates of land in Totington, with Alice, his daughter, in marriage, and that now William de Peniston holds that land, along with Cecilia (his wife), the daughter of the said Alice. Roger de Montbegon, we are told, gave to John Malherbe, his brother, ten carucates and six bovates of land in Croston, with their appurtenances, to be held by knight's service. The same Roger gave to the hospital of (St. John) of Jerusalem one bovat of land in alms, in Croston; and held fourteen bovates of land in Kaskenemor in thanage, on payment of 9s. 2½*d.*, and the half of the cost of a judge (*indice*, probably for *judice*). Gilbert de Notton held from him four bovates of land; Reynier de Wambwall held of the same land six bovates; Adam de Glothie held two bovates by thanage, and by payment of 9s. 2½*d.* and the other half of the cost of the judge aforesaid.\*

*The Lordship of the Gernets, Chief Foresters of Lancashire.*—The ancient family of the Gernets, who settled at Halton, near Lancaster, in the time of William the Conqueror, and received lands from Roger Pictavensis, still continued to hold those lands in the reign of Henry III., with the office of forester to the king throughout the whole county of Lancaster. We are told, in "Testa de Nevill," † that Roger Gernet held a knight's fee as forester, and that from that fee Roger Gernet, his ancestor, gave two carucates of land, in marriage, with his daughter, to Richard du Mulas (Molyneux), in Speke; that Vivianus Gernet gave to Robert Travers four carucates and a half of land, as a third part of a knight's fee; that Benedict Gernet, the father of Roger, gave two bovates of land to Wydon de Stub, to be held by knight's service; that William, the son of the same, gave two bovates in Leck to Margery, his sister, on payment of a rent of one pound of pepper per annum; and that he gave to Osbert one bovat of land in Leck, also for a yearly rent of one pound of pepper. Benedict Gernet

\* Testa de Nevill, p. 405.

† Ibid. pp. 400, 405.



gave twenty acres of land, in Altun, to Gilbert, the son of Aune, on payment of a pair of spurs, or three pence yearly. There are several other particulars given with regard to the Gernet family. Thus, Roger Gernet held three carucates of land in Halton, near Lancaster, by service of being chief forester through the whole county, and performed that service. Winan Gernet held two carucates of land from the king, in Heysham, by service of going to meet the king on the borders of the county with his horn and white wand; conducting the king into the county, being with him there, and accompanying him to the border of the county. The land was worth 5s. a year of the money of those times. Thomas Gernet held two carucates of land in Heysham, by sounding his horn before the king on his arrival in those parts. This land was worth 30s. a year. We are further told that the marriage of the wife, or rather of the widow, of William Gernet was in the gift of the king; but that she was married to Hamon de Masci (baron of Dunham-Masant in Cheshire) without warrant, and that her land was worth 50s. a year.

*The Barony of Lancaster, with the Lordship and Estates.*—With regard to the fee of the barons of Lancaster, the jurors who made this inquiry reported that Gilbert Fitz-Reinfred held one knight's fee in the county of Lancaster. They say that William de Lancaster, his father, gave in his time, in marriage (with his daughters), five carucates of land in the two Ecclestones, and in Lairbrec, which Richard de Mulas (Molyneux), William Blundell, Radulph de Eccleston, and Walter, the son of Swaine, and Godfrey hold. They also say that the same William gave to Warin de Banc two bovates of land in Forton, for his homage and knight's service, which Henry de Lee (afterwards high sheriff of Lancashire) holds. The same William gave to Bernard, the son of Rissi, two carucates of land in Halecath and in Catherall, which Richard the son of Swaine, and Beatrice the daughter of Robert, and Michael de Athelakeston hold by knight's service. The same William gave Hervey (or Henry) Falconer two bovates of land in Wyvensliga, which Hugh de Wyalles holds by knight's service. The same William gave to Grimbald de Ellal two bovates of land in Cruvles. William the elder, the son of Gilbert, baron of Kendal, gave two carucates of land, in Cockerham, to the canons of Lancaster, in alms; "hence (they add) his heirs hold less *in capite* of land in king." He also gave to Hugh Norman two carucates of land in

Scotford for knight's service. He also gave to Radulph of Thoroudesholm (Torrisholme) half a carucate of land in Lancaster, for a rent of 4s.; to Robert Falconer, two bovates of land in Carnford, for knight's service; and to Gilbert de Eston (Ashton), half a carucate of land in Eston or Ashton, for a rent of one mark. These details show the manner in which the estates of the barons of Lancaster were gradually broken up and divided.\*

The barony of Lancaster was further diminished by the following grants, which the grand inquest of the county state to have been made by Henry de Lee (Le), the son of Warin de Lancaster. They say that Henry de Lee holds six carucates of land in demesne, and pays for them 20s. per annum. Warin, his father, gave the fourth part of a bovat of land to the abbey of Cokersand in alms. Henry de Lee also gave to the same abbey two messuages. Robert, the son of Osbert, held two carucates and two bovates, *de antiquitate*, from the said Henry, by payment of 10s. a year, and by acting as reeve. Alan le Brun held, *de antiquitate*, two bovates from the same Henry, by payment of 6s. Dion, the son of Thurstan, held two bovates, by charter of the said Henry, and by payment of 5s. of rent. William, the brother of the same Henry, held one bovat from his gift, on paying yearly one pound of pepper. Richard, the brother of Henry, held two bovates from the same Henry, for 6s. per annum from the gift of Warin, the father of the same Henry. Edwin held two bovates from Henry de Lee, by his gift, for 5s. Robert held one bovat, by payment of 3s.; and Thomas, the son of Sigg, held one bovat from him, also by payment of 3s. of yearly rent.†

*The Burgesses and the Burgages of Lancaster.*—The first notice that we find in "Testa de Nevill" of land held by burgage tenure, in the county of Lancaster, is in the following entry with regard to the rent paid by the burgesses of Lancaster to the king:—"The burgesses of Lancaster hold one carucate of land in Lancaster, in free burgage, and freely by charter of the king, and they pay twenty marks per annum." This is an enormous rent for those times, equal to about £200 of modern money. It is the rent for one carucate of land, and is more than equal to the rent paid for twenty carucates by Sir Michael le Fleming. Of all the tenures of that time, tenure by burgage was the freest and the most independent; and being so, land was seldom let by any of the early kings in burgage at a lower rent than 1s. an acre,

\* Testa de Nevill, p. 401.

† Ibid. p. 403.

which was equal to 12s. to 15s. of modern money. This was about three times the rent usually paid for arable land, which was generally let for about 4*d.* per acre, equal to 5s. of modern money. In the account given of the burgages of Lancaster in "Testa de Nevill" there is the following curious entry, which shows that this part of the record was drawn up in the reign of King John. It is as follows:—"Nichols gave two burgages in alms, which were accustomed to perform service to the king. The said burgesses say that Roger Pictavensis gave to Warin his (that is, Nichols' great grandfather) half a bovate of land in Lancaster, and that he (Nichols) held it until he and his wife went into religion in the house of Furness; and the monks of Furness held that land freely to the coming of Galfrid de Valonis (the first high sheriff of Lancashire, appointed by Henry II., the father of King John, in the year 1164). He was unwilling that the town should be ungrateful (or displeasing) to our lord the king, and he took that land into the hand of the king, and made burgages of it, and established customs and services like the others, and they (the burgesses) were sworn to bear arms until the coming of the earl of Morton, who now is king; and they (the jurors who made the inquiry) do not know if he gave any liberties to them; and they hold seven burgages in such a manner that they do nothing for the king." We suppose that the meaning of this is, that these seven did not pay the same rents as the rest of the burgesses, who, as we have seen, paid a rent equal to £200 a year for one carucate of land, an enormous rent for those times.\*

We have the following additional particulars as to tenures in this neighbourhood:—

The church of Lancaster, as already mentioned, had been given by Roger Pictavensis, in the reign of William Rufus, to the great abbey of Sees, in Normandy, which was founded and richly endowed by the family of Montgomery, of which Earl Roger was a member. The church is mentioned in "Testa de Nevill" as being in the charity (*eleemosyna*) of the king, that is to say, of King Henry III. †

*Marriages of Heiresses and Widows in the Gift of the King.*—The marriage of Quenilda, the daughter of Richard, the son of Roger, was in the gift of the king; but the earl of Chester married her to Roger Gernet, because she held her land from the earl by military service, and from the king by farm. The land was worth 23s. a year. ‡

\* Testa de Nevill, p. 407.

† *Ibid.* p. 371.‡ *Ibid.* p. 371.

The lady Elewisa de Stuteville was in the gift of the king, and paid a fine to King John, that she might not be married against her will. Her land was worth £30 a year.\*

Matilda de Stockport was in the gift of the king, and paid a fine to King John, for the same privilege. Her land was worth two marks a year. †

Beatrix de Mitton was in the gift of the king, and paid a fine in the same manner. Her land was of the value of half a mark a year.

The lady Ada de Ferneys paid a fine in the same manner, and she was married to William Pincerna, or Butler. Her land was worth five marks a year.

The wife of Gamel de Boelton (Bolton) was in the gift of the king. Her land was worth 3s. a year.

Matilda de Kellet was in the gift of the king, and paid a fine to King John, "that she might marry herself," that is, might marry according to her own inclination. Her land was worth 20s. a year.

Agnes de Essam (Heysham) was in the gift of the king, and was married without any warrant. Her land was worth one mark a year.

The wife (or widow) of William Gernet was in the gift of the king, and was married to Hamon de Masci, without warrant. Her land was worth 50s. a year.

*Serjeanties or Offices by which Land was held.*—Ormus de Kellet held four carucates of land *in capite* from the king, by the office (*serjeantia*) of keeping the wapentake of Lonsdale. †

Adam, the son of Orme, held three carucates of land in Kellet, by serjeanty of the wapentake. It was worth 50s. a year.

Roger Gernet held ten carucates of land in Lonsdale, as forester. It was worth 100s. a year.

Thomas Gernet held two carucates of land in Hesum (Heysham), by sounding his horn before the king, in those parts. They were worth 30s. a year.

William and Benedict of Gersingham held from the king two bovates of land in Gersingham, by service of being foresters; and Margery, who was the wife of Bernard Fitz-Bernard, held two bovates of land of the *serjeantia* of Gersingham.

John of Oxcliffe held Oxcliffe *in capite* from the king, by the service of acting as carpenter in the castle of Lancaster. The land was worth 30s. a year.

Robert, reeve of Offerton, held half a carucate of land in Offerton,

\* Testa de Nevill, p. 371.

† *Ibid.* p. 371.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 401.

by service of being reeve for the lord the king in Offerton. The land was worth 16s. a year.

Adam, son of Gillemichel, held half a carucate of land in Slyne, by service of being carpenter of the king. The land was worth 16s. a year.

Roger Carpentar held ten acres of land in Lancaster, by service of being carpenter in the castle of Lancaster. It was worth 5s. a year, that is 6*d.* an acre, which was equal to about 6s. of our present money.

Roger, the son of Robert of Skerton, held half a carucate of land in that township, by service of being reeve of the king in Sutherton. The land was worth 11s. a year.

Radolf Barun held half a bovate of land, by service either of being mason (*cementarius*) in the castle, or of paying 5s. a year, at the choice of the king.

William, the gardener, held seven acres of land in Lancaster, by service of supplying vegetables to the castle (*olera et porrecta*).

Walter, the son of Walter the smith, and William, the son of William the smith, held a piece of land, called Hefeld, from the king, by service of doing iron-work for the ploughs. It was worth half a mark.

Wiman Gernet held two carucates of land from the king in Heysam, by service of coming to meet the king on the borders of the county with his horn and white wand, and conducting him into the county, and being with him there, and conducting him to the border of the county. The land was worth 5s. a year.

*The Barony of Theobald Walter in Amounderness.*—Proceeding southward through the hundred of Amounderness, we find that Allen de Singleton held half a carucate of land by service of keeping the wapentake or hundred; that is to say, he was high steward of the hundred of Amounderness.\*

In the hundred of Amounderness the heir of Aumeric Pincerna or Le Botiller, baron of Warrington, held a knight's fee of land in demesne, *in capite* from the king. We shall have to speak more fully of the fees held by the barons of Warrington, when we describe the estates held by them in the hundred of West Derby. All the information that we find in "Testa de Nevill" as to their estates in Amounderness, is that one of the fees held by the barons of Warrington, or, as he is described, the heir of Aumeric Pincerna, was in that hundred.

\* Testa de Nevill, p. 372.

Another great fee held directly from the crown in the hundred of Amounderness was that of Theobald Walter, baron of Amounderness or Preston. With respect to this it is stated, that the heir of Theobald Walter held in demesne a third part of a knight's fee in Wytheton and Tervel, *in capite* from the king. John de Thornul, William de Pres, Roger de Notesage, Adam of Bretekirke, William de Kyrkham, Robert, the son of Thomas, and Richard, the son of William, held the sixth part of a knight's fee in Thisteldon, Pres, and Grenele, of the fee of the said heir, and he of the king. William de Merton held the tenth part and the twentieth part in the same fee of Theobald Walter, and he of the king. Roger Gernet, Thomas de Bethun, and Robert de Stokeport held the fourth part of a knight's fee in Bustard Bruing of that fee, and he of the king.\*

*The other Fees in Amounderness.*—With regard to the fee of Richard de Frekelton, it is stated that Richard de Frekelton held the fourth part and the eighth part of a knight's fee in demesne in Frekelton, Quintoshay, Newton, and Ethelismic; that Gilbert Meolis, Robert de Notesage, and William de Pul held the sixteenth part of that fee in Frekelton; that Alan de Singleton and Swaine held in Frekelton the eighth part in that fee; Alan de Singleton, Warin de Quintoshay, and Robert de Dutton, the eighth part in Quintoshay; Alan de Singleton, Warin de Quintoshay, an eighth part in Ethelismic; Alan de Singleton, the sixth part of Ethelismic: all of that fee.†

The great family of the De Lacys, earls of Lincoln and constables of Chester, who were the most powerful tenants of the crown in the counties of Lancaster and Chester, with the single exception of the De Ferrers, earls of Derby, also held a fee in the hundred of Amounderness; but it was comparatively small, including only Warton, Pres, and Newton. We shall have occasion to describe the possessions of this family more fully in the account which we shall give of the fees of Clitheroe and Widness, in Lancashire, and of Halton, in Cheshire, of which we shall yet speak. In the fee of the earl of Lincoln in Amounderness, the third part of a knight's fee in Warton was held by Thomas de Bethun; and the fourth part of a knight's fee in Pres and Newton were held by William Deps (Dispenser) from the earl of Lincoln.

Amongst the churches in this hundred, those of Kirkham, St.

\* *Testa de Nevill*, p. 397.

† *Ibid.* p. 397.



Michael on Wyre, and Preston were in the gift of the king. With regard to the church of Kirkham, it is stated that the presentation belonged to King John, and that he gave two parts of the church (or of its income) to Simon Blund, for keeping the son and heir of Theobald Walter, who was a ward of the crown. The living was worth eighty marks a year. The church of St. Michael on Wyre was in the presentation of the king; and the son of the count of Salvata (probably an Italian priest) held it, "of the gift of the king who now is" (Henry III.), the son of King John. But the son of the count said that he was chosen to a bishopric, that the church was vacant, and that it was worth thirty marks a year. The church of Preston also belonged to the king. It had been presented by King John to Peter Russinol, who had died; and the king "who was then reigning" (Henry III.) gave it to Henry, the nephew of the bishop of Winchester. It was worth fifty marks a year.

We have no information in "Testa de Nevill" as to the burgages in the borough of Preston, though burgesses existed there probably as early as the reign of Henry I.

*The Fees between the Mersey and the Ribble.*—At the time when the survey and inquiry described in "Testa de Nevill" were made, the lands between the Ribble and the Mersey, which had belonged to King Henry III. when he ascended the throne, were held by William de Ferrers, earl of Derby, and Agnes de Ferrers, his wife. These lands had been granted by that king, in the year 1229, to Ranulf de Blundville, earl of Chester;\* and on his death, and the death, shortly afterwards, of his nephew, John the Scot, the last earl of Chester of that line, they had passed to Agnes de Ferrers, who was the sister of Earl Ranulf, and to William de Ferrers, earl of Derby, her husband.† These lands were still of great extent and value, although very large grants had previously been made from the estates of the crown, between the Ribble and the Mersey, to other parties. The lands granted by King Henry to the earl of Chester, and which afterwards passed as part of his inheritance to the family of the De Ferrers, were chiefly situated in the hundreds of West Derby, Salford, and Leyland. But, as already stated, the earl of Chester had greatly enlarged his Lancashire property, by purchasing the estates of Roger de Merseya, another very extensive tenant of the crown in that

\* Close Rolls, 18 Henry III. m. 2.

† Close Rolls, 17 Henry III. m. 17.

county.\* At the time when the survey described in "Testa de Nevill" was made, William de Ferrers, earl of Derby, and the Countess Agnes were probably the most extensive tenants of the crown in the county of Lancaster. Their only rivals were the De Lacys, earls of Lincoln, and owners, under the crown, of the great fees of Clitheroe, Widness, and Halton, whose estates in the two counties of Lancaster and Chester were little, if at all, inferior in value and extent to those of the De Ferrers family. Both these powerful families had also large estates in other parts of the kingdom, all of which subsequently passed into the hands of Edmund Plantagenet, the first earl of Lancaster, and second son of King Henry III., or into those of his son Thomas, the second earl of Lancaster, along with the whole of the estates of the king in the county of Lancaster. This was the commencement of the great and almost boundless wealth of the house of Lancaster, which ultimately rendered that branch of the royal family more powerful than the one which occupied the throne. With these general observations, we proceed to describe the great fees and estates held by the De Lacy family in the hundred of Blackburn.

*Clitheroe.*—*The Fee of the De Lacys, Earls of Lincoln.*—Roger de Lacy, constable of Chester, whose descendants afterwards obtained the title of Earls of Lincoln, held five knight's fees, of the fee of Clitheroe, which were chiefly situated in the hundred of Blackburn, in the county of Lancaster.† At the time when this survey was made, the heir of the De Lacys was a minor, and his estates were in the hands of the king. Previous to the time of which we are writing, the De Lacys had made many grants from the lands of the barony of Clitheroe. Thus, Hugh de Eland held three carucates and two bovates of land of that fee, for which he paid 48s. to Roger de Lacy, yearly. The same Roger de Lacy had given to Robert de Flamesbursch, in marriage with the daughter of Robert de Lacy, ten bovates of land, and the half and the third part of half a bovat, for knight's service, and a yearly payment of 20s. Roger de Thornton and Thomas de Harbury held ten bovates, and a half and the third part of half a bovat, from the same fee, by payment of 20s. per annum. Roger de Lacy had given to Gilbert de Lacy, in marriage with Agneta, the daughter of Heinfrid or Reinfrid, ten bovates of land, and a half and the third part of a bovat, for a yearly payment of 20s. He had also given to the monks of the

\* Lancashire and Cheshire: Past and Present. Vol. I., p. 349.

† Testa de Nevill, 403.

abbey of Stanlow, in Cheshire, six bovates of land in alms. Roger, constable of Chester, held the barony of the constablership *infra lineam* for four knight's fees, of which Richard, the son of Robert, held one by knight's service. William, the son of Mathew, also held the fee of one knight by knight's service in this fee. John de Lacy, constable of Chester, had given in alms to the Templars of Jerusalem one carucate of land, and to the Hospitallers of Jerusalem two carucates of land. Roger, constable of Chester, had also given to the abbey of Stanlow three carucates of land in alms. Richard de Mulas (Molyneux) held three carucates of land of the same fee, in which fee, we are repeatedly told, that ten carucates of land make a knight's fee. Hugh de Moreton held two carucates of land, of which we are told that twelve carucates make one knight's fee. Hugh de Tildesley held one knight's fee, and Allen de Hassal held half a carucate from the same fee, by knight's service. John Purchardon held the twelfth part of a knight's fee in Mitton from the fee of the earl of Lincoln, in Blackburnshire. The earl held it from the king; but it belonged to the dower of the countess.

The fees of the heir of the earl of Lincoln in the hundred of Blackburn included Mitton Parva, Wisewell, Apton, Tunley, Caldicotes, Snodesworth, Twiselton, Eathwisil, Acton, Livesley, the half Falridge, Marley Parva, Marley, Rushton, Billington, Alvethem, Harewood, and Clayton.

Alan de Singleton held the wapentake or hundred of Blackburn in fee, but held nothing—that is, no land—from the king in the hundred.

*The Barony of Penwortham.*—The De Boiseuls or Bussels, barons of Penwortham, were originally the principal tenants of the crown in the Leyland hundred. We find the following particulars of their estates, and of the manner in which those estates had been dealt with:—In the barony of Penwortham there were five knights' fees *infra lineam et extra*, that is to say, within the limits of the county or beyond them. Thorp, forming one knight's fee, was given to Guthe, the sister of Ranulf de Clavilla, in marriage. It was thus alienated from the barony; and the jurors who made the inquiry stated that they did not know who held it then. Brocton, one knight's fee, was given to Galfrid de Valonis by Albert Boiseul, and they did not know who held it. Warin Boiseul gave to Ranulf, the son of the

\* Testa de Nevill, 403.

heir of Roger, five carucates of land in marriage with his daughter ; and the same Ranulf was in the keeping of Eustace de Morton, with all that land. The same Warin Boiseul gave to Gilemichel, the son of Eward, in marriage with his daughter, four carucates of land, of which his heir held three carucates, who was in the keeping of the archdeacon of Stafford and of William of Harewood. The heir of Theobald Walter, who was also in the wardship of the king, held one carucate in Mithop in this barony. Warin de Boiseul also gave to Hamo Pincerna or le Botiller, in free marriage with his daughter, two carucates of land in Heton and in Eccleston ; and Adam de Hotton held the land in Heton, that is to say, one carucate. Albert Boiseul gave one carucate of land in Eccleston to the hospital of St. John of Jerusalem in alms. Richard Boiseul gave to Allan Fitz-Swayne, in marriage with his sister, four and a half carucates of land in Gunnolvesmores. Richard Fitton held the same land of the same barony by knight's service. Richard Boiseul gave to Robert Hikeling, in marriage with his sister, one carucate of land, which the heir of the same Robert still held. Richard Boiseul gave to Richard Spileman, in marriage with his sister, Standish and Langton. Thurstan Banastre held that land of his sister *per unum nisum*, that is, by the payment yearly of a nest of young hawks. Warin Boiseul gave three bovates of land in Penwortham and two in Langton to the church of Penwortham in pure alms. Richard Boiseul gave four bovates of land in Langton and one carucate in Farrinton to the same church in alms. Albert Boiseul gave two bovates of land in alms to the same church. The abbot of Evesham (in Worcestershire) held that church, with all the lands. Richard Boiseul gave to the abbey of Chester one carucate of land in Ruchford, which the abbot of Chester held. Richard Boiseul gave one bovat of land in Penwortham to the priory of Bolton in alms. Albert Boiseul gave to Gerald de Clayton four bovates of land for his homage, that he might be his seneschal. Robert Gresley held three carucates in Burnul and in Anderton, of the same barony of Penwortham, "and performs no service." Robert de Gresley held two carucates in Eston of the same barony, and ought to render yearly one falcon, or 20s., "but he does not pay it." Warin Boiseul gave to Norman three carucates of land in Kirkdale in knight's service ; and Quinilda, the daughter of Roger, held the land by the same service. Theobald Walter held the half of a knight's fee, which

Harvey, the father of Harvey Walter, gave to the grand falconer (*ornifer magn.*), with his daughter Alice in marriage; and four carucates of land in Routhclive and in Thistelton and in Greenhele, in knight's service. It is further stated, with reference to the barons of Penwortham, that the Lord Roger (de Lacy), constable of Chester, gave nine bovates of land in Leyland to the hospital of St. John of Jerusalem, which Hugh Boiseul held; also that Roger de Lacy gave to Robert Boiseul two carucates and two bovates of land in Langton, and in Leyland and in Ankeston, as the tenth part of a knight's fee.\*

*Other Fees in Leyland.*—We have already mentioned that William de Ferrers, earl of Derby, and Agnes, his wife, held the lands which had belonged to the king between the Ribble and the Mersey. This grant included Walton-le-dale, Bretherton, Clayton, Penwortham, Heton, Langton, Leyland, Chernock, Sewington, Heall, Charnock, and Wythall.† It also included the lands which Richard, the son of Roger de Frekelton, held, being one carucate of land in Thorp, held from the king *in capite*. The whole of these lands, however, were held, under William de Ferrers, earl of Derby, by the De Lacys, earls of Lincoln, and formed the fee of the heir of the earl of Lincoln in Leylandshire. We are further informed that Warin de Walton held the fourth part of a knight's fee of the fee of the earl of Lincoln, and he of the fee of the earl de Ferrers, and he *in capite* of the king.

The hundred or wapentake of Leyland was kept, as high steward, by Robert de Clayton, who, we are told, held no tenement from the king.

*The Barony of Manchester.*—The great hundred of Salford comes next, and includes many large estates. William de Ferrers, earl of Derby, held great part of the lands in the hundred of Salford, in right of his wife, the sister of Ranulf de Blundville, earl of Chester.

The borough of Salford was one portion of the royal estates which Henry III. granted to the earl of Chester; and although the earl of Chester only held that portion of his estates for the short period of three years, having died in the year 1232, he signalized his possession by granting to his burgesses of Salford a charter, under which the borough was governed by its own burgesses for many ages. This we shall give with the other charters of the Lancashire and Cheshire boroughs.

\* Testa de Nevill, p. 403.

† *Ibid.* p. 397.

In addition to the borough of Salford, William de Ferrers, earl of Derby, held numerous other manors in the hundred of Salford, *in capite*, from the king, many of which were held under him by the earl of Lincoln and the De Gresleys, barons of Manchester, in addition to the estates which the De Lacy and the De Gresley families held directly from the king. Amongst the manors in the hundred of Salford held by William de Ferrers were those of Bury, Middleton, Chadderton, Pendleton, Barton, Withington, and Pilkington.

The De Lacys, earls of Lincoln, held most of the above manors under the De Ferrers, earls of Derby, and had regranted them to many of the knights and gentlemen of the hundred of Salford.

The barony of Manchester, held in this age, and for many ages before and after, by the ancient and distinguished family of the Gresleys, or De Gresleys, was one of the most valuable estates in South Lancashire. In the time of Robert Gresley that family held twelve knights' fees in the honour of Lancaster, or the county of Lancaster—*infra lineam et extra*.<sup>\*</sup> Matthew, the son of William, and Roger, the son of William, held one knight's fee in Withington, of Robert Gresley, by the ancient tenure described as *de antiquitate*, and were bound to supply one judge for our lord the king. Gilbert de Newton held, along with the lady De Barton, one knight's fee and a half, and Thomas Withington held half a knight's fee from the same Robert, *de antiquitate*. Richard, the son of Robert, held five carucates of land and a half, namely, in Childwall, three; in the hundred of West Derby, one carucate of land in Aspull; one carucate in Turton; and half a carucate in Brochales. Roger de Samlesbury and Alexander held six carucates in Harewood, of the same fee. We are further informed that Albert de Gredly (Gresley), *senex*, or the elder, gave one knight's fee to Orme, the son of Aylward, in marriage with his daughter, in Dalton, Parbold, and Withington. The heirs of Orme held the said land. Alexander de Pilkinton held from Robert Gresley the fourth part of a knight's fee by knight's service, and supplying one judge to our lord the king, *de antiqua tenura*. Albert Gresley, the younger (*juvenis*), gave to Thomas de Pierrepont three carucates of land in Rivington and Lostock as the third part of a knight's fee. Their heirs still held that land. Robert Gresley, "who now is" (*qui nunc est*), gave to Robert de Buri fourteen bovates of his demesne at Manchester (Mamecestre) for knights' service, and his heirs held that land. The same

\* Testa de Nevill, p. 404.



Robert gave to Ranulf de Emecot two bovates of land, from his demesne at Manchester, for 6s. 8d. rent per annum. Albert Gresley gave to Robert de Bracebrugge two bovates of land, from his demesne of Manchester, for 4s. per annum. His heirs still held the land. Albert Gresley, senior, gave to Wluric de Mamecester four bovates of land from his demesne, for 5s. per annum. His heirs held the land. Albert Gresley gave four bovates of land from his demesne, in alms, to the church of Manchester. Albert Gresley (*juvenis*) gave to William Noreus (Norris) two carucates of land in Heton for 10s. a year. His heirs still held the land. The same Albert gave to Alexander, the son of Umoch, two bovates of land in Little Lever for half a mark and 1s. a year, or one nest (of hawks). His heirs still held the land. Albert Gresley, senior, gave to Orme, the son of Edward, with his daughter Emma, in marriage, one carucate of land in Aston, for a yearly rent of 10s. per annum. The heirs of the same Orme still held that land. The same Albert gave to Henry, the son of Siward, one carucate of land in Flixton for 10s. a year. The heirs still held the land. Albert Gresley, junior, gave to Elyas de Pennilbury (Pendlebury) Slivehall, for 1s. or for one nest of hawks per annum. The same Elyas still held that land. Roger de Samelisbury and Alexander de Harewode held one bovate of land in Chapples for 3s. of Robert Gresley. Albert Gresley gave to the monks of Swinehead, in Lincolnshire, one croft, which is called Wythacres, in alms. Robert Gresley, "who now is," gave to Ace, the clergyman, a piece of land of his demesne at Manchester, for 3s. The same Ace held that land. Gilbert Barton held one fee and a half in the fee of Thomas de Gresley, and he in the fee of the earl de Ferrers, and he *in capite* from the king. Mathew de Haversedge held a knight's fee in Withington of the same. Robert de Lathom held a knight's fee in Childwall, and the fourth part of a knight's fee in Parbold, and three parts in Wrightington, of the said fee of Thomas de Gresley. Richard de Pierrepoint held the third part of a knight's fee in Runworth. William de Worthington held the half of a knight's fee in the same fee. Roger de Pilkington held the fourth part of a knight's fee in the same.

Thomas de Gresley held in Lindeshey (Lincolnshire), in the honour of Lancaster, six knights' fees, and the third part of a knight's fee from the king.

But Thomas de Gresley is chiefly worthy of remembrance as the baron of Manchester who granted to that city its most valuable

foundation charter, a copy of which will be given in the present work.

*The Ancient Fee of William Peverel.*—The township of Aston, and the two Mertons, were escheats of the king, of the very ancient fee of William Peverel. These William de Ferrers, earl of Derby, then held. They were worth 40s. The same earl also held Blackrod from the same honour (of Peverel). It was worth 20s. a year. Hugh de Blackrod, or le Norreys, held Blackrod from the king, as part of the fee of William Peverel. It was an escheat of the crown, and contained one carucate of land. It was worth 20s. He held it by charter from the king.\*

*The De Traffords of Trafford.*—Henry de Trafford was one of the knights, or thanes, of Lancashire, who assisted in making the great survey of that county, in the reign of Henry III., about the year 1240. He and others of his family are mentioned in "Testa de Nevill" as holding estates in the hundred of Salford. It appears from very ancient deeds in the Anglo-Saxon language that they held some of the estates previous to the Norman conquest, which they hold to the present time.

*The Hultons of Hulton.*—Several members of this ancient family are mentioned as holding offices and estates in the hundred of Salford, in the reign of King John, and in that of his son Henry III. Amongst the offices was that of high steward of the hundred of Salford, granted to Richard de Hulton by King John. Marferth and Jarverth de Hulton are also mentioned as landowners in the Salford hundred, in the same reigns.

*The Fee of William de Ferrers, Earl of Derby.*—The two greatest tenants of the crown in the hundred of West Derby, at the time when the survey described in "Testa de Nevill" was made, in the reign of Henry III., were William de Ferrers, earl of Derby; and the De Lacys, barons of Halton in Cheshire, Widness and Clitheroe in Lancashire, and earls of Lincoln. As far as their Lancashire estates were concerned, the De Ferrers family had the higher position, holding those estates directly from the king, whilst the De Lacys held most of their Lancashire estates from the De Ferrers family. But in many other parts of the kingdom the De Lacys had immense estates held directly from the crown, and were amongst the richest and most powerful of the ancient nobility.

\* Testa de Nevill, p. 401.

In the hundred or wapentake of West Derby, the De Ferrers family held all the estates which had been conferred upon the last earl of Chester by King Henry III., in the year 1229. There are some particulars, with regard to these estates, in the high sheriff of Lancashire's annual return, for the 14th Henry II., preserved in the Pipe Rolls of the next year (1230). Amongst those estates were Liverpool, which we shall describe afterwards; Everton, near Liverpool, which was then cultivated by the villeins or bondsmen of the earl, who paid to him a yearly rent of £4 16s. of the money of that time, equal to about £70 of modern money. Walton-on-the-Hill was another portion of the estate, and paid a yearly rent of 60s., equal to about £45 of modern money, from rent of assize, that is to say, from ancient fixed rent. Crosby produced 105s., equal to £78, from the improvements and extensions of cultivation made by the villeins; and 10s., equal to £7 10s. of modern money, from rent of assize paid by Robert de Crosby, who held land as a freeman in the same manor. The manor of Hale, which was held by Richard de Mida, by charter from King John, produced £4 10s. a year, equal to £67 10s. of modern money, from rent of assize; and 50s., equal to £37 10s., from increased cultivation and improvements within the manor. Wavertree paid 20s., equal to about £15, for ancient rent, and half a mark, equal to about £5, for increase and improvements. The borough of Liverpool paid £9, equal to about £130 of modern money, for rent of assize. West Derby paid 72s. 6d., equal to £54 7s. 6d., for rent of assize. Several of the adjoining manors were held by thanage, the thanes or knights paying a yearly rent to the earl of 20s., equal to about £15, for thanage, besides amounts for rent of assize. Thus the manor of Lathom, held by the Lathoms, paid 20s., equal to £15, for rent of assize; that of Ditton 20s.; that of Garston 20s.; that of Thingwall one mark, equal to £10; that of Melling 15s. In Litherland, Adam de Mullienell (Molyneux) paid 20s. for thanage; Alan de Holland paid 18s., equal to £13 10s., for thanage in Holland, Aintree, and Barton; Alan, the son of Bernulf, paid 5s., equal to £3 15s., for thanage in Bickerstaff; Richard, the son of Roger, paid one mark, equal to £10, for thanage in Formby and Bold; Henry de Waleton paid 28s., equal to £21, for rent of assize in Formby, which he held by charter of King John; and half a mark, equal to £5, for increase of value. There was also paid to the earl 11s. 10d., equal to £8 17s. 6d., for sacfee of the fee of William

Butler, baron of Warrington; 3s., equal to £2 5s., from the fee of Robert Boiseul, baron of Penwortham, in Kirkdale; and 6s., equal to £4 10s., from the fee of Adam de Mullienell (Molyneux). The whole amount of these payments, in the hundred of West Derby, was £46 9s. 2d., equal to about £702 2s. 6d., of modern money.

In the hundred of Salford, the amount paid to the earl de Ferrers was £21 11s. 2d., equal to £323 15s. These two sums, with some smaller amounts paid in the hundred of Leyland, make the total payments to William de Ferrers, earl of Derby, £68 18s. 4d., equal to £1033 15s. of the money of the present time.\*

*The Fee of the De Lacy Family in Widness.*—The estates of the De Lacy family in the hundred of West Derby belonged to the fee or barony of Widness, which was subordinate to the fee of Halton. Halton castle, near Runcorn, was the chief place of strength, on the estates of the De Lacy family in Cheshire, and close adjoining to Lancashire. Amongst the chief knights and gentlemen who held from the fee of Widness were Robert de Lathom, or, as he is described in the feodary, "Dominus Robertus de Lathom," who held the manors of Knowsley, Huyton, Roby, and Torbock from the fee of Widness, as well as that of Lathom and other manors from William de Ferrers, earl of Derby. These estates passed soon after to the Stanleys, now and for many ages earls of Derby, by the marriage of Isabel de Lathom, the heiress of the De Lathom family, with Sir John Stanley. In the reign of Henry VI. they are described as belonging to Sir Thomas Stanley, knight, controller, who was the son of Sir John Stanley. The sum which the De Lathoms paid to the De Lacys for the manors of Knowsley, Huyton, Roby, and Torbock was £5 a year, equal to about £60 of present money. In addition to that sum they paid a fine or relief, whenever the lands passed to another tenant by the death of the preceding one. The amount of this relief does not appear to have been strictly fixed, but it was generally equal to two or three years of the annual rent.

In the same fee of Widness the manors of Sutton, Eccleston, and Rainhill were held from the De Lacys by Gilbert le Norreys, as a knight's fee, with a yearly payment of £5, and the usual fine or relief on renewal. In the reign of Henry VI., Sutton, Eccleston, and Rainhill were held by John Daniell of Daresbury. The manor of Little Crosby was held of this fee of the De Lacys,

\* Pipe Roll of the Sheriff of Lancashire, 14th Henry III.

by Richard Molyneux of Sefton. It was held as three carucates of land, and we are told that in this case ten carucates of land made one knight's fee. The yearly payment was £1 10s. of the money of that time. The manor of Halsall was held by Richard Halsall as half a carucate of land, and paid 5s. a year of the money of that time. Half the manor of Kirkby was held by Richard de Barton as half a carucate of land, for which he paid 10s. a year, and the relief as fixed on renewal. Peter Gerard held it in the reign of Henry VI. The other half of Kirkby was held by Ranulf de Bethum on the same tenure. This was in the hands of Thomas Bethum in the reign of Henry VI. The town and manor of Astley were held by Hugh de Tildesley for one carucate of land, on payment of 10s. a year and fine on entrance, known as the relief. This was afterwards held by Richard Ratcliffe.

The town and manor of Appleton were held from the lord of the fee in bondage, that is to say, by the villeins or cultivators. It was accounted as equal to three carucates of land. The rent paid was £1 10s. Cronton was held by the abbot of Whalley, in pure and perpetual alms, as three carucates of land, and paid £1 10s. Great Woolton and Little Woolton were held of the De Lacys by the prior of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem, for five carucates of land, and paid £2 10s. a year of the money of that time.

The fee of the De Lacys, earls of Lincoln, in West Derbyshire, was held from William de Ferrers, earl of Derby, who held it *in capite*. It included the manors of Appleton, Cronton, Sutton, Eccleston, Knowsley, Huyton, Torbock, Little Crosby, Kirkby, Maghull, Kirkdale, North Meols, and Argarmeols.\*

*The Fee of the Butlers, Barons of Warrington.*—Another great tenant of the crown was William Butler, or le Botiller, Latinized into Pincerna, baron of Warrington. He held no less than eight knights' fees *in capite* from the king. We are told in "Testa de Nevill" that Paganus de Vilers (Villiers) who first possessed the fee of Warrington, gave to Alan de Vilers, his son, five carucates of land to be held by knight's service; that the same Paganus gave to the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem one carucate of land, in Bekaneshow, in alms; that he also gave to William de Vilers, his son, his land of Newbold, by knight's service, which William, the son of the younger Paganus, held by the same service; that the same Paganus gave to Alan, his son, the land of Trafford in knight's

\* Testa de Nevill, p. 396.

service, which Robert de Vilers held by the same service; that he also gave to Thomas de Vilers the half of Nothorp and land of Hole, and the land of Calverton, in knight's service, whence Robert de Vilers held Hole, and the half of Calverton, except one carucate of land, which the same William de Vilers held, and the same Robert de Vilers, afterwards of Calverton, by the same service. The same Paganus also gave to Roger de Stainsby, Ince (that is to say, three carucates of land) and Barton, except four bovates of land, which William Blundell held of William Pincerna, or Butler, by knight's service. In addition to the above grants, the same Paganus de Vilers gave to Robert Mulas, or Molyneux, one carucate of land in Thornton to be held by knight's service, which Robert, the son of Richard, held by the same service; he also gave to Elwin one carucate in Thornton, which Gilbert, his son, held of William Pincerna, or Butler. The same Paganus also gave six bovates of land to William Gernet in Lydiate, which Benedict the son of Simon, and Alan his brother, held of William Pincerna. Paganus de Vilers also gave one carucate of land in Windle, and one in Hassal, to Vivian Gernet, in marriage with Emma his daughter, the land to be held by knight's service. Alan, the son of Alan, held the land in Windle from Robert de Vilers, and Alan, the son of Simon, held the land in Hassal from the said Robert by the same service. Reginald held four carucates of land from Paganus de Vilers by knight's service; and Hugh, the son of Gilbert, afterwards held that land from William Pincerna, or Butler, paying him four marks. Alan de Rixton held, *de antiquitate*, from William Pincerna, or Butler, one carucate of land in Rixton for one mark, and performed knight's service. Henry Fitz-William held, *de antiquitate*, from the said William Pincerna, one carucate of land in Alderton for one mark, and rendered knight's service. Hugh, the son of Henry, held, *de antiquitate*, from the said William Pincerna, by knight's service, a piece of land, which the said Paganus de Vilers gave to Gerard de Sankey. Robert, the son of Thomas, afterwards held it. Richard Pincerna, or Butler, gave to Mathew de Walton two bovates of land in Eggergarth, which Henry, the son of Gilbert, held. Also, in the town of Croppul, the prior of Thugarton held one carucate of land in pure and perpetual alms, as the gift of Robert de Vilers.

The barony of Warrington, described in "Testa de Nevill" as the fee of the heir of Aumeric Pincerna or Butler, baron of Warrington, formed part of the great fee which William de Ferrers, earl of Derby,



held *in capite* from the king. Among the places in this barony were Tyldesley, Culcheth, Rixton, Astley, Atherton, Sankey, Penketh, Hoole, Halsal, Windle, Lydiate, Eggergarth, Ince (Hyms), and Barton.\*

*The Estates of the Molyneuxes of Sefton.*—The Molyneuxes, now earls of Sefton, already possessed large estates in Lancashire, considerable portions of which they had held from the time of the Norman conquest. We are told in “Testa de Nevill” that Richard de Molyneux (Mulas) held ten and a half carucates of land, from the gift of Roger Pictavensis, as half a knight’s fee. Robert de Molyneux, the father of the said Richard, gave two carucates of land in Kardan, with his sister in marriage, to Siward the son of Avote; and Henry his brother held these carucates by knight’s service. From this land he gave three acres to the blessed Mary of Kokersand (Cokersand Abbey), in alms. Also, Robert de Mulas gave to Gilbert, his brother, one carucate of land in Thornton by knight’s service, which pertained to that fee, and which Richard his son afterwards held. Richard de Mulas, the son of the same Robert, gave to Richard, Branche, and Robert, half a carucate of land for knight’s service, and a rent of 6s. a year. The same Richard gave to Robert his son three bovates of land for knight’s service, and to Rann de Litherland two bovates in Litherland for knight’s service, and 5s. of rent. The same Richard gave to Simon de Mulas a culture of land for 2s. of rent. He also gave a culture of land to Richard de Thornton, for one pound of pepper per annum. The same Richard de Mulas held one and a half carucate of land in exchange for Toxteth, and paid the king 20s. Robert de Walton held from Richard de Mulas six bovates of land for a rent of 10s; and Richard, the son of Siward, also held from him six bovates for a rent of 10s.†

*The Barony of Newton.*—The barony of Newton, forming the fee of the heir of Robert Banastre, was also included in the larger fee of William de Ferrers, earl of Derby. It comprised, in the West Derby hundred, Makerfield, Lawton, Kenyon, and Herebury. It also included a knight’s fee in Walton, and one in Blackburn hundred, held from the fee of the De Lacys, earls of Lincoln.‡

Godfrey Banister, or (Arbalaster), bought six carucates of land from King John, in burgage, for the sum of £15.§

Henry de Waleton, high bailiff of West Derby, held fourteen carucates of land in Woolton, Wavertree, and Newsham, by being high bailiff of West Derby.||

\* Testa de Nevill, p. 396.

† *Ibid.* p. 396.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 396.

§ *Ibid.* p. 404.

|| *Ibid.* p. 403.

Adam de Girard held two carucates of land by service of summoning parties to appear before the courts of Justices, no very safe office in those turbulent times. This land was worth 4s. a year.\*

Lucas, the bailiff of West Derby, held two carucates of land, for keeping the working cattle on the estates of William de Ferrers.

*The Earldom of Chester.*—We have no account of the county of Chester in “*Testa de Nevill*,” Chester and Durham being at that time palatine counties were not returned along with the other English counties; the royal rights and properties in those counties having been surrendered, in one case to the earls of Chester, in the other, to the bishops of Durham, who were in the place of the king in them. We may add, however, with regard to the county of Chester, that it passed into the hands of the king’s eldest son, that is to say, of the prince of Wales, who was also made earl of Chester, in the course of the reign of Henry III. But the accounts of the earldom of Chester were made out separately for many years after.

It will have been seen in the account of the county of Chester, made at the time of the Domesday survey, that the whole of the lands of that county, as well as of the adjoining county of Flint, had been granted to Hugh Lupus, earl of Chester, and had been subgranted by him, to a great extent, to his barons and other powerful followers.

The manors or townships which Earl Hugh Lupus retained in his own hands or, as it was then called, in demesne, at the time of the Domesday survey, were forty-eight in number, and were scattered over the whole county. During the 150 years which followed the time of the Domesday survey a large portion of these manors were given, granted, sold, or exchanged for other manors. Several of them became the foundations of great private estates, some of which exist at the present time. The following is a list of these manors, arranged alphabetically:—Adlington, Alreton, Alsager, Alderley, Antrobus, Budworth (Little), Capesthorne, Clive or Cliff, Chalford, Colinton, Done, Dunham-on-the-Hill, Eaton, Eddisbury, Elton, Eastham, Frodsham, Gawsworth, Helsby, Hunger Weninton, Henshal, Hollingworth, Kennardsley, Lay (in Broxton hundred), Lay, Laiton, Manly, Macclesfield, Neston, Oulton, Over, Eccleston, Rushton, Romily, Sandbach, Sutton near Middlewich, Stanney, Trafford, Tintwistle, Upton-in-Wirral, Wernith, and Weaver. The greater

\* *Testa de Nevill*, p. 372.

part of these manors were included in the earl's forests and demesnes.

*The Barony of Halton.*—By far the most powerful of the barons of Chester were the Fitz-Nigels, who afterwards intermarried with the great family of De Lacy, thus uniting the ancient office and dignity of constables, or commanders-in-chief, of the earldom of Chester, with the earldom of Lincoln, and the vast estates of the De Lacy family, in almost all parts of England. We have already given an account of the possessions of the De Lacy family in the county of Lancaster, including their two great fees or lordships of Clitheroe and Widness. We now proceed to give some particulars as to the fee or barony of Halton in the county of Chester, of which Halton castle, near Runcorn, was the principal place of strength. We take these from a feodary of the lordship of Halton, which appears to have been drawn up about the time of Edward II., who was himself earl of Chester, before he came to the crown. In this feodary we have not only the account of the knights and gentlemen who held the estates at that time, but also of those who held the estates at a later period, probably in the reign of Henry VI. The latter are entered in a different hand, and at a later period, on this Return. They both throw much light on the descent of the lands and manors of this part of the county palatine of Chester.

The manor of Longdendale, on the extreme east of the county, was held of the fee of Halton, by Robert de Longdendale (described as "Dominus"), as one knight's fee, for a yearly payment of £5, equal to £60 of modern money, and for a relief or entrance fee, when one tenant of the manor succeeded to another. This manor passed, in the reign of Henry VI., or about that time, into the hands of William, Lord Lovell. Alderley was held by Robert de Monte Alto (described as "Dominus"), as the fourth part of one knight's fee, on payment of £1 5s. a year, and of a relief or fine of renewal, on the accession of every new tenant. At a later period, that is to say, about the reign of Henry VI., Alderley was in the possession of Thomas Weaver, from whom it passed to the Stanleys of Alderley. Aston, near Sutton, and Enderley, in Norton, were held by Richard de Aston as the fourth part of one knight's fee, on the payment of £1 5s. a year, and by the usual fee on renewal. They still belong to the ancient family of the Astons. Bexton, or rather one half of it, was held by John de Bexton, for the twentieth part of one knight's fee, on payment of 5s., and by the usual relief. Barrow (Great) was held by

Hugo, Lord Le Despencer, together with the half of a bovate of land in Little Barrow, for the half of one knight's fee, on payment of £2 10s. a year, and on the usual fee on renewal. The half of Barnston was held by Hugo de Barnston, as the fourth part of one knight's fee, for a yearly payment of £1 5s., and the usual relief. In the reign of Henry VI. it was held by John Tyldesley. Budworth and Aston was held by John Fitton, along with the third part of Upper Tabley, two bovates of land in Lower Tabley, one bovate of land in the fourth part of Cumberbach, one bovate of land in the hands of the prior of Norton, in Budworth, and the whole of the lands of Lithe, beyond the Dee, near Chester, for one knight's fee, on payment of £5 a year, and the usual relief or fine on renewal. Clutton was held by Robert de Monte Alto, as the sixth part of one knight's fee, for a yearly payment of 6s. 8d., and the usual relief. This manor passed to Thomas Weaver, who held it in the reign of Henry VI. Clifton, now named Rocksavage, was held by the lady ("Domina") Matilde de Chedull, as the half of one knight's fee, for a yearly payment of £2 10s., and the usual relief. It was held, in the reign of Henry VI., by Sir John Savage, knight, an ancestor of the earls Rivers, and of the marquises of Cholmondeley, who are also viscounts Rocksavage. Cotton was held by Henry de Cotton, as the twentieth part of one knight's fee, on payment of 5s. a year, and his relief. Capenhurst was held by Robert Pool, as the fourth part of one knight's fee, for £1 5s., and the usual relief.

Congleton was held by the countess of Lincoln, along with Upper and Lower Runcorn and Moore, as the sixth part of one knight's fee. The yearly value was £5 16s. 8d., with the usual relief. Daresbury was held by Alan le Norreys, along with Higher Walton, as the half of one knight's fee, on payment of £2 10s., and the usual relief. Herebury and Peckshull were held by Oliver de Bourdeaux, as the inheritance of Matilda his wife, for the fourth part of one knight's fee, on payment of £1 5s., and his relief.

Halton (the head of the fee) was held by the earl of Lincoln, as the half of one knight's fee. It was valued at £2 10s. Halton, or a part of it was held by Peter de Warburton ("Dominus Petrus de Warburton"), along with Stretton, Sale, and the half of Nether Walton, as four-tenths of one knight's fee, on payment of £2, and by the usual relief. In the reign of Henry VI., these lands were held by Galfridus, or Godfrey, de Warburton.

Both the above were ancestors of the ancient and honourable house of the Warburtons of Arley. Knotsford Booths was held by John de Legh, as the sixth part of one knight's fee, on payment of 16s. 8*d.*, and the usual relief. Kirkby-in-Waley (half) was held by Richard Samson, as the fourth part of one knight' fee, by a yearly payment of £1 5*s.*, and his relief. In the reign of Henry VI., Sir Thomas Stanley, knight, and Henry Litherland held the half of Kirkby-in-Waley. Hugo de Dutton ("Dominus"), held the town of Kekewick, the town of Weston, the half of Lower Walton, the third part of the town of Upper Runcorn, and six bovates of land in Newton, near Chester, as the half of one knight's fee—or according to another reading—for a fee, on payment of £2 10*s.* a year, and his relief. Gilbert de Lymme held the half of the town of Lymme, as the half of one knight's fee, on payment of £2 10*s.* a year, and his relief. John Dumvyll held it in the reign of Henry VI. Richard de Aston held Listark, as the fifth part of one knight's fee, by a payment of £1, and his relief. Lostock-Gralam, and the half of Plumley, were held by Thomas de Vernon, as the half of one knight's fee, on payment of £2 10*s.*, and his relief. Henry de Hulme held the town of Hulme (Holmes Chapel), for the twentieth part of one knight's fee, on payment of 5*s.*, and his relief.

Millington (one half) was held by Robert de Mulington, for the eighth part of one knight's fee, a yearly payment of 12*s.* 6*d.*, and his relief. Thomas de Vernon held the town of Moreton Rood, as the eighth part of one knight's fee, on payment of 12*s.* 6*d.*, and his relief. Moore was held by the countess of Lincoln. The prior of Norton held Norton, as the eighth part of one knight's fee, and Middleton, as the fourth part of a knight's fee, on payment of £1 17*s.* 6*d.*, and his relief. William de Moberly held the half of the town of Lower Pever, for the twentieth part of a knight's fee, and his relief, on payment of 5*s.* Runcorn was held by the countess of Lincoln. Godfrey de Warburton held the town of Sutton, as the fifth part of one knight's fee, on payment of £1, and his relief. Sale was held by Godfrey de Warburton. Stretton was also held by Godfrey de Warburton. Toft was held by Roger de Toft, as the twentieth part of a knight's fee, on payment of 5*s.* and his relief. Robert Leycester held Toft in the reign of Henry VI. Hugh, the son of Adam de Tabley, held the town of Tabley, as the twentieth part of one knight's fee, on payment of 5*s.*, and his

relief. John Leycester held Over Tabley in the reign of Henry VI. Ranulph de Traunmall held the town of Traunmall (Tranmere), for the ninth part of one knight's fee, on payment of 11s., and his relief. Robert Touchet ("Dominus") held the town of Whitley (Lower), as the third part of one knight's fee, on payment of £1 13s. 4d., and his relief. Walton (Over): Alan le Norreys held Walton and Daresbury.

Robert de Holland ("Dominus") held the town of Whitley (Upper), as the half of one knight's fee, on payment of £2 10s., and his relief. And Walton (Lower) was held by Petrus de Warburton.\*

*The various Tenures of Land in Lancashire and Cheshire.*—It will be seen from the above account of the lands of these two counties, that they were already divided amongst numerous proprietors, and were held by a great variety of tenures. The king still held all the regal rights over the whole of the land in the county of Lancaster; but in the county of Chester, nearly the whole of those rights had been given up to the Norman earls of Chester, at the time when that county was made a county palatine. The same thing happened in the county of Lancaster, about a hundred years later, when Lancashire was made a county palatine by Edward III. The first, second, and third earls of Lancaster, although of the royal blood, were not earls palatine, and possessed only the same rights within that county which were enjoyed by other earls in the other parts of the kingdom. Previous to the creation of the earldom of Lancaster, by Henry III., in favour of his son Edmund, the rights of an earl were exercised in that part of Lancashire which lies between the Ribble and the Mersey by the family of De Ferrers, earls of Derby; but all those rights passed to the earls of Lancaster, when that title was created by Henry III. The De Lacy family, although they held the rank of earls in the county of Lincoln, were only barons in the counties of Lancaster and Chester; though they held no less than three baronial fees in those counties, namely, those of Clitheroe and Widness in Lancashire, and that of Halton in Cheshire, along with the hereditary office of constable, or commander of the armies of the earls of Chester. Within the county of Lancaster, the barons of Lancaster, Amounderness, Penwortham, Manchester, Warrington, and Newton were of equal rank with the baron of Clitheroe, and that was also the case with the other barons in the earldom of Chester. The greater part of the land, as will have been seen, was held under these barons,

\* Feodary of Halton, in Leycester's *Antiquities of Cheshire*, p. 288.

by the three tenures of knight's service, thanage, and drengage; these three forms of tenure were very nearly the same in reality, the difference being chiefly that the one was known by an English or a Norman name, and the others by Saxon and Danish appellations. The number of knights, or thanes, or drengs, in Lancashire was very considerable, and included all the principal landowners under the rank of baron. The knights' fees were again very extensively subdivided, and were held in portions of from one-half to a forty-eighth part, by landowners of various ranks. A very large portion of the land of the two counties was also held by the abbots, the priors, and the heads of other religious houses, in what was called alms, or eleemosyna. This property had a wonderful tendency to increase; the power of the clergy and of the monastic orders being very great, especially on the approach of death, and the monastic estates not being liable to be broken up, like those of the laity, by marriage settlements, provisions for children, or by personal extravagance. Within the boroughs of the two counties, as well as those of the kingdom generally, the land was held on burgage tenure—a most independent and permanent tenure, out of which the freedom and the property of the ancient boroughs of England may be said to have grown. Much land was also held by what was called *serjeantia*; that is to say, by the performance of various public offices and services, which are now remunerated, in the higher offices, by salaries, and the lower, by wages.

But the real cultivation of the land, and the reclaiming of the extensive wastes of this district, was carried on by men holding their lands by the most useful and honourable, though then despised tenure of villeinage, often no doubt with the assistance of the lords. These were the real cultivators of the soil, and their position differed from that of modern tenants at will or yearly tenants, or even lessees, in the fact that they had a permanent interest in the soil, although they held it on condition of performing a variety of services which would now be thought of a somewhat servile character. But the position of this class began to improve very soon after the Barons' wars in the reigns of Henry III. and Edward I., when the representative system was introduced into this country. From that time the cultivators of the soil began to be regarded as free tenants, and gradually rose to the position of copyholders, holding their lands by a very secure and permanent title. The class of tenants holding at rack-rent did not exist until about the time of the Tudors, when



farming became very profitable, and rents and prices rose rapidly under the influence of a great influx of gold and silver from America, by way of Spain and Portugal, and a great increase of activity in every branch of industry.

The condition of cottage holders, described in Domesday Book under the name of *Bordarii*, cannot be traced very clearly; but they gradually rose to the condition of free labourers, and in the reign of Richard II. they were sufficiently powerful to shake the whole kingdom, from Devonshire to Yorkshire, in a determined struggle against the unjust laws, passed for the regulation of wages and employment in the preceding reign of Edward III. The object of those laws was to fix the amount of wages to be paid to workmen for every description of work, and also to provide that workmen should not move away in summer, in search of work, from the parishes in which they had lived in the winter months. Almost the only exception was in favour of the harvestmen of the counties of Lancaster, Chester, and Stafford, who then spread themselves over the kingdom, as the Irish labourers have done in modern times, and were found too useful in gathering in the crops in harvest, to be deprived of the right of searching for labour wherever they could find it.

*The Estates and Influence of the Earls and Dukes of Lancaster.*—There was no earldom of Lancaster in the early part of the reign of Henry III., when the survey or inquiry described in “*Testa de Nevill*” was made. That earldom was created by Henry III., in the fiftieth year of his reign (1265–66), in favour of his second son, Edmund Plantagenet. This was done at the time when the king had immense confiscated estates to dispose of, forfeited by the earls, barons, knights, and burgesses, who had taken part against the crown, in that disastrous part of the Barons’ wars which ended in the death of Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, at the battle of Evesham, and in the capture of Robert de Ferrers, earl of Derby, in the battle of Chesterfield. In endowing the royal earldom, the king gave to his son the castle of Lancaster, and all the possessions of the crown in the county of Lancaster. These included the borough of Lancaster, and the forests of the county, with all the rights reserved to the crown in the granting of baronies and other fees to the great tenants of the crown. They also included the whole of the estates of Robert de Ferrers, earl of Derby, between the Ribble and the Mersey, containing the boroughs of Liverpool and Salford, as well as the

extensive possessions of the earls of Derby in Derbyshire, Staffordshire, and other counties. In addition to the earldoms of Lancaster and Derby, the king granted to his son the third earldom of Leicester, a still more valuable possession; and still further enriched him by marrying him to Evelina de Fortibus, the heiress of the ancient earls of Albemarle, who had great possessions in the eastern parts of Yorkshire. The united wealth of the four earldoms held by Edmund, the first earl of Lancaster, was very great. But on the death of Earl Edmund, in the year 1298, he was succeeded by his eldest son Thomas, the second earl of Lancaster, who more than doubled the wealth of the earldom, by marrying Alicia de Lacy, the heiress, in right of her father Henry de Lacy, of the rich earldom of Lincoln and of the De Lacy family in Cheshire, Lancashire, and Yorkshire; and in right of her mother, of the great and rich southern earldoms of Salisbury and De Warenne. Earl Thomas of Lancaster was the richest and most powerful, and in the end the most unfortunate, nobleman of his time; the wealth and power of his six or seven earldoms having tempted him to try his strength against his cousin, Edward II., in which contest he lost his life, as well as his estates, as we have shown elsewhere. Whilst in his high estate, his yearly expenditure was equal to at least £100,000 a year of modern money, independent of the cost of numerous articles consumed in his castles and palaces, in entertaining his army of followers.

The following account of the yearly household expenditure of Thomas, earl of Lancaster, has come down to modern times, and may be regarded as the expenditure of the richest nobleman in England, in the time of the Plantagenet kings. All the sums given in this account should be multiplied by twelve, or perhaps fifteen, to turn them into modern money:—

*Household Book of Thomas, Earl of Lancaster, in the year 1313, 6 Edward II.—*

Charge of the pantry, buttery, and kitchen, . . . . .	£3405 0 0
To 184 tuns one pipe of red or claret wine, and two tuns of white wine, . . . . .	104 17 6
“ grocery, . . . . .	180 17 0
“ six barrels of sturgeon, . . . . .	19 0 0
“ 6800 stock-fishes, so called, and for dried fishes of all sorts, aslings, haberdines, &c., . . . . .	41 6 7
“ 1714 pounds of wax, vermilion, and turpentine, . . . . .	314 7 4½
“ 2319 pounds of tallow candles for the household, and 1870 of lights for Paris candles, called perchers, . . . . .	31 14 3
“ charge of the earl's great horses, and servants' wages, . . . .	486 4 3½

To linen for the earl and his chaplains, and for the pantry, . . . .	£43 17 0
" 129 dozen of parchment and ink, . . . . .	4 8 3½
" two cloths of scarlet for the earl's use; one of russet for the bishop of Anjou; seventy of blue for the knights; twenty-eight for the esquires; fifteen medley for the clerks; fifteen for the officers; nineteen for the grooms; five for the archers; four for the minstrels and carpenters; with the sharing and carriage for the earl's liveries at Christmas, . . . . .	460 15 0
" seven furs, variable miniver, or powdered ermine; seven hoods of purple; 395 furs of budge for the liveries of barons, knights, and clerks; 123 furs of lambs, bought at Christmas, for the esquires, . . . . .	147 17 8
" sixty-five saffron-coloured cloths for the barons and knights in summer; twelve red cloths for the clerks; twenty-six rag cloths for the esquires; one for the officers; and four rag cloths for carpets in the hall, . . . . .	345 13 8
" 100 pieces of green silk for the knights; fourteen budge furs for surcoats; thirteen hoods of budge for the clerks; seventy-five furs of lambs for liveries in summer, with canvas and cords to truss them, . . . . .	72 19 0
" saddles for the lords' summer liveries, . . . . .	51 6 8
" one saddle for the earl, of the Prince's Arms, . . . . .	2 0 0
" several items (the particulars in the account defaced), . . . .	241 14 1½
" horses lost in the service of the earl, . . . . .	8 6 8
" fees paid to earls, barons, knights, and esquires, . . . . .	623 15 5
" gifts to knights of France; the queen of England's nurses; to the countess of Warrene, esquires, minstrels, messengers, and riders, . . . . .	92 14 0
" 165 yards of russet cloth, and twenty-four coats for poor men, with money given on Maundy Thursday, . . . . .	8 16 7
" twenty-four silver dishes; twenty-four saucers; twenty-four cups; one pair paternosters; one silver coffer—all bought this year, . . . . .	103 5 6
" diverse messengers about the earl's business, . . . . .	34 19 8
" sundry things in the earl's chamber, . . . . .	5 0 0
" several old debts, paid this year, . . . . .	88 16 0½
" expenses of the countess, at Pickering, in the pantry, buttery, kitchen, &c., . . . . .	285 13 4½
In wine, wax, spices, cloths, furs, &c., for the countess's wardrobe,	154 7 4½
Total, . . . . .	£7359 13 0½

There were three earls of Lancaster of the Plantagenet line. These were Edmund, the first earl, the second son of King Henry III., who obtained the earldom in the year 1262, and retained it down to the time of his death, in the year 1296; Thomas, the son of the above, who succeeded to the earldom on his father's death, in the year 1296, and held it until he was convicted of high-treason, and decapitated at Pontefract castle, in the year 1320; and Henry, the younger son of Earl Edmund, and the brother of Earl Thomas, to whom the titles and

estates of the earldom were restored by Parliament in the year 1327, on the death of Edward II., and the accession to the throne of the youthful Edward III., then only eleven years of age. This Henry, earl of Lancaster, was the regent of the kingdom during the minority of the youthful king, and held the earldom of Lancaster, along with the earldoms of Leicester, Derby, Lincoln, Salisbury, and other honours of the family, until the time of his death, in the year 1346. There were also three dukes of Lancaster, of the same royal house. The first of these was Henry, the son of the first Earl Henry. He was raised to the honour of duke of Lancaster in the year 1352-53, 25 Edward III., at the time when the title of duke was first introduced into this kingdom.

It was on this occasion, and in favour of this duke, that the county of Lancaster was made a county palatine. In the charter by which Henry was raised to the rank of duke of Lancaster it was stated, that the king conferred that honour with the assent of Parliament, and created Henry duke of Lancaster, with the right to have throughout the whole of his life a chancellor and justices, to try all pleas, and to have all liberties and royal rights pertaining to a county palatine, as completely as the earls of Chester had held those rights within the county of Chester. The effect of this was to create within the county of Lancaster a power equal, if not superior, to that of the Crown; and in a few years after, the rights of the dukes of Lancaster were extended over the whole of the duchy of Lancaster, wherever its possessions might be situated. These rights were thus extended over the great estates in all parts of England, which had originally belonged to the earldoms of Derby, Leicester, Lincoln, Salisbury, and De Warrene, and afterwards to very extensive estates belonging to the Bigods, earls of Norfolk in that county, and to the estates of the De Bohuns, earls of Hereford, on the banks of the river Wye.

The second duke of Lancaster was the celebrated John of Gaunt, the fourth son of King Edward III., who obtained all these vast estates by his marriage with Lady Blanche, the sole surviving daughter and child of Henry, the first duke of Lancaster. The third duke of Lancaster was Henry of Bolingbroke, the only son of John of Gaunt, by that marriage, whose wealth and power were so great that he succeeded in dethroning his cousin, Richard II., and seizing upon the crown of England, which he held by the style and title of King Henry IV.

Up to the time of the accession of Henry Bolingbroke to the throne, the estates of the house of Lancaster continued to increase very rapidly. John of Gaunt added to them the possessions of the earls of Richmond, which he had received from his father, Edward III., and Henry Bolingbroke added the earldom of Hereford, which he obtained by marriage with the heiress of the De Bohuns, earls of Hereford. It was at one of the castles on the latter estates, namely, that of Monmouth, that his son and heir, Henry of Monmouth, afterwards famous as Henry V., was born.

When Henry of Bolingbroke succeeded to the throne, he made arrangements by which the dukedom of Lancaster should be held by himself, and by all succeeding kings and queens of England, as a separate possession, the revenues of which should form part of the private income of the crown. This arrangement, which was confirmed by several succeeding kings, was so far successful, that the duchy of Lancaster has remained a separate estate to the present day, and at this time produces a moderate revenue to the queen, in right of her duchy of Lancaster. But all these arrangements failed to save the estates in question from being greatly diminished, and gradually impoverished, either by the private expenditure of the sovereign, or by grants, many of them of the most reckless and thoughtless kind, made to courtiers or to other persons who were supposed to have claims on the royal family.

When the estates of the duchy of Lancaster were of their greatest extent, and most productive in revenue, in the time of John of Gaunt, and his son, Henry of Bolingbroke, they produced a yearly income of from £25,000 to £30,000 of the money of that day; equal to at least from £250,000 to £300,000 of the money of the present time.

At present, what remains of these estates produces a revenue of from £20,000 to £30,000 of modern money. But in early times, when the pecuniary value of the estates was largest, and seemed still larger from the poverty of the crown, and what would now be considered the poverty of most of the nobles of the kingdom, there were also a great number of feudal rights and services which added much to the power and influence of the dukes of Lancaster. It will have been seen from the accounts of the expenditure of Thomas, earl of Lancaster, given above, that he lived surrounded by knights, barons, and earls, and maintained an establishment suited to the power and dignity of a prince of the blood royal. All this was continued until

the time when the dukedom of Lancaster and the crown were united, when the expenditure was made in all respects worthy of royalty. For the next hundred years the estates of the dukes of Lancaster rather diminished than increased; but even so late as the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the possessions of the duchy were very large, especially if proper allowance be made for the difference in the value of money. At the same time, however, the income of the estates was greatly wasted by a profuse expenditure, and by the salaries of a great number of officers.

There is still in existence an account of the income and expenditure of the duchy of Lancaster, and of the parks, chases, offices, and church-livings connected with it, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and in the chancellorship of Sir Francis Walsingham, who held the office of chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster, in the year 1585, the twenty-eighth of Queen Elizabeth. It is curious, as showing the outline and, as it were, the remains of the greatest feudal estate that ever existed in England. The whole value of the estate was then worth £14,000 a year, equal to £80,000 or £100,000 of modern money. The portions of the estate situate within the counties of Lancaster and Chester, were those of Halton, Clitheroe, Furness, and Lancaster, which, together, produced £3100, equal probably to four or five times as much in money of this day. In addition to these estates there were, in Lancashire, the forests of Bowland, Wyersdale, and Bleasdale, and the parks of Leagram, Myerscough, Toxteth, and Quernmore; and in the county of Chester, a beautiful park around Halton castle. The expenditure within the county of Lancaster seems to have been very liberal, though divided among a great number of persons. The largest salary was that of the chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster, who received £40 a year, probably equal to about £250 of modern money; and the next was a justice's of the Queen's Bench, who, for his office in the county palatine, received £36 13s. 4*d.*, equal to about five times as much in modern money. Another justice received for his office in the county palatine, "and dyett too," £40 a year. The high-sheriff of the county of Lancaster had for his allowance, £9. The attorney-general for the county palatine received £6 13s. 4*d.*; the bailiff for the manor of Salford, £6 13s. 4*d.*; the bailiff for West Derby wapentake or hundred, £4; the bailiff for the manor of West Derby, £3 0s. 8*d.*; the constable of Liverpool castle, £6 13s. 4*d.*; the steward of the wapentake of Derby and Salford (long held by the Molyneux

family) £5; the steward of Amounderness, £2; the steward of Lonsdale, £2; the receiver of Clitheroe, £15 13s. 4d.; the steward of Blackburn, Tottington, and Clitheroe, for his fee, £3 6s. 8d.; the constable of Clitheroe castle, £10; the auditor of the county, £28; the stipend of the clerk to serve in the chapel of Liverpool, £4 17s. 4d.; the stipend of a clerk and schoolmaster at Manchester was £4 4s. 2d.; the stipend of a clerk and schoolmaster at Preston, £2 18s. 2d.; the fee of the clerk and schoolmaster at Walton, near Liverpool, £5 13s. 4d.; and an allowance was made to seven women praying within the late college, called Knowles's Almshouse, of £35 15s., which, considering the value of money at that time, was rather a liberal allowance.

Up to the time of Queen Elizabeth, and probably somewhat later, the power of the chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster was very great. He even claimed, amongst other rights, that of nominating one of the members for the borough of Liverpool;\* but these powers have long passed away, although the office of vice-chancellor of the duchy has been revived within the last fifty-years, has been placed in the hands of a sound lawyer, and has become extremely useful in the administration of justice. In all other respects, except a moderate payment to the privy purse of the sovereign, the duchy of Lancaster is a mere shadow of its former greatness.

*The Public Works of Lancashire and Cheshire in Early Times.—*

The numerous and well-constructed roads formed by the Romans, and which have been fully described in a previous part of this work, continued to be the principal lines of traffic and modes of communication in the north-western division of England, as well as in England generally, for many hundred years after the Romans had retired from Britain. There is no evidence of any similar works having been formed in this part of the kingdom, or anywhere else indeed, by the Anglo-Saxons or by the English people, in the times of the Norman, the Plantagenet, the Tudor, or even the early Stuart kings. The highways were upheld by statute labour from a very early period, but no new ones were formed in this part of England. During the whole of this long period the roads used by our ancestors in this part of England, either followed the same course which had been originally marked out by the engineers of the Roman army, or ran near enough to those lines, to render the road-making materials brought together

\* Records of the Corporation of Liverpool, A. D. 1562.



by the Romans available by their less intelligent and less industrious successors. During that long period the roads became much narrower and less convenient than they had been under the Romans, whose main lines of road were formed with great care, and carefully paved to a width of from twenty to thirty feet. Even so late as the close of the seventeenth century a paved horse track, four feet in width, was considered a perfectly good road in this part of England; and the rest of the road was left in a state of nature, or merely mended by filling up the ruts with the earth which had been thrown out of them by the action of the wheels in passing, or with earth brought from the neighbouring ditches. So late as the reign of Charles II., in the year 1675, a treatise was published on the highways of England, by Thomas Mace, in which he stated that the four chief impediments to highways in England were, first, mire, slime or dirt; second, deep cart ruts, with their high ridges; third, unevennesses and holes; and fourthly and lastly, loose stones. These evils, he stated, it was impossible to cure by the then existing mode of management, which required that every man should work on the public roads, or pay for labour, six days in the year. In the place of that plan, he recommended that daysmen should be employed every working day of the year upon the roads, at the rate of one man for every ten miles, or more in particularly bad places, whose business it should be to fill up the ruts, as quickly as they were formed. He also recommended that the roads should be rounded, and that good drains should be formed at the sides; but the notion of bringing new materials for the purpose of repairing the roads, or of forming them with successive layers of materials, after the manner of the Romans or of the roadmakers of modern times, never appears to have occurred either to him or to any one else. A horse track, four feet wide, for quick travellers; and an unpaved track, for broad-wheeled waggons, was regarded as all that was necessary to make a good road, up to the commencement of the eighteenth century. Indeed, it is a curious fact, that there was no paved road between Liverpool and Warrington until the reign of George II. The Romans had not made one; and it did not occur to any one else to supply the deficiency.

The greatest improvement in the means of communication made by our ancestors, in early times, was in the building of bridges across rivers and streams. This was done very extensively, even in the wildest parts of England. Most of the Lancashire and Cheshire

bridges, as well as those of other parts of England, were built under royal grants of *pontagium*, as grants for the construction of bridges were then called. These grants were made apparently under the royal prerogative, many of them being earlier than the existence of parliaments, and gave the power of raising rates or demanding tolls for the construction of bridges. In those times grants of this description were in the place of the private Acts of Parliament of modern times. There were several kinds of grants known by different names. The grants of *calcetum*, which were very few in number, authorized the raising of tolls or rates, for the purpose of repairing roads. These were chiefly confined to the military roads leading to the borders of Scotland, or to the roads in the neighbourhood of London, which were already beginning to be considerably used. The next were grants of *pontagium*, which were very numerous, and gave powers to build bridges over all the principal rivers in England. The third were grants of *pavagium*, or pavage, and authorized the raising of a sort of octroi duties, at the entrance of the different towns, for the purpose of paving the streets of those towns. The next were named *keyagium*, and were permissions to raise money for the purpose of forming quays and landing-places in seaport towns. Another set of orders, much less common, and known by various names, were permissions to raise money for the purpose of putting up and maintaining beacons and lights at the entrance of harbours. The last were entitled *muragium*, or murage, and were permissions to raise money for the building or upholding of walls around all the principal cities and boroughs of the kingdom. This was done chiefly as a measure of police, to give additional security to the citizens and burgesses, in an unsettled and turbulent age. Under the statute of Winton, or Winchester, passed in the reign of Edward I., it was required that walls should be formed around all borough towns, and that watch and ward should be kept at the gates during the night. These walls, which were seldom strong, in the interior of England were made under grants of *muragium*. In the case of great national fortresses like Chester, Carlisle, and Berwick-on-Tweed, the grants of *muragium* were much larger than in places where walls were erected as a mere measure of police; and at Chester the tax of *muragium*, or murage, was collected down to very recent times. One excellent effect of that has been to preserve the curious and interesting walls of Chester and York to the present day. There was a tax for the preservation of the walls and the bridge of Chester

at the time of the Domesday survey; and the tax for the preservation of those walls has continued down to the present times. In another part of the present chapter we shall give an account of the various public works executed in the counties of Lancaster and Chester in early times; and, in subsequent chapters, of the great public works constructed in those two counties in modern times.

*The Trade, Commerce, and Navigation of Lancashire and Cheshire, previous to the Discovery and the Planting of America by the English Race.*—In the earlier periods of English history, and down to the time of the first and second of the Stuart kings, the counties of Lancaster and Chester, forming the north-western division of England, were much behind the southern and eastern districts of the kingdom in all the elements of industry. This inferiority arose in a great degree from the remoteness of their position from the continent of Europe, and from the great commercial nations of the Continent, especially the Flemings, the Germans, the Genoese, and the Venetians, who then had the trade and manufactures of Europe in their hands. In those ages, England abounded in wool and skins, and produced a considerably larger quantity of wheat and of other grain than was consumed by its own inhabitants; and the first commerce of England consisted in the export of those articles, and the import of wine, of the finer kinds of woollen goods, and of gold and silver, the latter of which articles were chiefly imported by the Genoese, who had extensive intercourse with the interior of Asia, by way of the Black Sea, as well as by way of Syria and Egypt. At that time English wool was greatly famed for the excellence of its quality, and when the laws of England allowed it to be exported, which was not often the case, it was eagerly purchased by the merchants and manufacturers of Flanders and Italy. But the descriptions of wool that were most in demand with foreign buyers were those of the Cotswold sheep of Gloucestershire, and those of the Ryland sheep of Herefordshire, which were reputed to be the finest in England, and were compared by Camden, the prince of English topographers, to the wools of Tarentum, which were considered to be the finest of the wools of ancient times.\* There was also a great demand for other kinds of wool, grown in different parts of the southern and the eastern counties, especially for those of Norfolk and Cambridgeshire. But the wools of the northern and

\* Camden's *Britannia*: Gloucestershire and Herefordshire.

the north-western counties were less in demand amongst foreign manufacturers, being, in general, of a much stronger and coarser quality, unsuited for the manufacture of the finer woollens of Italy, though extremely well suited for the forming of strong and warm woollens and worsteds, adapted to northern climates. Hence the trade in British wool was almost entirely carried on in the English counties to the south and east of the river Trent.

But at a very early age the manufacture of British woollens, of a rather superior class, commenced in many parts of England, in addition to the home-spun and rude manufactures which must have always existed in almost every part of England, for domestic use. The finest manufactures naturally sprung up where wools of the finest quality were produced, and it was the object of early kings and parliaments to foster those manufactures by all the means in their power. Some of their measures were very sensible, such as the liberal encouragement given to Flemish and other manufacturers to settle in England. Others would have rather shocked the political economists of the present age; consisting of laws forbidding the export of English wool and fuller's earth, the latter much used in the woollen manufacture, under the severest penalties, and giving the woollen manufacturers the benefit of the collective wisdom of Parliament in the management of their own workshops. In those days the woollen manufacture was the principal manufacture of England; and the laws which forbade the export of the raw material, and taught the manufacturer how to make cloth, were regarded as the perfection of human wisdom. There were literally hundreds of these laws, and some of them continued in existence to the days of Mr. Huskisson. In defiance of such laws, the English woollen manufacturers, having abundance of good wool, plenty of water and water-power, and a most industrious population to assist them, soon began to flourish, and have done so ever since; having survived all restrictions, and now flourishing in perfect freedom. But the manufacture of a superior class of goods, suited for the markets of France, Spain, Italy, Flanders, and Germany, commenced earlier in the southern and eastern than in the northern counties, the latter being chiefly confined to strong and coarse goods, suited for domestic use.

Industry was everywhere followed by comfort and prosperity, which was proportioned to its success; being considerable everywhere, according to the notions of those ages, but much greater in the

southern and eastern counties, where the soils are good and where the quality of the wools were fine, than in the northern counties, which were less favoured in those and in most other respects. In the reign of Edward III., in the year 1341, it was considered desirable by Parliament to raise large sums of money, by taxation, for the purpose of assisting the king in his desperate schemes for effecting the conquest of France. These he undertook in direct defiance of the laws of succession to the throne always recognized in France, founding his claim to the French throne on the laws of succession generally recognized in this country. Parliament, which was quite as eager for the conquest of France, even as the warlike monarch who then occupied the throne, opened the purse-strings of the nation with almost unexampled liberality; and it is from the Rolls of Parliament of the year 1341, that we obtain the information as to the power of paying taxes, which was then supposed to exist in each of the English counties. At that time the county of Lancaster stood lowest on the list in proportion to its extent. We have, unfortunately, no return with regard to the county of Chester, Chester and Durham being then counties palatine, and the returns being made to the earl of Chester and the lord bishop of Durham, and not to the officers who received those returns from the other counties of the kingdom.

It appears from the Rolls of Parliament, that on the 19th of February, 1340, the Commons made a grant to the king of 30,000 tacks of wool, to assist him to meet that *profluvium expensarum* which, he justly stated, would be the result of his claim to the throne of France. The value of this quantity of wool was equal to about £1,500,000 in the money of the present time, which was an extremely liberal grant for so early an age. At that time each of the counties of the kingdom paid a fixed portion of every tax that was imposed, which was supposed to represent its tax-paying power.

The computations of the amount to be paid under this particular tax were originally made in wool, and not in money; but the actual payments were in money, calculated at £4 a sack, according to the money of that time, which must be multiplied by twelve to make it correspond with the money of present times. In order to make these payments intelligible, and to show the proportionate power of tax-paying in each county, we give these returns in three columns—the first showing the number of acres of land in each

county ; the second showing the number of sacks of wool which each county was considered liable to pay ; and the third showing the amount of money, of the reign of Edward III., represented by that number of sacks of wool, taking them at £4 per sack.

The tax imposed by the Parliament of Edward III., though called a wool tax, was in reality a property and income tax, every kind of property being taxed to produce the amounts for which the different counties were held answerable.

The following were the amounts payable by each of the counties of England, in the year 1341, towards a fixed tax of 20,000 sacks of wool, valued at £4 a sack, and equal to about £1,000,000 of modern money, which grant was afterwards increased to 30,000 sacks, worth about £1,500,000 :—

Counties.	Statute Acres.	Sacks.	Stones.	Lbs.	At £4 a Sack.
Bedford, . . . . .	295,582	367	10	4½	£1,468
Berks, . . . . .	451,210	538	13	0½	2,156
Buckingham, . . . . .	466,932	569	23	3	2,278
Cambridge, . . . . .	525,182	542	20	5¼	2,172
Cornwall, . . . . .	873,600	262	19	0	1,052
Cumberland, . . . . .	1,001,273	232	17	8½	932
Derby, . . . . .	658,803	247	13	12½	992
Devon, . . . . .	1,657,180	514	17	7	2,060
Dorset, . . . . .	632,225	580	21	4¾	2,320
Essex, . . . . .	1,060,549	668	3	4¼	2,676
Gloucester, . . . . .	805,102	591	3	3	2,364
Hereford, . . . . .	534,823	140	25	13½	564
Hertford, . . . . .	391,141	325	20	5¾	1,308
Huntingdon, . . . . .	229,544	235	6	6½	940
Kent, . . . . .	1,039,419	1,274	9	0¼	5,096
Lancaster, . . . . .	1,219,221	256	5	0	1,024
Leicester, . . . . .	514,164	336	10	9	1,340
Lincoln, . . . . .	1,775,457	1,265	18	12	5,064
Middlesex, . . . . .	180,136	236	10	11¾	944
London, . . . . .	—	603	2	12¾	2,112
Norfolk, . . . . .	1,354,301	2,206	20	8¾	8,828
Northampton, . . . . .	630,550	547	2	0	2,188
Northumberland, . . . . .	1,249,299	347	22	5½	1,392
Newcastle, . . . . .	—	73	8	5¼	292
Nottingham, . . . . .	52,676	326	18	5¼	1,308
Oxford, . . . . .	472,717	614	20	1½	2,460
Rutland, . . . . .	95,805	111	24	2	448
Salop, . . . . .	826,550	236	18	1½	948
Somerset, . . . . .	1,047,220	601	2	3½	2,404
Bristol, . . . . .	—	63	17	11¼	256
Southampton, . . . . .	1,700,216	678	19	7	2,716
Stafford, . . . . .	728,468	250	25	10½	1,004
Suffolk, . . . . .	947,681	950	3	0	3,836
Surrey, . . . . .	478,792	382	15	4¼	2,069

Counties.	Statute Acres.	Sacks.	Stones.	Lbs.	At £4 a Sack.
Sussex, . . . . .	936,901	382	15	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	£1,528
Warwick, . . . . .	563,946	420	9	10	1,680
Westmoreland, . . . . .	485,432	156	14	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	£628
Wilts, . . . . .	86,592	845	17	0 $\frac{1}{2}$	3,384
Worcester, . . . . .	472,165	209	0	6	836
York (West Riding), . . . . .	1,709,307	334	11	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	1,336
“ (East Riding), . . . . .	768,419	499	21	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	2,000
“ (North Riding), . . . . .	1,350,121	275	4	6	1,100
York City, . . . . .	2,000,720	49	13	0	200
Twenty-nine Counties, . . . . .	31,993,890	20,376	0	0	81,504

Equal in modern money to £978,048, of which £12,288 was paid by the county of Lancaster.

It will be seen from the above table that the county of Norfolk, which paid £8828, equal to £104,936 of modern money, was then the richest English county. It owed its wealth to the fertility of its soil, in the eastern part of the county; to the extent and value of its sheepwalks, in the western and the northern parts; to its extensive fisheries of herrings and other fish in the German Ocean; to the great convenience of its ports, especially Yarmouth and King's Lynn, for commerce with the Continent; but, above all, to its extensive manufactures, both of woollen and of worsted goods, in almost all the towns of the county. The city of Norwich was at that time, and has always continued to be, a wealthy and prosperous city, having the advantage of a very good river navigation to the sea, and of several fine streams of water, available for manufacturing purposes. The town of Aylesford was also famous for its extensive manufactures of woollen goods of the finest quality; and worsted goods were manufactured at the village of Worsted, from which they are supposed to take their name; and also in many other places in the same county. Most of the advantages which the county of Norfolk possessed, were also enjoyed in a greater or less degree by the whole of the counties along the eastern and the southern sides of the island, as well as by London, Newcastle, York, Lincoln, and Bristol, which were at that time all regarded as sea-ports, but were also the seats of extensive manufactures.

It will be seen that all these counties were rich, in that age, in comparison with other parts of the kingdom. In this respect they were superior to the inland counties, although the latter possessed considerable advantages in their abundant supply of wool and of water-power. They were also greatly superior in all those respects to the north-western counties, including Stafford, Lancashire, Westmoreland, and Cumberland.



We have no account either of Cheshire or of Chester in these returns, owing to the causes which we have already mentioned; but there is every reason to believe that they formed the most flourishing part of the north-western district, although they were far remote from the commerce of Europe, and were continually disturbed by wars along the Welsh border. For the same reason Shropshire, in that age, took a much lower position in wealth and industry than it is entitled to, from the fertility of its soil, the extent of its pastures, the abundance of its flocks, and its great mineral wealth.

The northern counties of England, and especially Lancashire, Cumberland, Northumberland, Durham, and the northern parts of Yorkshire, were at that time suffering from all the miseries and the horrors of an invasion, by the armies of Scotland. The reigns of Edward I., Edward II., and Edward III. were a succession of desperate wars between England and Scotland, commenced by Edward I. with the hope of conquering Scotland, or, at least, of rendering it subordinate to the English crown; continued by Edward II., in spite of the most overwhelming disasters; taken up by Edward III., at the beginning of his reign, from the most urgent necessity, the greater part of the northern counties being then overrun by the Scottish armies; carried on by him, after several misfortunes, with very great success, and finally abandoned after the northern frontier of England had been rendered secure, for the purpose of carrying on the still wilder and more hopeless undertaking of the conquest of the kingdom of France, which Edward III. claimed in right of his mother, Queen Isabella, the daughter of the French king. It was at the time when the schemes of Edward III. for conquering Scotland had just been abandoned, that the new and heavy taxes, of which we have spoken, were imposed, for the purpose of carrying on the war with France. But the northern counties of England were so much exhausted by the ravages of the invaders, and by the desperate efforts which they had made in the Scottish wars, that they declared themselves unable to pay even their usual small proportion of the general taxes to which they had been considered liable. They therefore demanded a new valuation of the northern counties, and this valuation was made; the result being that their payments were reduced by about one-third of the amount that they had previously contributed.

*Valuation of the Hundred of Lonsdale, in the 15 Edward III., 1341.*  
—It appears from an inquiry, made at Lancaster in the fifteenth year of the reign of King Edward III., before the abbot of Furness

and the principal landowners of the hundred, that the value of the ninth part of the sheaves of corn, the skins, and the lambs of the district—together with the ninth part of the goods of the burgesses in the borough of Lancaster; and the fifteenth part of the goods and merchandise of the merchants and other strangers then residing, or remaining in the hundred of Lonsdale—was £153 12s. 8*d.* Multiplying this sum by nine to obtain the full value of the goods in the money of that age, we find that the whole amount was about £1382 14s. This being again multiplied by twelve to turn it into modern money, we find that the total yearly value of the property of the Lonsdale hundred, in the year 1341, was equal to £16,592 8s. of the money of the present time. The whole of this amount, with the exception of £6 10s. 11*d.*, forming the ninth part of the goods of the burgesses residing within the borough of Lancaster, was raised from the produce of the soil, or from the iron mines of Furness, which belonged to the abbey of Furness, and were worked under the direction of the heads of that rich and powerful establishment.

*Valuation of the Hundred of Amounderness in the year 1341.*—A similar inquiry was made at Preston a few days later, before the abbot of Furness and the chief landowners of the hundred, with some of the burgesses of Preston, and showed that the whole yearly value of the ninth and fifteenth parts of the same descriptions of property existing in the hundred of Amounderness at that time, was £137 6s. 5*d.* Multiplying this amount by nine, we obtain £1235 17s. 9*d.* as the yearly value of the property of the hundred of Amounderness, in the money of that time; and turning this into modern money, we have the sum of £14,830 13s. as representing the value of the property of Amounderness at that period in modern money. The only borough in the hundred of Amounderness at that period was Preston, or as it was always called in that age, to distinguish it from many other places of the same name, Preston-in-Amounderness. The value of the ninth part of the goods of the burgesses of Preston was £6 17s. 4*d.* in the money of that time. All the rest of the property in the hundred was the produce of the soil.

*Valuation of the Hundred of Blackburn in the year 1341.*—A similar inquiry was made about the same time, and before the same commissioners, as to the value of the ninth and the fifteenth parts of the same classes of goods inquired into in the other hundreds of the county, in the Blackburn hundred. From this it appeared that the

value of the ninth part of the goods of the hundred of Blackburn was £119 4s. 11d. This gives a total, in the money of that time, of £1073 4s. 3d., equal to about £12,878 11s. of modern money. In this return it was declared that there were no boroughs in the hundred of Blackburn, and that there were no persons living by trade or merchandise there.

*Valuation of the Hundred of Leyland in 1341.*—A similar valuation was made in the hundred of Leyland, which is much smaller in extent, though containing much good land. In this hundred the value of the ninth part of the above descriptions of property was declared to be £72 a year. This gives a total value for the hundred of Leyland of £648, equal to £5832 in the money of the present time. There were no towns or boroughs in the hundred of Leyland at that time.

*Valuation of the Hundred of Salford in 1341.*—The valuation of the hundred of Salford gives very extraordinary results, for the return showed that the ninth part of the goods of the men of that hundred was £104 8s. This gives a general amount of £939 12s., equal to £11,275 4s. of modern money, for the income of the hundred of Salford, now the richest district in England, with the exception of the metropolis. What is equally curious, it is stated that there were no towns or boroughs in the hundred liable to be taxed, and no persons engaged in trade and merchandise. By boroughs must be meant parliamentary boroughs, for Manchester had a charter from the De Gresleys, dated 1301.

*Valuation of the West Derby Hundred in 1341.*—This extensive hundred was at that time the richest part of the county of Lancaster. The value of the ninth part of the goods of the inhabitants of the hundred of West Derby was £230 16s. 4d. This represents a total value of £2077 7s., equal in modern money to £24,928 4s. There were at this time two boroughs in the hundred of West Derby, viz. Wigan and Liverpool. The value of the ninth part of the goods of the burgesses of Wigan was £5 9s. 4d. a year. The value of the ninth part of the goods of the burgesses of Liverpool was £6 16s. 7d.

*Valuation of the County of Lancaster in the Fifteenth Year of the Reign of Edward III., 1341.*—The value of the ninth part of the goods of the whole of the inhabitants of the county of Lancaster at this time, was £859 0s. 6d. This gives a total value of £7731 4s. 6d., in the money of that time, equal to £92,774 14s. in the money of the present day. The present yearly valuation of property and income in the county of Lancaster is rather more than £25,000,000.

*Progress of the Towns and Town Population of Lancashire and Cheshire from the Domesday Survey A.D. 1085 to the Restoration of the Monarchy and the planting of America A.D. 1606 to 1660.*—We shall best be able to compare and to contrast the condition of the north-western division of England, formed of the counties of Lancaster and Chester, in ancient and modern times, by tracing the history of the towns and town population of that portion of the kingdom in early times, and by contrasting it with their present progress. The history of the towns, boroughs, and cities of the two counties may be conveniently divided into two periods. The former of these periods extends over a range of nearly 600 years, and includes the time which elapsed between the Norman conquest and the Restoration of the Monarchy, at the close of the great Civil War. The second includes a period of rather more than 200 years, commencing with the Restoration, in the year 1660, and coming down to the present time. No contrast can be greater than that which is presented by the difference in the rate at which the towns and the town population of the counties increased in these two periods. In the former, even those places which had been formed earliest, and which had taken the firmest hold on the trade and the natural resources of the district—such as Manchester, Liverpool, Preston, and Wigan; the towns in the salt district of Cheshire; and the ancient city of Chester, then the undoubted capital of the north-western district—did not increase in population at the rate of more than a few hundreds, or at the most of one or two thousand persons, in a century; whilst in the second period the increase in the population, not only of the ancient cities and boroughs of the two counties, but of many places which were mere villages in ancient times, has become so rapid as to cause a rate of increase of hundreds, and in some cases even of thousands of inhabitants, in a single year. In the former of these periods even the four ancient parliamentary boroughs of Lancashire, viz., Lancaster, Preston, Liverpool, and Wigan, which had received the right of returning members to the earliest parliaments of England in which the burgesses were represented, were so weak in population and property that they were often excused from returning members to Parliament on that ground.\* In modern times so great has been the increase in population and wealth, that the two palatine counties now return between them from forty to fifty members. The chief cause of the wonderful change that has taken place

\* History of Boroughs of England.

in modern times, in the rate of increase in the population of this part of the kingdom, is the still more wonderful increase in the trade and commerce of the two counties. This increase may be traced to a variety of causes, the relative importance of which will be shown in the course of this work. Perhaps the most important of all these causes was the planting or settlement of the continent of North America and of the West Indies by the English race, which took place in the first fifty years of the seventeenth century, and then gave a fresh impulse to the industry and the commerce of the north-western districts of England, which continues to the present time, with continually increasing force. Since that time all the other regions of the earth have been thrown open to the commerce of this division of England, which now extends to the whole world.

We have already stated, at the commencement of this chapter, that none of the present towns or cities of Lancashire are described as boroughs in the Domesday survey, and that the city of Chester is the only place which is spoken of in that record as a borough in the north-western district, and in which there was then a considerable town population of freemen and burgesses, holding their lands by burgage tenure. Almost the only place in Lancashire at which there were any burgesses at that time was Penwortham, on the south bank of the river Ribble, opposite to the ancient town of Preston. It is mentioned in the Domesday survey that there were a few persons holding land by burgage tenure in that place, and it is very probable that they may have been connected with the ancient Saxon town or borough of Preston, though there is no mention of any burgesses as existing at Preston at the time of the Domesday survey. The ancient Roman settlements or garrison towns of Lancaster, Ribchester, and Manchester, which we have described in a previous chapter of this work, had been almost destroyed in war, or had sunk into decay in the course of ages, and at the time of the Domesday survey had no separate local governments or privileges, and were at the most market towns, if not villages. In almost every age towns or places of meeting and assembly, of one kind or other, are necessary for the purposes of civil government, and for that exchange of the produce of the soil, and of rude manufactures, which commences even in the rudest state of society. In those early ages nearly the whole of the trade that then existed was carried on at markets, mostly held every week, or at fairs held once or twice a year. But at all these markets and fairs the king, or the great tenants of the crown holding under the king,

claimed the right to receive tolls and dues on everything that was bought or sold, and these tolls and dues were frequently excessive and unreasonable. One of the first improvements which was effected by the early kings of the Norman and Plantagenet races, was to grant charters authorizing the holding of markets and fairs, at different places which were found to be most convenient for those purposes; and at most of those markets and fairs the persons attending them were promised security during the holding, and a moderate rate of tolls on purchases and sales. A considerable amount of trade and intercourse thus sprang up, and a resident population of a few hundred persons soon collected at several points. The privileges of free boroughs were then sought and obtained either from the crown, or from some of the great tenants of the crown who held the *jura regalia* within their own lordships. In the county of Lancaster the greater part of the ancient charters were granted by the crown; but in some cases, especially in those of Manchester and Clitheroe, they were granted by the Gresleys, the De Lacys, and other great tenants of the crown. In the county of Chester most of the old charters were granted by the earls of Chester, who possessed all the rights of the crown within that county; but some were also granted by their barons, who exercised nearly the same rights as the earls themselves.

*The City of Chester from the Domesday Survey, A.D. 1084-85, to the Restoration, A.D. 1660.*—As the city of Chester possessed municipal rights long before any other place in the north-western division of England, and was for ages the chief place in that part of the kingdom, we shall first describe the rights conferred upon Chester by its early charters, and the progress made by that ancient city. We have already given a full account of Chester under the Romans, and of its local laws as they existed at the time when the Domesday survey was made. The city itself, although greatly injured in the siege laid to it by William the Conqueror, and the assault of the Normans, began to revive soon after the Conquest; and the settlement of the Norman earls of Chester, with their numerous followers, on the banks of the Dee, gave a considerable impulse to intercourse with Normandy and France. The earliest account that we possess of Chester, in the ages which immediately followed the Norman conquest, is given by a monk of the name of Lucian, whom Camden describes as having lived soon after the event. He says:—"Chester is built as a city, the site whereof inviteth and allureth the eye;

which, being situate in the west parts of Britain, was in times past a place for the reception of the legions coming afar off to repose themselves, and served sufficiently to keep the keys, as I may say, of Ireland, for the Romans to preserve the limits of their own empire; for being opposite to the north-east part of Ireland it openeth the way for passage of ships and mariners, with spread sails, passing, not often but continually, to and fro; and also for the commodities of sundry sorts of merchandise. Which city, having four gates, faces the four cardinal winds: on the east side it hath a prospect towards India; on the west towards Ireland; north-eastward to the greater Norway; and southward to that great and narrow angle, which divine severity, by reason of civil and home discords, hath left unto the Britons, who long since, by their bitter variance, have caused the name of Britain to be changed into the name of England. Over and beside, Chester hath, by God's gift, a river to enrich and adorn it, the same fair and fishful, hard by the city walls, and on the south side a road and harbour for ships coming from Gascony, Spain, Germany, and Ireland, which, with the help and direction of Christ, by the labour and wisdom of merchants, repair and refresh the heart of the city with many good things, that we, being comforted every way by God's grace, may also drink wine often more freely and more pleasantly, because those countries enjoy the fruit of the vineyards abundantly. Moreover, the open sea ceaseth not to visit us every day with a tide, which, according as the broad shelves and bars of sands are opened or hidden by tides and ebbs incessantly, is wont, more or less, either to send or exchange one thing or other, and, by this reciprocal flow and return, either to bring in or carry out somewhat."

Although the above account is vague and somewhat fanciful, there is no reason to doubt that Chester had a trade with Ireland, Norway, and France at a very early period. This gradually increased as the neighbouring seas were cleared from pirates; and by the time of the Tudor kings and queens had rendered Chester a flourishing port, and the principal outlet and inlet for the trade and commerce of the north-western district.

The early prosperity of Chester was greatly promoted by the possession of numerous and valuable municipal rights and customs. Many of these dated from Saxon times, and some possibly from the times when the Britons and the Romans ruled in Chester. They seem all to have been confirmed by the Norman earls of Chester,



and continued in force during the whole Plantagenet and Tudor periods.

The following is a summary of the principal rights enumerated and described in the *Custumale* of Chester, and confirmed by the Norman earls of that city:—

1st. The city of Chester (according to the *Custumale*) was a free city, “and any one born within the limits of the city, who continued quiet within the bounds and liberties of the city for a year and a day, was from that time free from the earl and all others within the city”—that is, he could not be claimed as a serf by any one, even by the earl himself.

2nd. The citizens might every year choose a mayor on the Friday after the feast of St. Dionise, or Dionisius (the 9th October), who must, before taking office, swear to obey the law of the king, and to preserve the liberties of the citizens. On the same day the citizens might of their own power also choose two sheriffs, who took a similar oath, to obey the king, and to preserve the liberties of the city, so far as in them lay; and

3rd. They had also the right to hold the local court known as the Pentice court, and to judge of questions relating to acquittances, releases, and recognizances; and they had also the right to choose coroners as often as need required.

4th. No citizen could be arrested in the city without the authority of the sheriff or the earl's bailiff; and any one arrested in the city was to be brought to the prison at Northgate, there to be detained and kept until delivered, according to the law and custom of the city.

5th. The Pentice court had jurisdiction in all kinds of pleas and plaints.

6th. A Portmoot court was to be held every fifteen days, before the mayor of the city at the Pentice, to hear and determine all plaints and pleas, real and personal, of all lands and tenements within the city, and the liberties thereof arising and being, and to make execution thereof. And the men of the city had the right of trying and punishing thieves apprehended within the city, and felons belonging to the city; given up to justice for crimes committed beyond the limits of the city.

7th. The citizens claimed to have a merchants' guild (*guilda mercatoria*) with all liberties and free customs, and that every one that was of the said guild should be a freeman in the said city, and might

bring within the liberties of the city all kinds of merchandise coming to the city by sea or land.

8th. For the maintenance of the guild there was to be taken 4*d.* (equal to 4*s.* in present money) a ton on iron.

9th. They—the citizens—had also the right of taking certain tolls on all kinds of merchandise bought or sold within the limits of the city.

10th. They were themselves free from all toll, for any kind of merchandise bought or sold by them in a fair or market, or other places, as well within the city of Chester as throughout all the county of Chester; also as well throughout all England as in Wales, and the marches thereof.

The following is a translation of the ancient Customale or Record of the Liberties of Chester, a copy of which exists in the Muniments of the Corporation of Clitheroe, who were entitled, under a grant from Henry de Lacy, constable of Chester, to all the rights enjoyed by the citizens of Chester.

*The Customale or Summary of Rights of the Citizens of Chester.*—The mayor and citizens of Chester do challenge these liberties, to wit:—First, that the city of Chester is a free city, and that the aforesaid citizens may by their own power choose yearly a mayor on the Friday next after the feast of St. Dionise (9th October). But having (*i.e.*, but he must have) first made his oath of the law of the king, and sworn to the said citizens to preserve the liberties of the city. Also, that they may of their own power choose two sheriffs on the day named, and in manner aforesaid, on which, at the command of the said city, the mayor and bailiffs thereof do make and perform their oaths. [The oath of the mayor and bailiffs follows. It is chiefly of allegiance to the king and defence of the rights of the crown, and thus concludes:—“You shall preserve the liberties of the city as much as in you lieth. You shall keep two leet courts in the year, if God shall lend you life. You shall look that the officers do their duties unto you to the uttermost of their power.”] The mayor and citizens also challenge to have two markets every week of the year, on the Wednesday and Saturday, and all things appertaining to a market. Also, two fairs in every year in the said city, one on the feast of the Nativity of St. John Baptist, and the other on the feast of St. Michael the Archangel (June 24th and September 29th), and all things belonging to a fair. They also challenge to have these liberties underwritten:—“To wit, acquittances, releases, recognizances,

with their appurtenances, and the Pentice (a court so named from its penthouse porch), in the city, for them, their heirs and successors, for ever. If any citizen die, his will, being reasonably made, shall be accounted strong and sure, in what place soever he shall die. If any citizen do buy anything upon the eighth day (in open market), and before witnesses, and some man afterwards shall come out of France or England who can reasonably reprove (claim) the thing bought by the citizen, the citizen who bought it shall be quit from the earl of Chester and his bailiffs, losing only and restoring the thing bought. If any man shall come to the bailiffs who can reasonably disprove the thing bought, he shall pay the price of it to the citizen which the citizen can reasonably prove he paid for it. If any citizen, &c., have lent to any man any of his goods and chattels, it may be lawful to him to take no man in the city for the recovery of his goods, without the license required of the sheriff or the bailiff of the said earl. If any citizen be slain in the service of the king, his goods shall be disposed of as if he had made a lawful will, and no man shall trouble them, their heirs, or successors, upon pain of £20 to be paid to the earl. No man shall buy or sell any kind of merchandise which shall come to the city by sea or land, except themselves (that is the citizens), their heirs and successors, or by their grant, unless in the fairs holden upon the feast-days of St. John Baptist and St. Michael; and no man shall hinder or trouble them of the aforesaid liberty, on pain of £10, to be paid to the earl for his own use. And the said city doth challenge all their liberties and free customs to be holden of the same earl, &c., to the said citizens, &c., for ever, yielding yearly to the said earl, &c., the sum of £20, at the feasts of Easter and St. Michael, by equal portions. And also they challenge that they may of their own power choose coroners in the said city, so often as need requireth, who shall swear before the mayor of the city, that they will faithfully do and execute attachments and pleas of the crown, and of the said earl, within the said city and liberties thereof, and other things belonging to the office of coroners. And to have and hold all pleas of the crown which shall happen within their liberties, to be pleaded before the mayor and bailiffs of the said earl in the court of the said city, and to receive all amerciements and all other things which belong to the said earl in this behalf, or which they know the predecessors of the said earl to have been accustomed to receive beforetime. And also they claim to have for ever sac and soc (local jurisdiction), toll, and infangethef

(trial of thefts committed within the city), and outfangethef (trial of thefts committed without the city) and to be quiet throughout all the dominions of the said earl from toll, passage, lastage, murage, pontage, and stallage, danegelt, guiltbitt, and all other customs, as well within England as in all other territories of the said earl. And also they challenge, that if any do die testate or intestate neither the said earl nor his heirs shall cause their goods to be confiscated; but their executors or nearest friends shall have them wholly. Also, that no bailiff or officer of the said earl of the said city shall attach or distrain within the liberties of the said city, or execute the office of bailiff in default of the aforesaid citizens or their bailiff. Also, they challenge that if any man be attached or apprehended within the liberties of the city, he shall be brought to the prison of the said earl in the said city—to wit, to Northgate, there to be detained and kept, until he be delivered according to the law and custom of the said city. Also, they challenge that they themselves or their goods, in what place or dominion soever of the said earl, shall not be arrested for any default whereof they stand not either as sureties or principal debtors. Also, they challenge to have their merchantable guild (or guild merchant, *gilda mercatoria*) with all liberties and free customs which they ever freely and quietly have had in the time of the ancestors of the said earl in the said guild. Also, they challenge to have all the goods of felons and fugitives within the liberties of the said city, which do amount to the value of £30, or under; and if the said goods do exceed the value of £30, the said earl shall have all the residue. Also, they challenge that the mayor of the city shall have the office of escheator of the said earl within the liberties of the city, and shall be as escheator. That every mayor at the time he is chosen shall come into the exchequer of the earl, before the justice of the earl, or his deputy, and the chamberlain of the earl and his heirs, or at least before the chamberlain, and shall swear faithfully to execute the said office, and to make a true account thereof to the earl. The mayor and citizens by these words, "Acquittances, releases, recognizances, and patents," do challenge to have, record, and to receive all manner of recognizances, as well for peace-keeping as for all manner of debts, to what sum soever amounting, before the mayor for the time being, in their court (then called the Portmoot), and to record, receive, and make releases, and acquittances of the premises in the said court. Also, to determine all indictments and forfeitures in the said court, and to take issues,

americiaments, and fines thereof, to their own proper uses. And by these words, "merchantable guild, with all liberties and free customs which they ever freely and quietly have had," they challenge that upon the Friday next after the feast of St. Dionise they may of their own power choose every year two stewards of the same guild, which be of the fraternity of the same guild, who then shall swear before the mayor and sheriffs and other citizens, that they will truly and sufficiently make account of all money by them received of any persons coming into the guild, and of all other customs of the said guild which have been received time out of mind and appertain to the said guild. That every one that is of the said guild shall be a free man in the said city, and may buy within the liberties of the city all kinds of merchandise coming to the city by sea or land; that no man that is admitted into the said guild shall buy anything within the liberties of the city without consent of the stewards of the guild, and for the maintenance of the said guild they may take, as their predecessors time out of mind have taken, these customs:—On every ton of iron, 4*d*. And by this word "soc," they challenge to hold pleas in their court, called the Pentice, before the sheriffs of the city, and all manner of complaints and pleas personal between parties, of every cause arising within the liberties, &c., which do belong to a court baron, and also to have suit of all free citizens. And by this word "Pentice court," they challenge to have in the said court all kinds of pleas and plaints amounting to any sum, and all pleas personal, and all plaints arising within the liberties of the city; and also, to have to their own proper use all issues, fines, forfeitures, and americiaments arising within the said court. And by this word "soc," they challenge to have fines, issues, americiaments, and forfeitures, of and for all articles, complaints, and pleas coming out of the said court, which do appertain to a court baron; and by this word "Portmoot," they challenge to have and to hold a certain court in the city every fifteen days, called the Portmoot, in the common hall, before the mayor of the city, and there to hear and determine all plaints and pleas, real and personal, of all lands and tenements within the city and the liberties thereof, arising or being, and to make execution thereof; also to receive all articles which belong to the view of frank-pledge, by indictment in rolls or inquiry, and then to hear and determine and execute, and also to have and to hold to their proper uses all issues, fines, and forfeitures whatsoever proceeding out of the said court.

And by this word "toll," they challenge to have and take toll for all kinds of merchandise bought or sold within the liberties of the city: to wit, for every ship coming within the liberties of the city, called "keile" (a keel), toll, 4*d.*, and to the clerk, 1*d.* For every merchant having merchandise in the city exceeding the value of 6*s.* 6*d.*, for his toll on all his merchandise, 4*d.*, and the clerk, 1*d.* And for every tun of wine, 4*d.*; and for every last of any kind of merchandise coming in or going out of the city and liberties thereof, 4*d.*; and if there be more merchants, every one of them 4*d.*; and for every horse carrying in or out of the city any load or fardel of merchandise or victuals, to be bought or sold, 1*d.*; and for every horse bought, 4*d.*; for every ox, cow, or heifer, 1*d.*; for every three sheep, 4*d.*, and if there be more, 4*d.*; and for every pair of wheels, 4*d.* And by this word, 'them,' they challenge that every one born within the liberties of the city that shall continue quiet within the franchises and liberties of the city a year and a day, he and his goods shall be quiet from the earl, and from any others in the city of Chester. And by this word, "infangethef," they challenge that felons apprehended within the liberties of the city [the rest of the sentence is illegible; probably, shall be tried before the mayor and bailiffs in the Pentice]. And by this word "outfangethef," they challenge that if any felon of the city be apprehended for felony within the city and county, the felon shall be delivered to the officer of the city to take execution. And also they challenge by this word "theolonio," that they may be free from all toll for any kind of merchandise, or any other things bought or sold by them in any fairs or markets, or other places, as well within the city of Chester as through all the county of Chester, and also as well throughout all England as in Wales and the Marches thereof."

The following confirmation was granted to the citizens of Chester by Randle or Ranulf de Blundeville, seventh earl of Chester, some time within the years 1190 and 1211, during the constablership of Roger, seventh baron of Halton, who is a witness to the charter:—

"I have given, &c., to my citizens of Chester their guild merchant, with all the free liberties and customs which they have ever freely and quietly had, in the time of my ancestors, in the said guild; and I forbid, upon penalty to me of £10, that any man trouble them thereof." The same generous and enlightened nobleman granted a second confirmation to the citizens of Chester. Its principal clauses are as follows:—"I have given,

granted, &c., to my citizens of Chester all the liberties and free customs which they have ever had, freely and quietly, in the time of my ancestors—to wit, acquittances, releases, and recognizances, with the appurtenances in the city of Chester, for ever. If any citizen, &c., die, his will, &c. If any citizen, &c., do buy anything in open day before witnesses, &c. If any citizen, &c., do lend any of his goods or chattels to any man, &c., it may be lawful, &c. If a citizen be slain in my service, &c. All these liberties and free customs I have given to the said citizens, &c., to hold of me and my heirs, freely, &c., for ever; and I forbid that no man hinder or trouble them thereof, on pain of £10." The unfinished clauses ending with &c. will be found fully set forth in the *Custumale*, or laws and customs of Chester, given in a previous page. There is a third charter by the same earl, and as amongst the witnesses are Constable Roger and Master Hugh the abbot, this fixes the date of this charter within the three years 1208–1211, in the first of which Hugh Grylle succeeded to the abbacy, and in the latter Roger the constable died:—

"I have granted, &c., to my citizens of Chester, and to their heirs, that no man shall buy or sell any kind of merchandise which cometh to the city of Chester by sea or land but themselves or their heirs, by their grant, except in the (two) fairs, &c. Wherefore I will that my said citizens, &c., have and hold the aforesaid liberties of me and my heirs for ever, &c., freely, quietly, peaceably, and honourably. And I forbid, upon penalty of £10 to be paid to my use, any man troubling or hindering them of their said liberties."

Charters were granted to the citizens of Chester by other earls, and when the earldom was united to the crown, King Edward I., who was the first earl of Chester of the blood royal, granted to the citizens by his charter of the 12th June, 1303, all the privileges in every part of the realm possessed by the citizens of London, Bristol, and the other great seaports of the kingdom.

The general result of the above charters, and of the prescriptive rights enjoyed by the citizens of Chester, was to render the city one of the freest, as well as one of the most flourishing cities in England; and it would no doubt have remained one of the greatest of English seaports if it had been as much favoured by nature as it was by good laws, and by the active spirit of its inhabitants.

The city of Chester continued to be the chief city and port of the north-western division of England during the whole of the



Plantagenet and Tudor periods, and would probably have continued to be so to the present time, if the river Dee had been as well suited to the navigation of large ships as the river Mersey. But this is not the case. We have already seen that the port of Chester produced an income to the crown of £90 a year (equal to more than £1000 of present money), at the time of the Domesday survey, in the year 1086. This rent continued to be paid to the crown down to the year 1377, the 1st of Richard II., when the yearly amount paid to the crown by Chester was reduced to the sum of £73 11s. 8*d.* (equal to about twelve times as much of modern money), owing to the shallowing of the river Dee. A few years later, in the reign of Henry VI., the rent of the city was again reduced, "because the port was destroyed by the sand of the sea." And again, in the reign of Edward IV., the king remitted the sum of £80, owing from the rent of Chester, "because of the charge of the walls, and that the river had become sandy, and merchandise was in decay." Still later, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the citizens of Chester were excused from paying towards a newly imposed tax, on the ground that the merchants, citizens, and inhabitants had "within the ten years last past, lost divers notable ships and vessels of the said city, and great quantities of their goods and merchandises, upon the sea, as well by pirates as by divers other misfortunes; and especially at the entries in and going out at the mouth of the said port, which had lately grown and become more dangerous." For this reason—namely, the gradual deterioration of the port—the trade and commerce of Chester were always somewhat checked in their progress, though they continued to be moderately prosperous, at least down to the reign of Queen Elizabeth.

The average nett receipt of the great customs at the principal outports of England from the 20th to the 25th Queen Elizabeth, that is, from the year 1578 to the year 1583, was as follows:—Chester, including Liverpool, £437 13s. 4½*d.*, of which £211 4s. 8*d.* was paid by Chester, and the rest by Liverpool; Exeter, £995 13s. 6½*d.*; Boston, £168 2s. 11½*d.*; Bridgewater, £87 5s. 11*d.*; Bristol, £901 17s. 2½*d.*; Gloucester, £47 13s.; Hull, £1515 18s. 2*d.*; Newcastle-on-Tyne, £229 8s. 3*d.*; Lynn, in Norfolk, £1661 15s. 10*d.*; Plymouth and Fowey, which are returned together, £281 17s. 11*d.*; Poole, Dorsetshire, £751 2s. 9*d.*; and Yarmouth, £1167 14s. 8*d.* The whole sum is wonderfully small, even after allowing for the omission of London, not amounting to more than £6195 3s. 7*d.*;

but this may be in some degree accounted for by the fact that England was then engaged in a desperate war with the Spanish monarchy, which was at that time the greatest naval power in the world. Subsequent to that war the customs revenue increased rapidly, and at the close of the reign of Queen Elizabeth produced about £50,000 a year. Down to that period, and for many years afterwards, the greater part of the trade of England was with the continent of Europe, and was carried on from the ports of Lynn and Yarmouth, in Norfolk, and from those of Hull and Boston, which, with London, were the outlets of the manufacturing districts of those days, as well as the most convenient places for intercourse with the Continent, especially with the great Flemish markets of Antwerp and Bruges, and subsequently with those of the Dutch republic.\*

*The Bishopric of Chester.*—The ancient city of Chester was made the see of a bishop by Henry VIII., in the 33rd year of his reign (1541). The bishop of Chester mentioned in the Domesday survey was in reality the bishop of Lichfield,† afterwards known as the bishop of Lichfield and Coventry. This diocese included the city of Chester, which for a short time was inhabited by the Norman bishops, who, immediately after the Conquest, found it safer to reside within the walls of fortified and garrisoned towns and cities than in the open country. But in quieter times the bishops of Lichfield returned to their ancient seats, which their predecessors had occupied from the time of the introduction of Christianity amongst the Anglo-Saxons of the kingdom of Mercia. The modern bishopric of Chester therefore dates from the reign of Henry VIII., and was founded on the ruins of the ancient monastery of St. Werburg.

The diocese of Chester, as described by Bishop Gastrell in his interesting and valuable account of the diocese, recently published by the Chetham Society, originally "contained all Cheshire and Lancashire; that part of Yorkshire which was formerly called Richmondshire, with some other parishes in that county; part of Cumberland next to Lancashire; part of Westmoreland belonging to the barony of Kendal; and some parishes in Flintshire and Denbighshire, in North Wales."‡ In more recent times two bishoprics,

\* Harleian Manuscript 306, Article 4.

† Camden's History of Queen Elizabeth, p. 416.

‡ *Notitia Cestriensis; or Historical Notices of the Diocese of Chester*, by the Right Rev. Francis Gastrell, D.D., Lord Bishop of Chester; now first printed from the original manuscript, with illustrative and explanatory notes by the Rev. F. R. Raines, M.A., F.S.A., rural dean, canon of Manchester, and incumbent of Milnrow. This work, which forms four parts, or two volumes, of the "Remains, Historical and Literary, connected with the Palatine Counties of Lancaster and Chester, published by the Chetham Society," is not only interesting as an

viz, those of Manchester and Ripon, have been formed out of portions of the bishopric of Chester, which was itself only a moderate portion of the original Mercian bishopric of Lichfield.

*The Cathedral of Chester.*—The cathedral of Chester was founded on the site of the monastery of St. Werburg, which with all the ancient privileges, liberties, and customs belonging to it, were granted to the dean and chapter or to the bishop. The cathedral was described by Pennant (1769) as an ancient structure of a rough external aspect, being built of a red friable stone, which has mouldered with the lapse of years, but the beauty of choir and the chapter-house attracts the notice of every traveller. After the lapse of another hundred years, this description is still truer than it was in the time of Pennant; but plans are now under discussion for restoring the cathedral to its pristine beauty, by the instrumentality of the ablest Gothic architects of the age. It is to be hoped they may be carried out with as much success as those of the interior, of which a very competent judge says, that the "dean (Anson) and chapter, in these costly reparations, have been guided by the spirit which animated ancient founders and benefactors. Religious feeling and correct taste are visible, as well as an accurate acquaintance with the history of the sacred structure in all its architectural details. There appears to be a laudable desire to preserve its primeval character, and at the same time to maintain its cathedral features.\*

The cathedral of Chester is peculiarly rich, and extremely interesting from the variety of styles which it displays, distinctly marking the different periods of their erection, and assigning to each century its portion of a building, commenced as early as the reign of William Rufus, and added to during succeeding ages, until it was scarcely completed by the alterations and additions for which it was indebted to the wealth and influence of Cardinal Wolsey. Of these varied portions not the least remarkable are those which remain of the Norman edifice. They are interesting from the very obscurity of their history; interesting from their character, their severe, simple, massive grandeur, alike indicative and illustrative of the age to which they belong, and which, if we were entirely at a loss for written

account of the ecclesiastical establishments of the two counties in the time of Bishop Gastrell, who held the bishopric of Chester from the year 1714 to his death, in the year 1725; but is rendered doubly valuable by the notes of the Rev. Canon Raines, the editor, which bring down the account of those establishments to the present time, besides supplying an immense amount of valuable information of every kind relative to all the parishes of the two counties.

\* The Rev. Canon Raines' Notes in *Notitia Cestriensis*, vol. i. p. 65.

authority, would tell us no less plainly the very era of their erection ; interesting from the perfect state of preservation in which, after the lapse of so many ages, we still find them, and from the obscurity in which they have some of them remained so long buried, known only by report to the antiquarian, and entirely hidden from public view.\*

The following particulars as to the more ancient part of this venerable building are from a paper read before the Archæological Society of Chester at one of its first meetings, by Mr. William Ayrton :—

“The remains which bear the appearance of earliest date are those in the north transept of the cathedral, on the east wall of which is part of a triforium, consisting of seven arches—four open, three blank. These arches are exactly semicircular, springing from very plain capitals and resting on plain cylindrical shafts, the bases of which are equally devoid of ornament and unpossessed of well-proportioned character. The capitals, plain as they are, have been further mutilated to agree with the subsequent facing of the wall. The proportions are :—

Width of each arch, . . . . .	2 feet 1 inch.
Length of shaft, . . . . .	3 “ 2 “
Length of pillar, including base and capital, . . . . .	5 “ 4 “
Height of arch from the spring . . . . .	1 “ 0½ “

Access to this triforium is at present obtained through an archway at the back of it, which corresponds in size and situation with the arch in front of it, and which appears to have been one of a double arcade, the remaining arches of which are now built up and hidden by plaster. On the opposite (the west) wall of the transept are three plain blank arches precisely similar, which are probably the remains of a corresponding triforium, the front arcade of which has been removed in reducing the thickness of the wall for a subsequent design. On the east side of the east wall of this transept, and forming part of the present vestry, is a Norman arch springing from the capitals, the mouldings of which are entirely lost in plaster, the shafts of the pillars being gone. This arch is very lofty and massive, being doubly recessed, the diameter of the outer arch being about nine feet, and the height to the centre of the arch from the present flooring about fifteen feet.

“We now come to a portion of the Norman edifice which has of

\* The Norman Remains of Chester Cathedral, by William Ayrton ; Journal of Architectural, Archæological, and Historical Society for the county, city, and neighbourhood of Chester, part i. p. 60.

late excited very great, and, perhaps, more than a proportionate interest ; I mean the so-called Promptuarium, lately excavated. This chamber is a sort of gallery, or cloister, on the ground floor, about ninety feet long by forty feet wide, traversed in the centre by a row of pillars (with one exception cylindrical), which divide it into six double bays, from which pillars, and from corresponding ones at each side, spring the intersecting arches by which the building is vaulted. I cannot pass by these pillars without calling your attention to their beautiful proportions, and their adaptation to the rude and ponderous roof which they support. They have been contrasted with similar pillars at Worcester and Canterbury ; we may now compare them with others in the same building of which they still form part. It is interesting to find so great a variety in the specimens of Norman architecture which we possess in Chester cathedral ; and the variety is more striking when we see drawings of the different specimens brought together and closely contrasted. The pillars of the triforium in the north transept are, like those in the crypt at Canterbury, rude and ill-proportioned ; the shafts, small ; the capitals, heavy and overloaded ; while those of the Norman vault are the very reverse, each pillar being really beautiful in itself, and still more so when considered with reference to the vaulted roof which it supports. The side pillars are entirely Norman in their character, as the centre ones, being simply the square pier, on each face of which is the pilaster attached. The groining of the roof is without the finish of ribs at the joints, a finish characteristic of a later period."

In the next vestige of Norman work which comes before us we find undoubted marks of a later era. This is a vaulted passage running across the south end of the "Secunda Aula," and leading from the abbot's apartments to the cathedral. It is groined in exactly the same proportions as the bays of the Norman chamber, and the arches are circular, springing from pillars precisely similar ; but the groining is ribbed, and not with cylindrical, but elliptical mouldings. These mouldings stamp a Semi-norman character on the work, being almost a transition to the early English style. Two beautiful Norman doorways gave ingress and egress from this passage, and still remain, though the one which opened to the present west cloister is sadly disfigured by the alterations of the sixteenth century. The doorway to the west is yet perfect, excepting the shafts of the pillars, which are gone. The capitals supporting one side of the architrave are foliated, and of late character of Norman work.

*Early Literature of Chester.*—Chester was the literary capital of the north-western district in early ages, and produced a historian, a dramatist, and a poet, whose works have come down to present times. The first of these was Ralph Higden, the author of the "Polychronicon," a history of nearly all nations, written in the Latin language, but translated into English by Sir John Trevisa, and forming one of the first works printed by Caxton in England; the second was Sir John Amery, a clergyman, and the author of the celebrated Chester Plays, founded on scriptural subjects, which were represented yearly at Chester, and formed the delight of the citizens and of strangers; the third was Henry Bradshaw, the author of a poem on the life and miracles of St. Werburg, the patron saint of Chester. These are all works of merit, according to the measure of the age in which they were written. The poem of Henry Bradshaw especially is very curious, both as a very early specimen of the English language and of English poetry, and as throwing light on the religious opinions which prevailed and were taught in England previous to the Reformation.

*Poem on the Life and Virtues of St. Werburg.*—Henry Bradshaw, Bradsha, or Braddshaa—for in all these ways is his name written by his contemporaries—was "a religious man," that is, an ecclesiastic, of whom Anthony Wood states that "he was born in the ancient city of Westchester, commonly called the city of Chester; and being much addicted to learning and religion when a youth, was received among the Benedictine monks of St. Werburgh's monastery in that city. Thence in riper years he was sent to Gloucester College, in the suburb of Oxford, whence, after he had passed his course in theology among the novices of his order, he returned to his cell at St. Werburge, and in his elder years wrote 'De Antiquitate et Magnificentia Urbis Cestriæ Chronicon,' and translated [paraphrased rather] from Latin into English a book which he thus entitled, 'The Life of the glorious Virgin St. Werburge: also many Miracles that God had showed from her. London, 1521. 4to.' He died in 1513 (5th Hen. VIII.), and was buried in his monastery, leaving then behind him other matters to posterity; but the subjects of which they treat I know not."<sup>\*</sup>

Henry Bradshaw, in the "prologue of the translatur," as he

\* The Holy Lyfe and History of Saynte Werburge, very Frutefull for all Christen People to Rede, edited by Edward Hawkins, Esq., and forming vol. 15 of "Remains, Historical and Literary, connected with the Palatine Counties of Lancaster and Chester," published by the Chetham Society, 1847.

modestly calls himself, states the work is founded on a Latin book "which remaineth in Chester monastery, named "The True Passionary," his object being to "follow the legend and true history, after a humble style, and little to vary." He commences, however, rather ambitiously as follows :—

"When Phebus had roune his cours in Sagittary,  
And Capricorn entered a sygne retrograt  
Amyddes Decembre, the ayre cold and frosty,  
And pale Lucyna the earth did illumynate,  
I rose up shortly, from my eubycle preparat,  
Abut mydnyght, and caste in myne intent  
How I myght spende the tyme convenent."

After much musing on the vanity of earthly pursuits, he resolves "some small treatise to write brevely, to the comyn vulgares their mynde to satisfy," and takes for his subject the life and virtues of St. Werburg, of whom he says :—

"In the abbey of Chestre she is shryned rychely,  
Pryores and Lady of that holy place,  
The chief protectrice of the sayd monastery  
Long before the Conquest, by devyne grace.  
Protectrice of the cytee, she is and ever was  
Called special prymate and principal presydent,  
There rulynge under our Lord Omnipotent."

The poet then proceeds to give a flattering account of the kingdom of Mercia (*Mercyens*), and of the bounds and commodytes of the same. He says :—

"The realme of Mercyens, by olde antyquyte,  
As playnly declareth Polychronicon,  
Three hundred yeres endured in auctoryte  
Under eighteen kings, worthy nomynyou,  
Greatest of gouvernance of all this region ;  
There Wulfer reigned, a king victorious,  
Father to Saynt Werburge, vyrgyn most glorious.

"All this royal realme holdeth, as we fynde,  
Habundance of fruytes, pleasant and profitable ;  
Great plenty of cornes and graynes of every kynde,  
With hills, valeys, pastures, comly and delectable.  
The soile and glebe is set plentuous and commendable  
In all pleasant purportes : no part of all this lande  
May be compared to this foresayd Merselande."

Our poet next proceeds to trace the lineage of the fair saint to innumerable kings and lords, and then comes to "a brief declaration of the holy lyfe and conversation of Saynt Werburge," of whom he says :—



"And as she encreased more and more in age,  
 A new plant of goodness in her did dayly sprynge.  
 Great grace and vertue were set in her ymage,  
 Whereof her father had much mervellynge.  
 Her mother mused of this ghostly thyng.  
 To behold so yonge and tender a may  
 From vertu to vertu to proceede every day.

"In beauty anyable, she was equal to Rachel:  
 Comparable to Sara in fyrrne fidelyte;  
 In sadness [thoughtfulness] and wisdom like to Abygaell;  
 Replete as Debora with grace of prophecy;  
 Equivalent to Ruth she was in humylyte;  
 In pulchrytude Rebecca; like Hester in Iolynesse;  
 Lyke Judith in vertue and proved holynesse."

With all these virtues and beauties, she had admirers innumerable, all of whom she refused, having made up her mind to a life of religion, and became a nun in the nunnery of Ely, under St. Audry, her abbess and cousin. After some time, her uncle, King Ethelred, "seeing the holy conversation of Werburge, his niece," made her lady and abbess of Weedon, in Northamptonshire, and afterwards of Trentham and Hanbury, which houses she is said to have governed with much judgment and humility. Here, however, the legend begins to give an account of her miraculous powers; and this forms the chief part of the remaining portion of the poem, which is devoted to an account of her miracles.

The first miracle of St. Werburg mentioned in these veracious pages is one which she is said to have worked on certain wild geese, at the time when she was abbess at Weedon, in Northamptonshire. The geese, it seems, were very troublesome and destructive on the lands, pastures, waters, and fields, devouring the corns and fruits. These winged delinquents she summoned before her, and they came when called, "dragging their wings," and entering the hall in "great confusion." There she kept them all night, and then set them free, on condition that they should none of them in future do any destruction "in the lordship of Weedon." On this they flew away rejoicing until they missed one of their number, who had not only been stolen by one of the servants, but also roasted and eaten. On hearing the clamour of the geese, and learning the cause, St. Werburg ordered the bare bones of the goose to be brought, "and then by the virtue of her benediction the bird was restored, and flew away full soon." Two other miracles wrought for her, if not by her, are also mentioned by the poet. These were in the younger days. In one case "a

wanton prince" put her into a great fright, running after and almost catching her, when, "to flee from the traitor" the quicker, she threw off her veil, which was caught on a sunbeam :—

"Which myracle sene, the prince fled away ;  
The virgin was preserved by grace that day."

Another miracle was performed at the village of Hoo, in Kent, when the fair saint was pestered by another lover, and again compelled to run away :—

"And as she fledde from this cruell persone,  
She ran for succour to a great oak tree.  
By grace the sayd tree opened that same season,  
Suffering this mayd to have sure and free entree,  
Thereby she escaped this wicked tyranny ;  
Which tree to this day enduring, at the yere  
By miracle is vernaunte, fresshe, grene, and clere"

After performing many other miracles, St. Werburg at length died ; but after her death miracles equally wonderful continued to be worked at her shrine. She died in the abbey of Trentham ; but the people of Hanbury by a pious fraud got possession of her remains, which continued to work wonders for them. Some hundred years later the pagan Danes invaded the land ; and then the holy men and women who had charge of St. Werburg's remains fled to the well-fortified city of Chester, where they were received with unbounded rejoicings, and where the miracles became more wonderful than ever. She soon became the patron saint of Chester and Cheshire, and was so regarded when Henry Bradshaw wrote this poem, about twenty years before the Reformation. The list of her miracles at Chester is much too long to be quoted ; but amongst those mentioned by Bradshaw are that she saved Chester from destruction by Welshmen ; she cured a woman who was halt and lame ; that she defended Chester from innumerable barbaric nations ; that she sent "fruit to a barren woman ;" that she made a woman blind for unlawfully working, and cured her on repentance ; that she brought to life a young man who had been unlawfully hanged by thieves ; that she restrained wild horses from devouring the crops in the manor of Upton ; that she restored to health a canon of Chester who had broken his leg ; that she raised the sands in the river Dee on the petition of William, constable of Chester, to make a way of retreat for the earl, who was surrounded by the Welsh ; that a great fire at Chester was stopped, by the shrine being carried about the city by the monks.

The poem concludes with an earnest entreaty to the inhabitants of the county palatine of Chester, praying them to remember these things, and to be kind to the monastery of St. Werburg:—

“O ye worthy nobles of the West partye,  
 Consider in your mind with hye discretion  
 The perfite goodness of this sweet ladye.  
 The mean Saynt Werburge, now at this season,  
 Which hath been your salfe and singular tuision,  
 And so ever will be: have this in your mynde  
 When you to her call with humble supplication,  
 Wherefore to the monasterye be never unkinde.”

*Military Events at Chester from A.D. 1064 to A.D. 1600.*—The city of Chester, being a military position of great strength, suffered severely from the ravages of war, during the stormy period between the Norman Conquest and the close of the great Civil War. At the time of the Conquest Chester was taken by storm by the Normans, after a long and obstinate siege, and nearly half the houses in the city were destroyed. During the wars with the Welsh, the English armies generally assembled at Chester, and more than once were driven back to the walls of that city by those brave descendants of the ancient Britons, who often fought their way to Chester, and even burnt the suburbs on the Welsh side of the river Dee. In the wars between Henry IV. and the barons, the barons obtained possession of Chester, and even after the city had been taken by the king, the castle was held for the barons by Luke de Taney, the warlike chief justice of Chester, for many weeks. It was at Chester that Bolingbroke, afterwards Henry IV., met the unfortunate king, Richard II., and it was there that the former put to death Sir Piers Legh, and other brave men who had maintained their fidelity to the unfortunate son of the Black Prince. A few years later Henry Hotspur, and many of the Northumberland party, marched through Chester, on their way to the fatal battle-field of Shrewsbury, and induced some of the citizens to follow them, and to share their fate. A few years later, when it became certain that a civil war was about to break out between the houses of York and Lancaster, Queen Margaret of Anjou visited Chester, and induced many gentlemen of the county, and citizens, to adopt the white swan, the emblem of the house of Lancaster, most of whom afterwards perished in the great defeat of the Lancasterian party, at the battle of Market-Drayton, on the borders of Cheshire. And on the occasion of the invasion of England by the Scottish armies, in the reign of

Henry VIII., the citizens of Chester sent sixty men to share in the perils of Flodden Field.

But of all the military events in which the citizens of Chester were engaged, the most memorable were those connected with the great Civil War. We have spoken of this extraordinary siege, which lasted for nearly three years, in a previous chapter, in which we have given a full account of the memorable events of that great contest; and it is only needful to repeat that no other city did or suffered so much for the royal cause as the ancient city of Chester. The city was left in ruins, and the inhabitants were almost reduced to penury in the course of the siege, yet as soon as the royal banner was raised by Sir George Booth, a few months before the Restoration, the royalists were again willingly received within the walls of Chester. This movement was somewhat premature, but it only anticipated the feelings of the nation by a few months, and fortunately did not bring any serious misfortunes on the brave old city, which from that time to this has enjoyed uninterrupted tranquillity. In a subsequent chapter of this work we shall bring down the history of Chester to modern times.

*The other Towns of Cheshire.*—In addition to the port and city of Chester, several other towns sprang up in the same county, in early ages, some of which obtained valuable charters from the earls of Chester or the kings of England. These towns were chiefly situate along the banks of the rivers Weaver, Mersey, Bollin, and Dane, the principal streams of the county of Chester.

The towns of NANTWICH, MIDDLEWICH, and NORTHWICH, which have already been spoken of as the seats of the salt manufacture of Cheshire, advanced steadily in prosperity, and attained to many times the amount of wealth and population which they had reached at the time of the Domesday survey. In the reign of Edward I. the rent paid to the crown and the earl of Chester from the salt works at Middlewich was £84; and from those of Northwich, £76; and their value continued to increase down to the Tudor period, when they were still in a very flourishing condition. We have described the old code of local laws prevalent at all the three Cheshire wyches—as the salt works were called—which were introduced in the Saxon times, and continued to exist under the Norman and Plantagenet rule. But it does not appear that either Northwich, Middlewich, or Nantwich had any other charters granted, either by the earls of Chester or by the crown.

We have accounts of the salt district of Cheshire, from the pens both of Leland and of Camden, the former describing the appearance and the industry of those towns in the reign of Henry VIII., and the latter describing them near the close of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Leland speaks of Northwich as "a pretty market town, but foul," that is, badly cleansed, which was a very common fault in those days. By the salters' houses he saw great stocks of small cloven wood, used to seethe or evaporate the salt water from which they make white salt.\* At Nantwich he says there were more than three hundred salters, or persons engaged in the production of salt; and there were canals or channels for distributing the salt water from the pits through the town. The water was boiled in furnaces of lead. Leland mentions that the last abbot of Combermere had made salt from the brine which flowed into the lake at Combermere.† Camden, in his description of the salt district says, that the river Weaver, after watering fertile fields, flowed through Nantwich, not far from Middlewich and Northwich. These are noble *salinæ*, distant five or six miles from each other. Thence the salt water is drawn from wells or pits, which they prepare, not after the manner of the ancient Gauls and Germans, by pouring the water on burning wood, but by boiling in pans, fire being placed under them. The whitest salt, he says, is prepared at Nantwich; the less white at Middlewich and Northwich. "I do not doubt," adds Camden, "that these *salinæ* were known to the Romans, and that a salt-tax was paid here. From Middlewich to Northwich there is a noble road, which is raised on gravel to such a height as enables you easily to see that it is a work of the Romans, especially as gravel is so scarce in this district. Matthew Paris states that Henry III. stopped up these saltworks when he laid waste this district, lest the Welsh, who were then in insurrection, should supply themselves with salt from these mines; but when quiet times brought back the rays of peace they were again opened."

About fifty years after the above was written, the whole of the salt region of Cheshire was involved in war. The three salt towns of Northwich, Middlewich, and Nantwich, were the strongholds of the parliamentary party in Cheshire. Several engagements between the royalist and the parliamentary armies took place at Northwich and Middlewich; and Nantwich, which was then the chief place in the salt districts, was strongly fortified by the parliamentary party, and was long besieged by the royalists. It was at Nantwich, as we have

\* Leland's Itinerary, vol. v. p. 92.

† Ibid. vol. v. p. 93.

already mentioned, that the great battle took place between the parliamentary army under Sir Thomas Fairfax, and the royalist army under the first Lord Byron, in which the royalists were overthrown and driven back within the walls of Chester. Nantwich, which abounds in brine, continued to be the chief place for the production of salt for a considerable time after the great Civil War ; but having no supplies of coal in those times, it lost the trade when the woods were exhausted, and when the lower part of the river Weaver was made navigable to Northwich and to Winsford, so as to bring up supplies of coal to those places from the Lancashire coal-fields.

The town of FRODSHAM, at the mouth of the river Weaver, was one of the outlets of the salt trade of Cheshire, in early times. It had a strong castle, and an ancient bridge across the river. Frodsham received charters from Ranulf de Blundeville, the great earl of Chester, in the years 1200 and 1228. By these charters an acre of land and a burgage right was granted to each burgess, at a yearly rent of 1s. ; but it was provided that the burgesses should not remove to any other places except such as were subject to the earls of Chester. A few years later, Edward, earl of Chester, afterwards King Edward I., granted the town and castle of Frodsham to David, brother to Llewellyn, the last king of North Wales who, however, soon forfeited it by joining in an insurrection against the English crown. Frodsham had an easy access to the salt district by the Weaver.

*The Origin and Early History of Birkenhead.*—The towns in the county of Chester, on the south bank of the river Mersey, were at that time few and small. BIRKENHEAD was then a priory, inhabited only by a few monks, and without even a village around it, so late as the reign of Henry VIII. But there was an ancient ferry across the river Mersey from Birkenhead to Liverpool, and the prior of Birkenhead obtained two charters, in the reign of Edward II., authorizing him to build houses for the accommodation of travellers desiring to cross the river. In the first of these charters the king concedes and gives license to the prior and convent of Birkenhead, that "they may cause to be built on their own ground at Birkenhead, near to the arm of the sea between Liverpool and Birkenhead, in any place where this may be done without injury to other parties, sufficient houses for receiving and entertaining travellers passing beyond the arm of the sea ; and that they and their successors may hold these houses for ever." In

the second charter, granted by Edward II., in the eleventh year of his reign (1318), the reasons for erecting these houses, for the accommodation of travellers, are set out more fully in the following recital of the charter :—" Know ye, that from the town of Liverpool, in the county of Lancaster, unto the Priory of Birkenhead, in the county of Chester, and from the said priory unto the aforesaid town, beyond the arm of the sea there, a common passage is used ; and on account of contrariety of weather and frequent storms, great numbers of persons wishing to cross there, from the said county of Chester, into the parts of Lancaster, being often hindered, it has hitherto been needful to turn aside to the said priory, by reason that at the passage aforesaid there are not any houses for lodging such persons, nor can any provisions be there found to be bought for the support of the said persons ; on account whereof the said priory hath hitherto been burdened beyond its means, and the said persons have been very much wearied and grieved. We, willing, in this behalf, to apply a remedy, of our especial grace have granted and given license, for us and our heirs, as much as in us lies, to our beloved in Christ, the prior and convent of Birkenhead, at the place of the passage aforesaid, or as near as shall most conveniently be done, to build sufficient houses for lodging such persons, and the same, being built, to hold to them and their successors, for ever ; and that the persons who shall dwell in the same houses may buy and sell provisions for the support of the men thereabout to cross the said arm of the sea, without the hinderance or impediment of us, or our heirs, justices, escheators, sheriffs, or other bailiffs or ministers whatsoever."

About thirty years later, in the 27th Edward III., 1354, the prior of Birkenhead was required, by a *quo warranto*, to prove by what right he had built the above-named houses ; on which occasion he produced these charters. He was then called upon to show what and what kind of profits he claimed in right of the ferry at Birkenhead, when it was stated that he claimed for a man and horse, laden or not laden, 2*d.*, equal to about 2*s.* of present money ; for a man on foot,  $\frac{1}{4}$ *d.*, equal to about 3*d.* of present money ; and on the market day at Liverpool, that is, on Saturday, for a man,  $\frac{1}{3}$ *d.*, equal to about 6*d.* present money ; or for a man and his baggage on market day, 1*d.*, equal to about 1*s.*

On the same trial of *quo warranto*, the prior of Birkenhead was put to the proof, of nearly all the rights which were claimed by



him, not only at Birkenhead but on the River Mersey, and throughout the whole of the hundred of Wirrall. These, as will be seen from the following copy of the pleadings, were numerous and manifold, including rights claimed by the priory on land and water in Bidston, Morton, Salghan, Tranemoll (Tranmere), Willaston, and throughout the forest of Wirrall. As valuable rights still exist, depending on the evidence furnished on this inquiry, and as it shows what was claimed by the priors of Birkenhead, we give the proceedings at length:—

“Pleadings in a plea of *quo warranto* (extracted from the Roll of Pleas of the county of Chester, of the 27th year of Edward III. (1354).—The prior of Birkenhead was summoned to answer the lord the earl concerning a plea: By what warrant he claims to dig turves and to have common of pasture in the townships (vills) of Budeston, Morton, and Salghan, for himself and his men and tenants, for all their cattle; and within the bounds of the manor of Claughton, to wit, from the boundary of the township (vill) of Oxton to the edge of the water of Mersee, on his own proper soil, to make all kinds of fisheries (fishing places); and on his said soil to receive all sorts of profits, except royal wreck; and to have small boats as well on his aforesaid part of the water of Mersee, as on his own proper soil, to wit, to fish, and to carry and receive all other profits beyond the said water, and all manner of lands, being in the peace of our lord the king for the time being; and that he and his men and tenants shall not be impleaded of any matter touching the forest, unless they be found in the manour: and that he and his men and tenants may be quit of receiving and feeding all manner of servants, except six foresters, without horse and without all other suit, when the time for feeding them shall come: and to have the ferry (passage) over the water of the Mersee for all things, and for that ferry (passage) on his own proper soil to erect and have sufficient houses, and that the men dwelling in those houses may have all sorts of victuals, and may buy and sell them without the hinderance of any one: and that he and his successors, and their men and tenants, may be quit of all suits at the hundred of Willaston: and that he and his successors may have their free court twice in the year, for the correcting of all their tenants, to wit, the assize of bread and beer, and all manner of forfeiture of bylagh, and to have furze and fern, and common of pasture for all their cattle in the township (vill) of Tranemoll (Tranmere) at all times of the year.

“And the aforesaid prior comes, and as to his first claim, to wit, to

dig turves and have common of pasture, he says, that in what respect soever he claims those liberties by name, it is nevertheless free tenement, and does not fall within the claim of a liberty; wherefore he has no need at present to show warrant thereof; therefore it was considered by the judges that the aforesaid prior, as to this, may go thence without day.<sup>o</sup> And as to the holding his free court, he says that he has divers tenants who owe suit to his court of Claughton, according as is granted of common right, wherefore it does not fall within the claim of liberties; therefore it was considered by the judges that the aforesaid prior, as to this, may go thereupon without day. And as to the assize of bread and beer, and all kind of forfeiture of bylagh, he disclaims it altogether in the same liberty; therefore let that liberty be taken into the hand of our lord the earl, so that the tenants of the same prior concerning the rest may be in attendance, at the turn of the sheriff in the hundred of Willaston (Wirrall) of our lord the earl. And the aforesaid prior as to this is in mercy. And as to this, that he claims alone to have fisheries from the boundary of the manor of Claughton as aforesaid; and as to this which he claims above, that he and his men and tenants may not be impleaded of anything touching the forest, unless found in the manour; and as to this, that he claims to have furze and fern and common of pasture in the township (vill) of Tranemoll, all those things touch the forest of our lord the earl in Wirhall, therefore let nothing be done thereupon at the present, but they are respited until, &c., pleas of the forest there. And as to the liberties of feeding servants, and so forth, he says that he has divers lands and tenements in Wirhall, and that the lord Ranulf, formerly earl of Chester, by his charter granted to all free men and tenants, and those having lands in that part, that they and their heirs for ever should be quit from receiving and feeding all servants, except six foresters only, without any horses, and without any other suit. And he brings here the charter which witnesseth the same: And as to the other liberty, to wit, the being quit of suit at the hundred of Willaston (Wirrall), he says that a certain Ranulf, formerly earl of Chester, by his charter granted to the prior of Birkenhead who then was, and to the monks there, that they and their free men should be free and quit of suit at the hundred aforesaid, and of 8*l.* which to the sheriff of the same hundred they were used to pay. And he brings here the charter which witnesseth this same, and by that warrant he claims that liberty, to wit, for himself

<sup>o</sup> Without any day being fixed to inquire into the matter.

and his men, to wit, his tenants at will, &c. And as to the aforesaid ferry (passage) and the building of houses to be made at the place of the ferry (passage), he says that the Lord Edward, formerly king of England, the father of our lord the now king, by his letters patent, granted and gave license, for himself and his heirs, to the prior of Birkenhead who then was, (he being the) predecessor of the new prior, and to the convent of the same place, that they, in their own grounds at Birkenhead, at the place of the ferry (passage) from the town of Liverpool, in the county of Lancaster, to the priory of Birkenhead in the county of Chester, and from the same priory even unto the aforesaid town, across the arm of the sea (which ferry, indeed, was before that held common), or near to the same ferry accordingly as might more conveniently be done, they might build sufficient houses for such entertaining, and might hold the houses so constructed; and that men abiding in those houses might buy victuals for the support of people about to pass over that place, and might sell the same without any let of him our lord the king, or his heirs, or any other persons whatsoever, which letters patent, indeed, our lord the king now inspecting, has ratified and confirmed the same by his letters patent. And moreover he granted to the same prior and convent then being, that they and their successors should for ever have in that place a ferry over the said arm of the sea, as well for men as for horses, and other and whatsoever things; and receive for that (passage) according as might reasonably be done. And he brings here the letters patent of our aforesaid lord the now king, which testify the premises, the date of which is at Wodestock, the 13th day of April, in the fourth year of his reign. And by that warrant he claims that liberty. And William Braas, who sues for our lord the earl, prays that the aforesaid prior may show and declare to the court, &c., what and what kind of profits he claims by virtue of the aforesaid ferry. Who says that he claims for a man and horse, laden and not laden,  $2d.$ ; and for a man on foot,  $\frac{1}{4}d.$ ; and on the market day at Liverpool, to wit on Saturday, for a man,  $\frac{1}{2}d.$ ; and for a man and his baggage on market day,  $1d.$  And the aforesaid William Braas, says that the aforesaid prior has taken the aforesaid profits in excess and after another mode than by right he ought to do, and this he prays may be inquired of by the country. And the aforesaid prior doth the like. Therefore it is commanded to the sheriff that he cause to come hither the next common twelve (jurors), &c., by whom, &c., To inquire, &c."

At the time of the Reformation the Priory of Birkenhead shared the common lot, and was suppressed, along with the smaller monastic houses. In the year 1545, all the property and rights which the priors had held for about four hundred years passed by grant of the king into the hands of Ralph Worsley, of Worsley in Lancashire, page of the wardrobe and groom of the chamber "of the unconquered chief," Henry VIII., and afterwards keeper of the lions, lionesses, and leopards in the Tower. This grant included the site of the late Priory of Birkenhead, with the church, belfry, and churchyard of the same; all the house, edifices, mills, barns, and stables, within or nigh the precincts of the same; a messuage or tenement in the possession of Robert Molyneux; one dove-house, one mill, and all the fish yards, with two acres of meadow, seventy acres of arable land, and one parcel of land, where flax was used to be grown; the ferry, the ferry-house, the boat called "Ferribot," and the profit of the same; situate and being in Birkenhead, and Bidston, and Kirby Whalley, otherwise Wallasey; together with all the lands and rights belonging to the said priory, in the townships, parishes, or hamlets of Birkenhead, Claughton, Wolton, Tranmere, Bidston, and Kirby Whalley. At the time when the priory was granted to Ralph Worsley it produced a clear yearly rental of £115 13s. 5d. After passing through various hands, it came into possession of Francis Richard Price, Esq., in whom the manor of Birkenhead, and the rights which formerly belonged to the prior, were long vested. The monks at Birkenhead had a granary in Water Street, Liverpool, which produced a rent of 4s. 2d. at the time when the priory was suppressed. That was the only property which they possessed in Liverpool.

The town of RUNCORN, higher up the river Mersey, is also an ancient ferry from Cheshire to Lancashire, standing at a place where the river narrows, so as to afford a convenient shelter for vessels passing up and down the stream. It was at Runcorn that a strong castle was built by Ethelfleda, the daughter of Alfred the Great, to command the entrance of the river. A small town sprung up on the Cheshire side, under the protection of the castle, which had some trade even in early times, though less than might have been expected, owing to the winding course of the stream above the town, and the numerous shallows and sand-banks between Runcorn and Warrington. In modern times Runcorn has become the terminus of a great system of inland navigation, and the site of a magnificent railway bridge across the river Mersey.

Still higher up the river Mersey there was a ford from LATCHFORD to Warrington, at the point where the old Roman road crossed the river, and where the principal bridge between Lancashire and Cheshire was afterwards built. Ascending the river, at Thelwall, there was in Saxon times an ancient borough, which was repaired and fortified in the time of Edward the Elder, the son and successor of Alfred the Great, but which afterwards declined to a mere village. Still higher up the stream there was a Saxon castle, at WARBURTON, which commanded the ferry across the Mersey at Holinfare. And higher still was the ferry at Stretford, where the Roman road from Chester to Manchester crossed the Mersey, and where a wooden bridge was erected, either in the Plantagenet or Tudor times. A little to the south of this bridge the town of Altringham grew up in the time of the Saxon kings.

STOCKPORT, still higher up the Mersey, is the only town on the Cheshire side of that stream (except Halton and Altringham) that has possessed a charter from early times. This charter was granted by Sir Robert de Stockport, baron of Stockport in the reign of Edward I. By this charter Stockport was made a free borough, and it was provided that each burgess should have a perch of land to his house, and an acre to his field, and should pay yearly for it the sum of 1s., equal to about 15s. of modern money. The town passed to the Warrens by the marriage of the heiress of the Stockport family with one of the Warrens, since of Poynton, about the reign of Henry IV. Sir Robert de Stockport also obtained for Stockport, from Edward I., a fair of seven days at the festival of St. Wilfrid, and a market on Fridays. Stockport was one of the two chief entrances into Cheshire from the north, and into Lancashire from the south, in early times; Warrington being the other. The main roads from north to south ran through those two places, both of which were strong military positions; Stockport being built on the site of an ancient Saxon stoccade, or fortress of timber, which guarded this passage across the river. It was at Stockport that Prince Rupert crossed the Mersey on his march into Lancashire, in 1644, after having taken the town by storm and made the garrison prisoners.\* The rivers Mersey and Tame meeting at Stockport, and the rich coal-fields of Poynton, gave an early impulse to the industry of Stockport.

MACCLESFIELD, built at the entrance of a pass in the hills which divide Cheshire from Derbyshire, amidst numerous streams, and near

\* Ormerod's Cheshire, vol. i. p. 640.

to the coal-fields of Cheshire, was made a free borough by the great Ranulf de Blundeville, earl of Chester, in the reign of Henry III. In this earliest charter it was provided that the borough should consist of 120 burgesses; and the yearly rent to be paid for each burgauge was 1s., equal to 15s. of present money. In the 45th Edward III., his son the Black Prince, as earl of Chester, granted various privileges to the burgesses of Macclesfield; and the king; his father, granted to his burgesses of Macclesfield that Macclesfield should be a free borough, and that his burgesses there might have a guild mercatory, with all the liberties and free customs to that guild belonging; and that they should be quit throughout all Cheshire, as well by water as land, of toll, passage, pontage, stallage, lastage, and all other customs (excepting salt in the wyches); and that they might have pasture, and housebote, and boybote in the forest of Macclesfield.<sup>o</sup> After the battle of Bosworth Field, the burgesses of Macclesfield, who had followed the Stanleys to that great and destructive fight, were so much reduced in numbers that they could not find men to fill the offices of the borough.

CONGLETON, on the river Dane, near both to the Cheshire and the Staffordshire coal-fields, obtained a charter making it a free borough from Henry de Lacy, earl of Lincoln and constable of Chester. Camden speaks of Congleton as the *Condote of the Romans*; but the positions of the two places do not correspond, and Kinderton, near Middlewich, is now generally supposed to be the *Condote of the Romans*.

*The Boroughs of Lancashire from the Norman Conquest to the Restoration.*—We now proceed to give a summary of the history of the boroughs of Lancashire from the Norman conquest to the Restoration.

*The Borough of Lancaster in Early Times.*—We have already described Lancaster as it was under the Romans, whose remains are continually discovered in and around this ancient Roman station. Lancaster does not appear ever to have become extinct during the long period of war and strife which intervened between the retirement of the Romans and the appearance of the Normans on the banks of the Lune. The parish church of St. Mary's existed previous to the Conquest, standing by the side of the ancient castle, constructed on the site of the Roman fortifications, and probably built with the materials of which they were originally formed. One of the great Roman roads, which we have described in a previous

\* Ormerod's Cheshire, vol. iii. p. 365.

chapter, crossed the river Lune at Lancaster, originally by a ford, afterwards by a bridge, and rendered it a natural resting-place on the great line of communication from the north to the south. Whatever trade existed in this part of the kingdom naturally collected at Lancaster, which is not only the port of the rich valley of the Lune, but also of the valley of the Ken, in which the woollen manufacture was established at a very early age, at Kendal and the surrounding villages. For many ages there was a great trade carried on, chiefly by means of packhorses, from Kendal through Lancaster and southward to Preston, Wigan, and Manchester. In addition to this, numerous well-endowed religious houses were erected in and around Lancaster by the early lords of the honour of Lancaster, who occasionally resided in the stately castle of Lancaster. This castle itself, built in a strong position on a lofty hill, and commanding the principal passage across the river Lune, was the principal fortress, along that part of the northern frontier of England, which lay nearest to the earldom of Cumberland, long claimed by the kings of Scotland as a fief of the Scottish crown. For many ages it was one of the most important military positions in the kingdom, and can seldom have been left without a garrison. When the earls and dukes of Lancaster afterwards became almost as powerful as the kings of England, they added to the strength of the castle and town from which they took their chief title, and no doubt visited it pretty frequently, to keep up their power and influence in the most warlike portion of their possessions.

A number of religious houses were founded at Lancaster in early times, chiefly by Norman lords of the honour of Lancaster, which must have had some effect in increasing the resident population and the wealth of the town, although a portion of the revenues of the most important of these houses was for a time applied to foreign purposes. Soon after the Norman Conquest a priory was formed at Lancaster by Roger Pictavensis, the first Norman lord of the honour of Lancaster. This priory was merely what was called a cell or dependency of the great Norman abbey of Saint Martin de Sees, founded by the father and mother of Earl Roger, and which he enriched with numerous grants in the county of Lancaster, as well as on his estates in other parts of England. But the priory of Lancaster represented the abbey of Saint Martin de Sees in England, and shared a portion of its wealth. The charter by which the grants in Lancashire were made, set forth that Earl Roger Pictavensis—for the safety



of his own soul and that of his father, Roger, earl of Shrewsbury; of his mother, the Countess Mabilla; of his brothers and of all his friends—had given to God and to Saint Martin the church of the Holy Mary of Lancaster, and all things pertaining to it, and a part of the land of that town, from the ancient wall to the inclosure of Godfrey and also to the Priestgate; and near to Lancaster, the two manors of Aldcliffe and Newton, and whatever pertained to them, with the wood to Frithbrook, with the honours and lordship which he (Earl Roger) and Arnulf de Montgomery, his brother, there had. He also gave to the same abbey the church of Heysham, with the churches of Cotgrave, of Cropal, Crofton, Eccleston, and Preston, with the tithes of his demesne lands, and two bovates of land, with the tithes of the parish and the church of Kirkham and Melling, and of Bolton on the Sands, and other tithes. He also gave to the same abbey, Bolton, with its church and all pertaining to it, with the tithe of the forests and of the grazing of his woods. In addition to this he gave to the same church the tithes of foals, of calves, of lambs, of kids, of swine, of cheese, and of butter, in Salford (West), Derby, Hale, Everton, Walton, Crosby, Meols, Crofton, Preston, Ribby, Singleton, Pressure, Middleton, Overton, Caton, Bare, and Stapleton. He granted also that any of his tenants might make grants to the priory of Lancaster, even to the extent of half their estates. In consequence of this permission Godfrey, the vice-comes, gave to it the tithes of Bispham, and whatever he had in the town of Lancaster; and Radolf Gernet gave three men, that is to say, serfs, in Suffolk. The witnesses to this grant were the said earl and his daughter Sibilla, Godfrey the vice-comes, Albert Grellet, or Gresley, and the son of Robert, G. Boiseuil and his brother, and G. de Villeres, Ranmard the son of Chetel, Ulf the son of Torolf, and Ranachill the son of Raynhald.\*

John, earl of Morton, afterwards King John, confirmed the above grants of Roger Pictavensis and Godfrid the vice-comes, made to Saint Martin de Sees and to the church of Saint Mary at Lancaster. The deed of confirmation mentions two manors, viz., Aldcliffe and Newton. The boundaries of the latter were perambulated before Earl John, and are thus described:—"From that rivulet which flows between my town of Lancaster and the Hospital of Lepers of St. Leonard, descending to the Lune and to the rivulet of Frithbrook, which forms the division between my forest and the wood of Newton,

\* Dugdale's Monasticon, the Priory of Lancaster.

which Roger Pictavensis gave to the church of Saint Mary at Lancaster, and granted with all the liberties and free customs which he had in his land." These and many other possessions were held by the abbey of Saint Martin de Sees until the reign of Henry V., when the alien priories were converted into English foundations. Amongst these was the priory of Lancaster, which was vested in trustees, to be held in trust for the abbey of Sion, in Middlesex, founded by King Henry V. It belonged to the abbey of Sion down to the time of the Reformation.\*

Another of the religious houses of Lancaster was the Dominican priory, situate at a place known as the Priory. This priory was formed about the year 1269, when we first hear of the prior of this establishment. It continued in existence to the time of the Reformation. The prior and friars of Lancaster are mentioned in the 4th of Edward II. In the year 1513, Bryan Tunstal, of Thurland castle, by his last will left to the friars of Lancaster £40, beseeching them to sing for his soul, and all Christian souls, a hundred masses. In the year 1523 Edward Stanley, Lord Monteagle, knight of the order of the Garter, by his last will and testament left 20*s.* to Master Richard Beverley, prior of the black friars of Lancaster, to preach a sermon on the day of his burial. Leland, whose "Itinerary" was written in the reign of Henry VIII., says "The old town of Lancaster, as they say there, is almost all burned, and stood partly beyond the Black Friars." The last prior of this house was Galfrid Hesketh, who held that office in 1533, when the house was suppressed by Henry VIII. †

St. Leonard's hospital was founded either before the reign of King John, or by King John himself, and consisted of a master, a chaplain, and nine persons, of whom three were to be lepers. What renders it probable that this hospital was founded by King John, is the fact that members of the hospital were allowed in the following reign to have pasture for their cattle, wood for their fires, and timber for their buildings, in the king's forest at Lonsdale. In the 17th Edward II., 1324, an inquisition was taken respecting the lands of this hospital in Lancaster, Skerton, and Wyresdale, which were valued at £6 6*s.* 8*d.*, equal to twelve or fifteen times as much of modern money. The finding in this inquiry was "that John, king of England, founded the hospital for one master, a chaplain, and nine poor men, of whom three shall be lepers and the rest healthy; that each of them was to

\* Dugdale's Monasticon

† *Ibid.*

have daily one loaf, which should weigh the eighth of a stone—one pound twelve ounces—and have pottage three days a week, Sunday, Monday, and Friday." In the year 1357, Henry, duke of Lancaster, annexed this hospital to the nunnery of Seaton, in Cumberland.

There was formerly also a Franciscan convent of grey friars at Lancaster, near the bridge, but very few particulars respecting it have been preserved.

Another foundation mixing religion with charity was that of Gardyner's almshouses, founded by John Gardyner, a prosperous miller of Lancaster, in the year 1485. In addition to a chantry and an almshouse, John Gardyner founded a grammar-school at Lancaster. With regard to this school, he says in his will dated the 21st June, 1472, "I will have a certain grammar-school within the town of Lancaster, upheld and maintained at my own proper expenses, and that the grammarian keeping the said school have yearly six marks"—equal to about £60 of present money—"to be paid out of the said mill, by the hands of my executors; and that William Baxterden shall keep the said school during his life, to wit, so long as he the said William can teach and instruct boys."

Lancaster was made the head of the county of Lancaster, and the place for holding the assizes in the reign of King Henry II., the first king of the Plantagenet line. In that reign, about the year 1176, the whole kingdom was divided into iters or circuits for the administration of justice, and judges were sent throughout the kingdom for the administration of justice. We find in an ancient MS., at the office of the duchy of Lancaster, the following memorandum, on the circumstances which attended the converting of the castle of Lancaster into a place of justice for the county of Lancaster:—"England, in King Stephen's time, was constantly in troubles, and no laws executed, but each man lived by plunder and violence. After his death, King Henry II., coming to the throne peacefully, had the laws put in better execution, and arranged that justices itinerant should see the same performed in each county, which before were only to be had at the king's court in London: and, whereas, Gilbert, the baron of Kendal, being his receiver for the county of Lancaster, was called Gilbert de Furnesis (or of Furness), William, the son of the said Gilbert, was constituted *senescalus* (steward), *hospitii regis*, and a baron in Lancashire, and thereupon, by consent of Parliament, called himself William de Lancaster; and Warine, his younger son (Lancaster castle being a prison for malefactors), was made keeper of the castle and

prison, and as a *magister serviens* had his maintenance therein, and for the reward of his services had given him by the king the towns of Aynoldsdale, Ravensmeols, Liverpool, Litherland, and French-lee, from which his son was called Henry de Lee, to whom King John afterwards, in lieu of his surrender of Liverpool, which he forthwith made a borough, confirmed the rest of the aforesaid towns, and also added English Lee to the same."

Lancaster received its earliest charter from John, earl of Morton, and lord of the honour of Lancaster, youngest son of Henry II., and brother of Richard I., some years before he ascended the throne as King John. This charter is supposed to have been granted about the year 1189. It conceded to the burgesses of Lancaster very valuable and extensive rights of local government and trade. At the time when John, earl of Morton, granted this charter to Lancaster, he was lord of the great commercial city of Bristol, in right of his earldom of Gloucester, and he conferred on the burgesses of Lancaster all the liberties and the customs which he had previously conferred on the burgesses of Bristol as part of that earldom. Amongst the rights granted to the burgesses of Lancaster by this charter the following were the most important:—That they should not be answerable to any court beyond the walls of the town, except in pleas relating to foreign tenures; that they should be free from the numerous dues and taxes known by the names of tolls, lastage, and pontage, and from all other customs throughout the whole land and power of the earl; that they should have all their reasonable guilds or trading rights as fully as they were enjoyed by the citizens of Bristol; and that they should have and possess all void or vacant grounds and places within the boundaries of the borough to be built on at their pleasure. These were amongst the principal liberties and privileges granted to the burgesses of Lancaster by Earl John in his first charter; but it was not in his power, as earl of Morton, to grant to the burgesses of Lancaster freedom from tolls and charges in the royal boroughs throughout the kingdom. But when he ascended the throne in the year 1199, King John abrogated his charter founded on that of Bristol, and granted to the burgesses of Lancaster all the rights and privileges enjoyed by the burgesses of Northampton, and subsequently the still wider rights enjoyed by the citizens of London. The most important of the liberties claimed under the charter granted by King John, after he ascended the throne, were exemption from tolls throughout the whole of England and the

ports of the sea, a court for enforcing the payment of all debts contracted at Lancaster, and the power to choose a mayor or bailiff yearly to preside over the local government of the town.”\*

*Charter of Bristol afterwards granted to Lancaster.*—The charter by which King John, while earl of Morton, conferred upon “his burgesses of Lancaster” the liberties of Bristol, is as follows :—

“John, earl of Moreton, to all his men and friends of France and England, Wales and Ireland, present and future, sends health. Know ye that I have granted, and by this present charter have confirmed to my burgesses of Bristol (and Lancaster), dwelling within the walls and without, as far as the boundary of the town, all their liberties and free customs, as well, freely and completely (or more so), as they ever had them in any time, or in the time of my predecessors. The liberties they granted them are these—viz., that no burgess of Bristol (or Lancaster) shall plead or be impleaded out of the walls of the town in any plea, except pleas relating to foreign tenures, which do not belong to the hundred of the town; and that they shall be quit of murder within the bounds of the town; and that no burgess shall wage duel, unless he shall have been appealed, for the death of any stranger who was killed in the town and did not belong to it.

“And that no one shall take an inn within the walls by assignment, or by livery of the marshal, against the will of the burgesses; and they shall be quit of toll and lastage, and pontage, and of all other customs throughout my whole land and power; and no one shall be condemned in a matter of money, unless according to the law of the hundred—viz., by forfeiture of 40s.; and that the said hundred court shall be held only once a week; and that no one, in any plea, shall be able to argue his cause in miskenning; and that they may lawfully have their lands, and tenures, and mortgages, and debts, throughout my whole land, whoever owes them anything; and that with respect to the lands and tenures which are within the town, they shall be held by them duly, according to the custom of the town; and that with regard to debts which have been lent in Bristol (and Lancaster), and mortgages there made, pleas shall be held in the town according to this custom of the town; and that if any one in any other place in my land shall take toll of the men of Bristol, if he shall not restore it after he shall be required, the mayor of Bristol shall take from him a distress at Bristol, and force him to restore it; and that no stranger tradesman shall buy within the town, of a man who is a stranger, leather, corn, or wool, but only of the burgesses; and that no stranger shall have a wine shop, unless in a ship, nor sell cloth for cutting, except at a fair; and that no stranger shall remain in the town with his goods, for the purpose of selling, but for forty days; and that no burgess shall be confined or distrained anywhere else within my lands or power for any debt, unless he be debtor or surety; and that they shall be able to marry themselves, their sons, their daughters, and their widows, without license of their lords; and that no one of their lords shall have the wardship, or the disposal of their sons and daughters, on account of the lands out of the town, but only the wardship of their tenements which belong to their own fee, until they be of age, and that then shall be no recognition in the town; and that no one shall take tye in the town, unless for the use of the lord-earl, and that according to the custom of the town: and that they may grind their corn wherever they shall choose; and that they may have all their reasonable guilds as well or better than they had them in the time of Robert and his son William, earls of Gloucester; and that no burgess shall be compelled to bail any man, unless he himself chooses it, although he be dwelling on his land. We also have granted to them all their tenures within the walls and without, as is aforesaid, in messuages, in copses, in buildings, on the waters, and elsewhere, wherever they shall be in the town, to be held in free burgage—namely, by landgable service, which they shall pay within the walls. We have also granted that any of them may make improvements as much as they can in erecting buildings anywhere on the bank and elsewhere, so it is without

\* *History and Antiquities of the town of Lancaster*, by the Rev. Robert Simpson, M. A. p. 268.

damage of the borough and town ; and that they shall have and possess all void grounds and places which are contained within the aforesaid boundaries, to be built on at their pleasure. Wherefore I will, and firmly enjoin, that my burgesses aforesaid, and their heirs, shall have and hold all their aforesaid liberties and free customs, as is written above of me and my heirs, as well and as completely (or more so) as ever they had them in former times, well and peaceably and honourably, without any hinderance or molestation which any one may offer them on that account. Witness, &c."

A confirmation of the charter of John was granted by Henry III. in the thirty-sixth year of his reign, in 1252, in which is a recital of all these grants, and in some passages one charter may serve to explain the other. The frequent confirmation of charters, from *Magna Charta* to that of the most insignificant borough, was occasioned by a doubt, whether the reigning monarch was bound by the acts of his predecessor.

In the reign of King Edward I. the burgesses of Lancaster, like those of Liverpool and Preston, had to defend the rights conceded to them under their charters, against the crown. In the 20th Edward I. *quo warrantos* were issued by the crown, and were tried at Lancaster, by which the bailiffs and commonalty of that town were summoned to show by what right they claimed exemption from the payment of toll, stallage, and lastage to the crown throughout all the king's cities and ports in England, as well as freedom from the jurisdiction of the crown in the trial of suits in the hundred and county ; and also by what right they claimed to have a free borough, to hold markets and fairs, to make the assize of bread and beer, to try prisoners charged with theft within the borough, and to inflict the punishments of the pillory, the tumbrel, and the gallows on prisoners convicted within the borough of Lancaster. All the payments from which the burgesses claimed exemption under their charters, and all the pecuniary penalties which those charters authorized them to inflict, originally formed part of the rights of the crown, and furnished considerable sums towards the royal revenue ; hence, whenever the kings of England found themselves in difficulties about money, they began to hold commissions of inquiry, known by the then familiar name of *quo warrantos*, as to the title by which other parties than the crown held those rights. In general this was merely a method of extorting money, for the renewal or continuance of the rights ; and this was the result of most of the numerous *quo warrantos* tried in Lancashire in the 20th Edward I. The real object was to extort money, wherever it could be obtained, and whatever was proved before the judges appointed to make these inquiries. In the case of the burgesses of Lancaster,

Lambert, the bailiff of the borough (for up to that time the burgesses do not seem to have elected a mayor), appeared with Thomas de Lancaster, Robert de Chatterton, and William le Chanteur on behalf of the commonalty of the borough, and produced the charter granted by King John, the grandfather of King Edward I., by which he granted and confirmed to his burgesses of Lancaster, all the liberties which the king's burgesses of Northampton possessed at the time of the death of King Henry II. and Richard I., in place of the liberties of the city of Bristol, which John had granted to the burgesses of Lancaster when he was earl of Morton. In addition to this, Lambert the bailiff, and his associates, claimed for the burgesses of Lancaster freedom from the obligation to grind their corn at the king's mill, and from all other servile customs. They also claimed that the cattle of the burgesses might pasture in the king's forest, as the king's cattle were accustomed to do; and that the burgesses might, under inspection of the king's forester, have dead wood from the forest for burning, and as much timber as was necessary for building and repairing their houses. The bailiff also produced the charter by which they were authorized to have a free borough with a market every week, on Saturday, and a fair every year, commencing on the eve of St. Michael, and lasting for eleven days. In reply to the case set up by Lambert, William Inge, who was retained for the crown, contended that the above charters did not confer the rights claimed by the burgesses, and succeeded in obtaining a verdict, to the effect that the said liberties belonged to the king, and were worth sixteen and a half marks per annum, equal to about £160 of modern money, which the sheriff was commanded to raise, and the burgesses were ordered to pay within three weeks. It appears from the report of this case that three weeks afterwards the burgesses of Lancaster paid at Appleby, by the hands of their attorneys, William le Chanteur and Lancelot de Bulke, the said sum of sixteen and a half marks, whereupon the aforesaid liberties were granted to them by the king, the grant being enrolled at Westminster.\*

In the above proceedings the governing body and the burgesses of Lancaster are described as the bailiff and community of the borough of Lancaster; but soon after that time the chief officer of the borough assumed the title of mayor, having under him one or two bailiffs, and being assisted by a town council consisting of twelve of the principal

\* *Placita de Quo Warranto et Rageman coram Hugene de Cressingham et sociis suis Justic. Itinerant apud Lancast. in 8 bis soc. Trinitatis, Anno Regis Edwardi, fil. Henrici, Viceimo.*



burgesses, and occasionally by a more extended council consisting of forty of the burgesses. We have a full account of the government of the borough in the reign of Edward III., in the year 1362, being the thirty-sixth year of the reign of that monarch, in certain constitutions and orders, entitled "The old constitutions and orders used in the town of Lancaster, examined and ratified the thirty-sixth year of the reign of King Edward III." These constitutions and orders are 142 in number, and include all the principal laws and by-laws of the borough.

It appears from these constitutions and orders, that the courts of the town of Lancaster were held every week, on the Thursday, and that there were two head courts held half yearly, the first on the Thursday next after the feast of Saint Luke the Evangelist, and the other on the Thursday next after Low Sunday. At these head courts all the burgesses of the town were required to be present, under penalty of a fine of 6*d.*, equal to from 6*s.* to 8*s.* of modern money. At the first head court held on the Thursday next after the feast of Saint Luke the Evangelist, the mayor was chosen, always provided there were no strangers present. It is stated in the orders and constitutions that much inconvenience had arisen from the presence of strangers at the election, and hence it was provided that no stranger, "that is, no unsworn and foreign burgess," should be in the court at the time of choosing the mayor and bailiffs, "because of great debate and strife that has happened amongst us, through maintenance of such strangers being in our court the day of the choosing." Apparently the object of this arrangement was to exclude certain classes of burgesses, and to place the power of choosing the mayor in the hands of a select body of the principal burgesses. It was therefore provided that if any stranger or foreigner was in the court, and would not go forth, "or the mayor and bailiffs peradventure dare not put him out," then the election was to be postponed to another day, to be appointed by the twelve principal burgesses, who formed the counsel or advisers of the mayor. On the day appointed these twelve burgesses met and nominated such persons as they thought fit to be mayor or bailiffs, and their choice was to be confirmed by forty of the principal burgesses elected by the twelve. And then the mayor was to be chosen by those forty, and the voice of them that shall be put forth (proposed), or the more part of them, provided always "that no one shall be chosen to be mayor except he was bailiff before, of the said town, or else mayor before;" and that all burgesses shall give their voices "privily and

secretly, every one by himself, upon his new oath, without fraud, favour, or counsel, to him that is most able and discreet that he knoweth, that can best order and rule the town and maintain the franchises, liberties, and duties appertaining to the same town." It was further provided "that after the mayor was chosen, twelve of the best of those that are put forth (proposed) of the forty shall choose one bailiff, and the rest of the said forty shall choose another bailiff, with the assent of the residue of the commonalty there being." With regard to the council of twelve, it was provided that "at the first court following after the election of the mayor and bailiffs, the twelve shall be chosen after this manner; that is to say, the mayor shall choose three, or four at the most, of them that were of the office of the twelve the year before, and which be in the court that day; and he shall make them swear to choose them other of their neighbours, being burgesses, most able, discreet, and agreeable, to the number of twelve, to serve in the office of twelve the year following." The above seems to be a very complete plan for excluding all the burgesses except a small number, consisting of the mayor and bailiffs, the twelve who were nominated by them, and the forty who were occasionally nominated by the twelve to elect the mayor. Everything appears to have been done privately, in order to carry out this plan the more effectually.

With regard to the duties of the mayor, it was provided that the mayor and bailiffs should prove or try bread and ale once a month, at least, in order to ascertain whether the bread was of the weight required by law, and the ale of the proper quality. The bailiffs were to receive the passage and through tolls, as also the market tolls, by themselves or servants. Neither the mayor nor any of the bailiffs was to give any reward for the town to any bear-wardens or minstrels without the consent of four of the head burgesses and four of the commons, under forfeiture of 6s. 8d. The bailiffs were to give banquets at Shrovetide and Easter, the same to be allowed in their accounts; but neither the mayor nor the bailiffs was to give wine or victuals to any other person, without the assent of the twelve head burgesses; and any expenditure of this kind was not to be allowed by the auditors in their accounts. The bailiffs were to furnish stallage or stalls to artificers, merchants, and victuallers, at the market on Saturday, charging only one penny, which, however, at that time, was equal to about one shilling of modern money.

With regard to the burgesses, it was provided, that no one should

be made a burgess in the town of Lancaster, except he had dwelt there for the space of one whole year at least, "within which time his neighbours may know his conversation, manner, and behaviour;" and that no one should be sworn a burgess except at a head court. Every freeman's son on taking up his freedom was to pay 20s., and every apprentice 26s. 8d. These amounts were at least ten times as large as they are now, and must have made it very difficult, if not impossible, for the poorer classes to take up their freedom. In addition to this, no one was to be admitted "without a whole consent;" that is to say, an unanimous vote. Freemen refusing to pay scot and lot were to forfeit their freedom. No one was to receive the freedom of the town unless he was of some art or craft. Freemen were allowed to take apprentices; they were not allowed to let their shares in the public pastures to any except brother freemen, under pain of forfeiting their rights for ever. If they made over their goods to others by fraud or deceit they lost their freedom; and also if they made any complaint of the kind named "wrangling." Any burgess or freeman found "in rebellion against any order" made by the general assent of the court, for the profit of the town and the commonalty, was to forfeit for every offence 3s. 4d. Still more formidable were the penalties against holding what the Americans call caucuses—to fix on candidates for the offices of mayor or bailiffs. Against this offence it was provided, that "if there be any assembling together, or any conspiracy of any burgesses gathered together, and sworn to make the mayor and bailiffs before they come into full court, upon this being lawfully proved, they and every one of them so doing shall lose their liberties, never to be restored again; and he and they whom they have so chosen shall never be put to any office within the town. No freeman to be allowed to refuse to be sworn on a jury.

Lancaster suffered severely in the wars which were carried on by Edward I. and II., and others of our early kings, with a vain hope of conquering the kingdom of Scotland. After the defeat of the army of Edward II. at Bannockburn in the year 1320, a Scottish army, under the command of Robert Bruce, poured into the northern counties of England, and inflicted terrible sufferings on the inhabitants. In the course of their progress they burnt the town of Lancaster to the ground, and laid the surrounding country waste on every side. But the castle of Lancaster was too strong to be taken without a regular siege, and afforded shelter to many of the fugitives, and a

point round which the population of the district reassembled when the storm was passed. The borough was gradually rebuilt, and spread into the valley and took the castle-hill as its western boundary. Two years later the northern part of the county was in so unsettled a state, that the assizes were held at Preston instead of Lancaster; and even there they were brought suddenly to a close by the appearance of bodies of armed men. Some years later, during the feeble minority of Richard II. in the year 1389, another Scottish army succeeded in marching as far south as Lancaster, and again burnt a considerable part of the town. This was the last time at which Lancaster suffered from Scottish invasions; for though large Scottish armies passed through this town in the great civil war, they were in alliance, or hoped for the assistance of portions of the English people, and did not commit any outrages on their march.

Both John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, and his son King Henry IV. visited Lancaster, and the latter held a court there for the transaction of business connected with the duchy. The liberties of the burgesses were confirmed by Richard II., Henry IV., and Henry V., the last of whom granted the burgesses freedom from tolls at the ports of Ireland. They made pavage grants to the borough of Lancaster in the years 1340 and 1342 (14th and 16th of Edward III.), and pontage grants for the repair of the bridge across the Lune were made in the years 1325, 1326, and 1330, and on other occasions. In the year 1431, the 10th of Henry VI., all the liberties of the town were confirmed by the king or his advisers, with the assent of Parliament. In a petition from the burgesses of Lancaster about this time, it is stated that "Lancaster from time immemorial has been, and still is, the chief and most ancient borough within the county of Lancaster; to which borough there is a great confluence and concourse of people, as well of merchants, denizens, aliens, and others, and that before this time the town has been for the greater part inhabited by merchants." The mayor and bailiffs therefore ask for additional powers to collect debts, as "many of the burgesses have fallen into great poverty because they have not power by law in the borough to recover their debts promptly on the day fixed for payment."<sup>\*</sup>

Lancaster escaped with little injury, in the wars between the Houses of York and Lancaster, the scene of the sanguinary struggles between the rival claimants to the throne having been in distant parts of the kingdom; but King Edward IV. in the year 1469,

\* Rot. Parl. vol. iv.: Petitions in Parliament, 10th Henry VI.

after his escape from the great castle of the Nevilles at Middleham in Yorkshire, escaped to York, and thence to Lancaster, where finding Lord Hastings, his chamberlain, with sufficient force to protect him, he resumed the government, and soon after defeated and conquered all his enemies. In the reign of Henry VII., Lambert Simnel, that pretended representative of the house of York who had landed in Morecambe Bay, marched through Lancaster with his mixed army of Flemings, Irishmen, and English Yorkists, on his way to York, without doing any injury to the inhabitants.

In the reign of Henry VII., in the year 1505, the mayor, bailiffs, and commonalty of the borough of Lancaster asserted their right to have a free port at Lancaster, and to be free from tollage in all the ports and boroughs in the kingdom ; but in this age the condition of the borough does not appear to have been very prosperous, for in an Act of Parliament of the 35th Henry VIII. (1544), for the repairing and amending of certain decayed houses and tenements in England and Wales, it is stated that "divers and many beautiful houses of habitation had been within the walls and liberties of the towns of Lancaster, Preston, Liverpool, and Wigan, in the county palatine of Lancaster, which now are fallen down, decayed, and at this time remain unre-edified, lying as desolate and void grounds." The act then proceeds to provide for their restoration by the public authorities of the boroughs in question, or by the chief lords. No cause is given for this decay, of what must have been amongst the finest buildings in these places ; but it possibly may have arisen from the great confiscations of property, which took place there, as at other places, at the time of the Reformation.

In the year 1604, James I. granted the borough a new charter ; and in the year 1621, the nineteenth of his reign, he issued a proclamation declaring that not only the burgesses, but all the inhabitants of Lancaster, should be toll-free throughout the whole of England. In the following reign, in the year 1635, when King Charles I. and his advisers determined to raise ship-money by the royal prerogative, the amount demanded from the county of Lancaster was £3500. The sums demanded from the different parliamentary boroughs of the county were as follows:—Lancaster, £30 ; Preston, £40 ; Wigan, £50 ; Liverpool, £25 ; Clitheroe, £7 10s.; and Newton, also £7 10s.\*

\* Dr. Hibbert Ware, *History of the Foundations of Manchester*, vol. iii p. 272. These figures not only show what were then considered to be the relative means of each of these towns, but also show how very insignificant all of them were at that time. There is no separate return from Manchester, which is included with the other parishes of the Salford hundred

Lancaster, like nearly all the towns in Lancashire and Cheshire, suffered very severely in the great civil war; having been taken by storm by the royalists, under the earl of Derby, having been besieged by the parliamentary party, and having been made to contribute to the support of the large Scottish and English armies which repeatedly marched through the town and lived on the resources of that and the neighbouring districts. We shall trace the modern history of Lancaster in a subsequent chapter.

*Borough of Preston in Amounderness in early times.*—Preston was one of the first Lancashire boroughs that obtained a charter conferring the right of self-government. This town, which succeeded the Roman station of Ribchester as the chief place in the valley of the Ribble, had many advantages of position, being situated on the lofty bank of a wide river, with sufficient depth of water for the largest vessels that were built in early times, and thus forming a port which was the natural outlet of one of the most extensive and fruitful valleys in Lancashire. Preston also stood at the point where the great roads, originally formed by the Romans, but which continue in use to the present time, crossed the river Ribble by a bridge constructed in very early times, and at which that road is crossed by another road, also constructed by the Romans, which ran across the northern part of England, extending from the estuary of the Wyre to that of the Humber. In early and turbulent times the town derived much advantage from belonging to, or being connected with, the priests of the abbeys of York and Ripon, who owned much land in this neighbourhood. The monks formed a class of landlords, superior in influence and intelligence to the fierce soldiers who ruled and tyrannized over the rest of the country. It is stated in the Domesday survey that all the villages in Amounderness, with three churches, belonged to Preston, which was thus the chief place of the hundred.

The CUSTUMALE of Preston, forming the earliest charter possessed by the borough, has for many ages been attributed to King Henry I., the youngest son of William the Conqueror, who is said to have granted it in the year 1100, that is, in the first year of his reign. The corporation of Preston have a certificate of Sir Thomas Walmesley, a judge of the Common Pleas in the reign of James I., in which it is stated that he had seen a charter granted by Henry I. to the burgesses of Preston in the first year of his reign (1100). Some doubt has been thrown on the correctness of this date, and it has been

supposed that the learned judge mistook the first year of the reign of Henry II., 1154, for the first year of Henry I. Either of these dates would make this charter the oldest borough charter known to have been granted in Lancashire ; and if the date 1100 is correct, it is very much the oldest.

There are several points in which this charter or *Custumale* differs from the ancient *Custumale* of Chester quoted above. One of these is that the Preston charter is described at the close as being the law of Preston in Amounderness, "which they have from the law of the Bretons." The meaning of this expression is by no means clear ; but it may be mentioned that before Lancashire was formed into a county the two northern hundreds, including the town of Preston, formed part of the earldom of Richmond, which was granted by William the Conqueror to Allan duke of Brittany, his nephew, or to a younger brother of the duke ; and it is possible that this early connection between the earldom of Richmond and the dukedom of Brittany may have caused some of the municipal laws of the latter province to have been united with the Norman and Saxon laws contained in the early charters of Preston. The *Custumale* of Preston itself seems to be granted by a king, and not by an earl ; and some of the rights which it confers, especially that of freedom from tolls, not only extend to the whole of England, but to the king's dominions abroad. It is well known, however, that Henry I., who was the first king of English birth of what is called the Norman line, was extremely anxious, especially in the early part of his reign, to obtain the support both of the English and the Norman people, as well as of the great nobles ; and it is quite possible that this charter, granted by him, may have been granted for the purpose of conciliating both his English subjects and his Norman or Breton followers. In the immediate neighbourhood of Preston there appears to have been a French, Norman, or Breton settlement soon after the Conquest, for one of the manors near that town is still called *Lee François*, whilst another is named *Lee Anglais*. In the Domesday survey repeated mention is made of Frenchmen settled in different parts of England, especially in the county of Chester, and it is not improbable that there were also French or Breton settlers in *Richmondshire* or *North Lancashire*, under the protection of the Norman earls of Richmond.

The liberties conferred by or recognized in the *Custumale* of Preston, are as extensive as those conferred by the *Custumale* of Chester, already quoted. Under this charter there was at Preston,



from very early times, a guild merchant, or trading company, including the whole of the burgesses, or such of them as were in a condition to use its privileges, with a hanse and other customs thereto belonging. To encourage the taking of burgages in the borough, it was expressly provided that any bondman, holding the king's land within the borough, and in the guild and hanse paying scot and lot for a year and a day, should remain free in the town. All the usual privileges of local government and of freedom from tolls, both within the borough "and throughout our land and domain, as well in England as other lands," were granted to the burgesses of Preston. The sheriffs of the neighbouring counties were forbidden to intermeddle with the burgesses, concerning any plea, plaint, or dispute pertaining to the town, save the pleas of the crown. The burgesses were not bound to come to more than three port-moot courts yearly, unless there was a plea against them. They were at liberty to give their daughters or granddaughters in marriage to any one, without the license of the lord; their wives and heirs were to succeed to their chattels and lands, and their widows might marry whomsoever they pleased. A burgess was not liable to pay transit toll, and he had a right of common pasture everywhere within the borough, except in cornfields, meadows, or inclosures. The burgesses were not required to go on any expedition except one from which they might return on the same day, "unless with the lord himself." Any one summoned when the justice of the town—probably the chief magistrate—was in the expedition, who did not go, forfeited 12*d.*, unless he made a reasonable excuse, such, for instance, as that "his wife was lying in childbed of a son." But if a burgess was summoned to go on an expedition with the person of a king, no excuse was accepted. No justice was allowed to lay hold on the house or chattels of any deceased burgess. By the last clause of the Custumale it is provided, that if any one shall scandalize or slander a married woman, she might clear herself by her own oath, and that then the slanderer should "take himself by the nose, and confess that he had spoken a lie." "There is the same judgment as to a widow." "This is the law of Preston in Amounderness, which they have from the law of the Bretons."<sup>2</sup>

In addition to the Custumale of Preston, another charter was granted by Henry II., which conferred upon the burgesses of Preston the same privileges, liberties, and free customs as were enjoyed by the burgesses of Newcastle-on-Tyne. These rights were

\* We shall give copies of this and some other interesting charters in an appendix, at the close of this work.

confirmed by King John ; and, in addition, he granted to the burgesses of Preston "the whole toll of the wapentake (or hundred) of Amounderness, and a free fair at Preston, at the Assumption of St. Mary, to last for eight days, together with the right of pasturage in his forest of Fulwood, and as much wood as they might require for building their town." King John also confirmed Henry Fitz-Warin in his right to certain rents in Preston, and granted to him 8*d.* a year, payable out of the revenues of Preston, as part of his income as governor of the castle of Lancaster.

In the twentieth year of the reign of Edward I. the burgesses of Preston, like those of Lancaster and Liverpool, had to defend their rights against a plea of *quo warranto*. As we have already mentioned, these pleas were in general merely methods of extorting money, in the form of fines, on the renewal of the rights whose existence was denied. In this case Adam, the son of Ralph, and Robert, son of Roger, the bailiffs, and other burgesses, appeared to resist the attack made by the officers of the crown. The rights which the burgesses were accused of having usurped were those of having a free borough, with market and fair ; gallows, or criminal jurisdiction in capital crimes ; infangthef, or the right of trial of felons for offences committed within the borough ; tumbrel, or the right of carting offenders round the borough ; pillory ; and the assize or testing of bread and beer ; and to be quit of fines, ameracements, tolls, and stallage. The charter was produced by which John, earl of Morton, afterwards King John, confirmed his father's (Henry II.) grants of liberties to Preston ; and also the charter of King John. But the judge, Hugh de Cressingham, and the jury adjudged the mayor and bailiffs and the community to be in the wrong, and all these rights were seized by the crown. A respite of ten days was obtained on the payment of ten marks, equal to £200 of modern money ; and all the rights were afterwards restored, no doubt in consequence of a larger payment. The right of the burgesses to the valuable salmon fishery of the Ribble was also attacked ; but the bailiffs alleged that it was held by them in common with Henry de Lacy, the powerful and wealthy earl of Lincoln and constable of Chester, and to this the court assented.

The desperate attempts of Edward I. and his son to conquer Scotland, after bringing unspeakable miseries on that country, ended for a time, at least, in the defeat of the English army at Bannockburn. This overwhelming defeat laid open the whole of the English

frontier to reprisals; and in the year 1323 Robert Bruce entered England by Carlisle, kept his way through Cumberland, Westmoreland, and Lancaster to Preston, which town he burned, as he had done Lancaster, and numerous other places. In this and subsequent raids Lancashire was laid waste to the Ribble, and Yorkshire to the gates of York.

In the same unfortunate reign a desperate battle was fought near Preston, between the adherents of King Edward II., under the command of Adam de Banastre, and those of Thomas, earl of Lancaster, the king's rebellious and powerful cousin; but the power of the earls of Lancaster was at that time greater than that of the king in Lancashire, and after a furious battle Adam de Banastre was defeated and killed, and his head was cut off and sent as a trophy to the earl, who soon after lost his own head, in a similar manner, at Pomfret castle.

The earliest Preston guild was held in the reign of Edward III., the most powerful and prosperous of all the Plantagenet kings. This king likewise confirmed all the grants of his predecessors, and granted to the burgesses the additional privilege of holding a fair of five days' duration, commencing with the vigil of St. Simon and St. Jude. We shall give a full account of the ancient and modern guilds of Preston in another chapter.

Preston had two small monastic institutions, the great house founded at Tulketh having been removed to Furness. The one was the Franciscan convent of Grey Friars, founded by Edmund, the first earl of Lancaster, the younger son of King Henry III. The second was a hospital dedicated to St. Mary Magdalene. Of the former Leland says:—"The Grey Freres college, on the N.W. side of Preston, in Amoundreiness, was set on the soil of a gentleman called Preston, and a brother or son of his confirmed the first grant of the site of the house; and one of these two was after a great man of possessions, and viscount of Gormanston, in Ireland. Diverse of the Prestons were buried in this house. But the original and great builder of this house was Edmund, earl of Lancaster, son of Henry III. Sir Robert Holland, who accused Thomas, earl of Lancaster, of treason, was a great benefactor of this house, and there was buried. There lay in the Grey Freres at Preston diverse of the Sherburnes and Daltons, gentlemen."

Preston was visited by Leland in the reign of Henry VIII., and by Camden in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. According to the

former the town was approached "over the great stone bridge of Rybill, and by five great arches." Preston had only one church at that time. The market-place of the town was fair, according to the notions of that time; and Leland mentions that the river Ribble though it went round about the town for a great space "touched not the town itself by almost half a mile." The country around Preston, both on the north and south sides of the river, was inclosed for pasture and corn; and there was reasonable wood for building and some for fire in the hedges and "grovettes," or small woods, about the town. The people for the most part burnt turves, and it was not until long after Leland's time that Preston obtained an easy access to the coal-fields of South Lancashire by means of water-carriage. Camden says that Preston sprung up after the destruction of Ribchester, situated higher up the stream of the Ribble, and that at the time when he visited it, it was, "for those parts, a handsome and populous town." When the Lancashire towns were taxed to pay ship-money in the reign of Charles I., Preston was considered the richest seaport in the county, being called on to pay £40 for that purpose, whilst Lancaster paid only £30, and Liverpool only £25.\*

Previous to the breaking out of the great Civil War, Preston was one of the most flourishing towns in Lancashire. It was at that time regarded chiefly as a seaport, and not as a manufacturing town. A large portion of the legal business of the county, and all that related to the duchy of Lancaster, was transacted at Preston. From its beautiful situation it was always a favourite place of resort for the Lancashire gentry, and of residence for their families.

But the ravages of the great Civil War fell very severely on Preston, as will be seen from the account of those events given in a preceding chapter of this work. Preston was twice taken by storm in the first year of the war; and at a later period of the struggle it was the scene of one of the most desperate battles of the war, viz., that fought on the banks of the Ribble and the Darwen, between Oliver Cromwell and the Scottish army, under the duke of Hamilton. A little later Charles II., or as he was then called, the King of Scots, marched through Preston, at the head of another large Scottish army, and was followed shortly after by James, earl of Derby, at the head of the forces which he had brought from the Isle of Man, or collected in North Lancashire. The course of these armies was marked by famine and

\* Dr. Hibbert Ware's History of the Foundations of Manchester, vol. iii. p. 272.

pestilence, and some years elapsed before the Lancashire towns along their line of march recovered their usual prosperity. The number of sick and wounded men left behind by the hostile armies was the principal means of spreading pestilence through the district.

*Clitheroe in ancient times.*—This town owed its origin, in early times, chiefly to the advantages of its military position, in commanding one of the best of the military passes through the mountain chain which divides Lancashire from Yorkshire. The great family of the De Lacys built the castle of Clitheroe, and were lords of the honour of Clitheroe, until their estates passed by marriage to the earls of Lancaster, and ultimately to the dukes of Lancaster. Clitheroe was an important military position in the northern wars; its castle being a place of great strength before the invention of artillery, and the pass through the mountains being always of importance to an army wishing to move rapidly between Lancashire and Yorkshire. It was through this pass that Prince Rupert moved in his memorable march from Liverpool and Lathom house to York and the battle-field of Marston Moor; and through it he returned, after his defeat at the place last named.

Clitheroe was as rich in municipal rights as any town in Lancashire or Cheshire, having received from Henry de Lacy, constable of Chester, a grant of all the rights to which the citizens of Chester were entitled under their *Custumale*, or summary of rights, given in our account of that city. Clitheroe had also some separate privileges of a more local kind, the most important of which to the burgesses are set forth in a charter,\* granted by Henry de Lacy, earl of Lincoln, about the year 1283.

King Henry IV., in the year 1409, granted to the burgesses of Clitheroe, who were his tenants, the right to hold two fairs yearly. All the earlier rights granted to the burgesses of Clitheroe were confirmed by Edward I. in the year 1282. Clitheroe was made a parliamentary borough in the time of the Tudors, probably for the purpose of increasing the influence of the duchy of Lancaster, to which it belonged. But its progress was somewhat slow, and in the reign of Charles I., in the year 1635, the amount which the burgesses were called upon to pay as ship-money did not amount to more than £7 10s.

*The Borough of Wigan.*—Wigan was made a free borough, and received a charter from King Henry III. in the year 1246. The

\* See Appendix.

charter was granted by the king chiefly to oblige his secretary John Maunsell, who, in that age, was of course a clergyman, and who held amongst other pieces of preferment that of the rectory of Wigan. In the reign of Edward I. the burgesses of Wigan were called upon to return two members to Parliament, and have continued to do so ever since. The position of the town is very favourable for trade, being on the line of the great road through the county, on a river supplying much water-power, and on the richest part of the Lancashire coal-field. The coal-mines were worked by the Bradshags of Haigh in the reign of Henry VIII., and Wigan, although spoken of as being in a somewhat decayed state, in the reign of the same monarch, like other Lancashire towns soon regained ground. In the reign of Charles I. Wigan paid a larger amount of ship-money than Liverpool, Preston, or Lancaster; Wigan being rated at £50, whilst Preston was only rated at £40, Lancaster at £30, and Liverpool at £25.

*Manchester from the Norman Conquest to the Restoration.*—We have traced in the early part of this work the history of Manchester in the Roman and Saxon times, and down to the time of the Norman conquest.\* We now proceed to trace the rise and progress of this city from the time of the Domesday survey to the Restoration and the year 1660.

Soon after the Norman conquest the manor of Manchester was granted to Albert de Gresley—written variously Gresle, Grelle, and Gresley—by one of the lords of the honour of Lancaster; and for a long course of years that family were barons of Manchester. Several of them were summoned to Parliament under that title. Albert de Gresley, who lived in the reign of William the Conqueror, was the first baron of Manchester; and eight barons or lords of this family held the barony in succession. The names of these barons were Albert, who lived in the reign of William the Conqueror; Robert, who lived in the time of William Rufus and Henry I.; Albert, who was known as Albert Senex, or the Elder, to distinguish him from his son; Albert Juvenis, or the Young, so called to distinguish him from his father, the latter living in the reign of Henry II.; Robert, who lived in the reigns of Henry II., Richard I., John, and Henry III.; Thomas, who lived in the reign of Henry II.; another Robert, who lived in the reigns of Henry III. and Edward I.; and Thomas, the eighth baron of Manchester, of the De Gresley family, who granted the first charter to the burgesses of Manchester, on the 14th May, 1301,

\* Lancashire and Cheshire: Past and Present, pp. 264, 314, and 535.

and was thus the founder of the municipal or borough rights of Manchester. This Thomas was the last baron of Manchester of the De Gresley family, the barony having passed into the family of the Delawarrs at his death by the marriage of the heiress of the De Gresleys, Joan de Gresley, to John Delawarr. The second Robert de Gresley, who lived in the reign of King John, was one of the barons who extorted Magna Charta from that king, at Runnymede, and who steadily opposed the tyrannical measures of the king to the close of his reign. For this resolute conduct King John commanded the sheriff of Lancaster to take possession, and surrender to Adam Yoland, the castle of Robert Greslet, of Mamecestre, with all appurtenances, and all the land of the same Robert, which he held under or within the line (*infra limam*), to be held so long as it pleased the king. But on the overthrow and death of the tyrant, all the possessions of the Gresley family were restored.

Soon after the death of King John, and while his son Henry III. was still under age, Robert de Gresley obtained a charter entitling him to hold a fair yearly at Manchester, on the eve and day of St. Matthew, September 20 and 21. The following is a translation of this charter, as given in Pipe-roll of the sixth year of the reign of King Henry III. (1222):—

*Lancaster.*—Robert Gresley gives to the lord the king one palfrey, to have a fair until the full age of the lord the king [Henry III.] every year, at his manor of Mamecestre, during two days, to wit, on the eve of St. Matthew the Apostle and on the day of the same St. Matthew, unless that fair, &c. [This is a general clause usually inserted in charters, and intended to protect the king's rights in other fairs held in the same neighbourhood.] And the sheriff of Lancashire is commanded that he take, &c. Witness Hubert, &c., at Luknor, the 11th day of August [1222].

A few years later, when Henry III. had come of age, in the year 1227, he confirmed the above grant made during his minority. The confirmation is contained in the charter of the 11th Henry III., and is as follows:—

*For Robert Gresley.*—Henry, king, &c., greeting. Know ye that we have granted, and by this our present charter have confirmed, to Robert Gresley, that he and his heirs may have for ever a fair at his manor of Mamecestre, yearly, during three days, viz., on the eve, and on the day, and on the morrow of St. Matthew the Apostle; on condition that the said fair may not be to the harm of neighbouring fairs, as is provided in other charters of fairs. Whereby we well and strictly command that the said Robert and his heirs may have for ever the said fair, well and in peace, freely, quietly, and honourably, with all liberties and free customs to this kind of fair appertaining, these being witnesses:—H. de Burgh, earl of Kent, justiciary of England; R., earl of Cornwall, our brother; William, earl of Albemarle; Hugh de Mortimar [or Mortimer]; Brian de l'Isle; Philip de Albini; Ralph Gernun [or Gernons]; Richard D'Argentine; and others. Given by the hand of the venerable father, Ralph, bishop of Chichester, our chancellor, at Farrington, 19th day of August, in the eleventh year of our reign.



It will be seen that the above charter extends the time for holding the fair to three days, and also makes the grant not merely for the life of Robert de Gresley, but of him and his heirs for ever.

The grant of the rights of a free borough to Manchester was not made by the crown, but by Thomas de Gresley or Grelle, the eighth baron, who was supposed to hold that part of *jura regalia* which enabled him to make such a grant, as part of his lordship or barony.

A few years before the granting of the charter of Thomas de Gresley, in the year 1282, the 11th Edward I., Robert de Gresley, the third baron of Manchester bearing the name of Robert, died, leaving his son and heir Thomas de Gresley, who at that time was only eleven years of age. This boy at once became a ward of the crown, and his estates were held by the king, who received the rents until the heir arrived at manhood. As a preliminary to the occupying of the estates by the crown during the minority of the heir, King Edward I. issued an order to Henry de Lee, who was then high sheriff of Lancashire, requiring him to make a report or extent as to all particulars of the estates of the late baron of Manchester. In order to do this the more satisfactorily, the high sheriff called together a jury at Manchester, composed of twelve of the principal landowners of this district—viz., John Byron, Geoffrey de Bracebrig, Geoffrey de Chederton, Adam de Hulton, Alexander de Pilkington, Thomas de Ashton, Robert de Shoreswood, Elis de Lever, Richard de Radcliff, Robert Venton, Adam de Contliff, and Adam, son of John de Lever. These jurors made a return, the substance of which is given in the sheriff's extent or statement, and is to the following effect :—

First, the jurors stated upon their oaths that there was in the aforesaid manor of Manchester—or, as they call it, Mamecestre—a certain capital messuage, with houses and gardens, the fruit of which, with the herbage, were worth 2s. a year. This sum of 2s., and all the other sums mentioned in this extent, were worth from twelve to fifteen times as much in modern money, and may very easily be brought approximately right, according to modern valuation, by multiplying by twelve, as in this sum of 2s., which would amount to from 24s. to 30s. of modern money. The jurors further reported that there was a certain small park, called Aldpark, the herbage of which, with the pannage, was worth 33s. 4d.; a certain other park called Blakeley, the herbage of which, with the windfall wood and pannage, and an aerie of sparrowhawks, was worth £51 13s. 4d. in the

money of that time; a certain plot of demesne and herbage called Bradford and Bronhull, worth 40*s.*; a certain plot called Grenlawmo, belonging to the aforesaid demesne, worth 76*s.* 8*d.* a year; a certain plot called le Hulles, worth 13*s.* and 4*d.* a year; a certain plot called Keperfield, worth 4*s.*; two plots called Millward Croft and Samland, worth 9*s.* a year; certain land called Kypcliff, worth 3*s.* 3*d.*; two parts of one oxgang of land in Denton, worth 4*s.* 2*d.*; and a certain plot of land in Farnworth, worth 5*s.*

Within the borough of Manchester, according to this return, there was, so early as the year 1282, one water mill, of the yearly value of £17 6*s.* 8*d.*; and a certain fulling mill, which was worth yearly 26*s.* 8*d.*; there was also a certain public oven, at which the burgesses were bound to bake their bread, which produced to the lord 10*s.* a year.

"And," say the jury, "there is there rent of assise (or ancient fixed rent) of the burgages in Mamecestre, which pay yearly, at the Nativity of the Lord, at the Annunciation of the Blessed Mary, at the Nativity of St. John the Baptist, and at the Feast of St. Michael, £7 3*s.* 2*d.*" As the rents of the burgages were fixed at 1*s.* per burgage, it would appear from this statement of rent, that the number of burgages, and probably of burgesses, existing in Manchester at that time was 143; this, allowing for women and children as well as for men, would give a population of from 800 to 1000 persons, exclusive of non-burgesses, who would be very likely to be quite as numerous. This is the earliest glimpse that we obtain of the population of Manchester.

In addition to the sources of income mentioned above, the toll of the market and of the fair of Manchester, at that time, produced a yearly return estimated at £6 13*s.* 4*d.*

Amongst the other profits of the barony were the rent of two oxgangs of land held in bondage—or by serfs, as cultivators—in Openshaw, producing 7*s.*; sixteen oxgangs of land held in bondage in Gorton and producing 64*s.*; a certain plot of land in the same place called Hall-land, producing 20*s.*; the farm or rent of one mill in Gorton, worth 26*s.* 8*d.*; ten oxgangs of land held in bondage in Ardwick, with nine acres of land held by a different tenure, the whole worth 43*s.*; a certain plot of land called Twantford, worth 6*s.* 8*d.*; ten oxgangs of land in Crumpsall, worth 40*s.*; and the rent of certain assarted or newly cleared lands at Crumpsall, 10*s.* 6*d.*

In addition to the above, there were the rents of the free tenants and foreign tenants of the manor of Mamecestre, producing

£7 9s. 8d.; one goshawk payable yearly by Thomas de Aston, or Ashton, at the feast of St. Michael, and one barbed arrow rendered yearly by Adam de Lever; the rent of sac fee 49s.; the farm of wards at the feast of the Nativity of St. John the Baptist, 49s. 2½d.; the farm of five foot-bailiffs, for having their bailwicks, 100s.; the perquisites of the borough court of Manchester 8s.; the pleas and perquisites of the court baron 100s.; a certain fee of Withington which paid yearly a day's ploughing of fifteen acres of land, worth 7s. 6d.; and a certain custom in the same fee of reaping in autumn, extending over thirty oxlands of land, worth yearly 2s. 6d.

In addition to the above, the Barons of Manchester had extensive possessions in the surrounding country, at Heaton Norris, Barton, and Kuerdley. At this time the manor of Manchester was held by the De Gresleys, under the Lord Edmund, brother of the king, and the first earl of Lancaster, to whom a payment was made of £2 a year, equal to about £30 in modern money; it made one suit to the county of Lancaster, one suit to the wapentake of Derby, and was of the constablewick of Chester. In the forest there were eight cow pastures (*vaccaria*), and one plot which was not a full pasturage; these were worth £19 a year. The pannage and hawks were worth 40s., and the three foresters keeping the forest had certain privileges for which they paid 40s. The sum of the forest was £24.

Attached to the barony of Manchester were five knights' fees, half a fee, and the third part of a fee, held by some of the most distinguished of the knightly families of Lancashire; John de Byron held Withington; Robert de Lathom, Adam de Hulton, William de Botiller, Ralph de Catteral, and Geoffrey de Writington, held Parbold and Writington, Chocton and Dalton; Thomas de Aston, or Ashton, did suit at the court of Manchester for the same holding; Robert de Lathom held Turton and Childwall as parts of this barony; William de Worthington held Worthington; William, the son of William de Anderton and Amery his wife, held Rumworth; Alexander de Pilkington held Pilkington; and Barton and Heaton were in the hands of the lord of the manor. The barons of Manchester also held the advowsons of the church of Manchester, worth 200 marks; of that of Childwall, worth 200 marks; and that of Ashton, worth 20 marks. "Adding together the nett issues of the manor and forest, with those of its mesne manors, and also the advowsons of the three churches, we have the yearly sum of £395 1s. 8½d., which, multiplied by fifteen, gives us the equivalent amount in our present money (£5,926 5s. 7½d.)

nearly £6,000 a year ; showing a very extensive estate, and a large revenue for the lord of the manor of Mamecestre, in the year 1282.\*

*Thomas de Gresley's Charter to Manchester.*—Amongst the rights conferred on the burgesses of Manchester by the great charter of Thomas de Gresley, the following were the most important:—The burgesses, on paying 12*d.* a year, equal to about 15*s.* of modern money, were free from all other service to the lord ; no burgess impleaded within the borough was bound to answer anywhere but in the portmoot, for any plaint except such as pertained to the king's crown, or to theft ; the burgesses were allowed to choose a reeve or borough-reeve for themselves, "whom they would," and to remove the reeve ; every burgess was allowed to give or sell his lands, if need be, but the heir was to have the preference ; and if the heir would not purchase, it was lawful for the burgess to sell his inheritance, whatever age the heir might be, or whether he consented or not ; every burgess was entitled to demand from the reeve his stall or standing place in the market on paying 1*d.*, equal to about 1*s.* of our present money, to the use of the lord ; a burgess was not to pay as much as a stranger for the stalls in the market ; and if he stood in his own stall he was not to pay anything to the lord ; every burgess might feed swine of his own rearing in the lord's woods, except in the forests and parks of the said lord, until the time of pannage or fattening with acorns and mast, and might take them away before the time of pannage without license from the lord ; but if they remained during the time of pannage the lord was to be recompensed for their pannage ; the burgesses might arrest any man, whether knight, priest, or clerk, for debt, if found in the borough ; any burgess whom necessity might compel to sell his burgage might take another of his neighbour, and every burgess might let his burgage to his neighbour ; if a burgess either bought or sold to any man within the fee of the said lord he was to be free of the toll ; but if any man of another shire or district came to the town who ought to pay custom, and went away without paying it, he forfeited 12*s.*, or £8 of modern money, to the use of the lord, besides paying his toll ; if a burgess had no heir, he might bequeath his burgage and chattels, when he died, to whom he would, "saving only service of the lord ;" if a burgess died, his wife or widow was allowed to remain in the house, and the

\* Mamecestre : being chapters from the early recorded history of the barony ; the lordship or manor ; the vill, borough, or town, of Manchester, edited by John Harland, F.S.A., vol. 1. Printed for the Chetham Society, 1861.

heir with her, and to have necessaries, so long as she was without a husband, but if she married she was to depart from the house, leaving the heir in possession; on the death of any burgess his heir was not required to pay any other relief to the lord except certain arms; if any burgess sold his burgage, and wished to depart from the town, he had only to pay the lord 4*d.*, equal to about 5*s.* of modern money, and to depart from the town, going where he would. The above are the most important provisions of the charter of Thomas de Gresley.\*

The burgesses of Manchester continued to enjoy all the advantages of the above charter, including those of being burgesses of a free borough, for about sixty years. But during that period the power of the earls and dukes of Lancaster greatly increased, and the county was placed completely under their control by the granting of palatine privileges to the dukes of Lancaster. In the year 1359, the 32nd Edward III., Henry, the first duke of Lancaster, or his officers, raised the question of whether Manchester was a free borough or merely a market-town. An inquisition on this subject took place at Preston, before "Thomas de Seton and his fellows, justices of the lord the duke," on Monday in the second week of Lent, in the thirty-third year of the reign of King Edward III. The jury to whom the question was referred consisted of John de Radcliff, Oto de Halsall, Roger de Bradeshagh, Henry, son of Simon de Bickerstath, Robert de Trafford, John de Hopwood, Roger de Barlow, John of the Holt, Robert de Holme, John de Chetham, Thomas de Strangways, and John of the Scalefield. These jurors—most of whose names are still very familiar to a Lancashire ear—decided that Roger Delawarr did not hold the town of Mamecestre as a borough, nor did his predecessors hold the town as a borough, but that they held it as a market-town. In consequence of the decision that Manchester was a market-town, but not a borough, the town was no longer free from suit to the county and wapentake. "The result was, in fact, to reduce the portmoot to a mere subsidiary court to the lord's court baron, and to set up again the jurisdiction of the wapentake of Salford and that of the sheriff's tourn, within the town of Manchester, in all cases except such as related to the lord and his tenants, which, according to ancient usage, would be determined by the court baron. It may suffice to add that ultimately the several local courts merged into the half yearly court leet, court baron, and view of frankpledge, held about Easter and

\* We shall give a copy of this Charter in the Appendix to the work.

about Michaelmas, at which latter time the borough reeve and constables of Manchester for the ensuing year were elected.\*

On the death of Thomas de Gresley, the last baron of Manchester in the male line of that family, the manor of Manchester passed to John Delawarr, baron of Wickwar, in the county of Gloucester, and to his wife, Joan or Joanna, sister and sole heir of the last of the Gresleys. In this distinguished family it remained until about the year 1427, when it passed by marriage into the family of Sir Reginald West, who assumed the title and lordship of Manchester. The member of the Delawarr family whose name is most prominently and honourably associated with the city of Manchester, is Thomas Delawarr, who founded and endowed the college and the collegiate church of Manchester. This college was founded by him in the year 1422, under a royal licence granted by King Henry V., by which Thomas, bishop of Durham, John de Forden, the clergyman of the parish church of Manchester, and other feoffees named by Thomas Delawarr, received permission to erect or convert the church of Manchester into a collegiate church, and there to establish a college with a warden or master, and as many fellows and other ministers as to them seemed good. Under this arrangement, one warden, eight fellows, four clerks, and six choristers were appointed. The college and collegiate church thus founded, the warden and fellows of which were incorporated under the style and title of the Master or Warden of the College of the Blessed Virgin of Manchester, has continued to flourish for many ages, though with a change of title and with several changes in its organization. In the reign of Edward VI., or at the time of the Reformation, it was for a time suspended; but it was restored by Queen Mary, was reorganized by Queen Elizabeth, and was reconstituted by Charles I., besides having undergone many important changes in modern times. The endowment of the church when John de Forden was parson or rector is stated by Hollingworth, in his "*Mancuniensis*," to have amounted to about 200 marks per annum. This was equal to about £2000 of modern money. The parsonage house stood in or near a field on the side of what was then, and is now, called Deansgate. The sum bequeathed by Thomas Delawarr for the building of the college and the collegiate church is said to have amounted to £3000 of the money of Henry V.'s time, equal to from £30,000 to £40,000 of modern money. But large as this sum was, it was insufficient to

\* *Mamecestre*, by John Harland, vol. iii. p. 454.

- defray the expense of building the new college and the new collegiate church. The college was built on the site of the ancient hall of the barons of Manchester, in a very open, healthy, and commanding position. Part of the stone used in constructing the college is said to have been furnished by the remains of the old hall, and it is said that part of it was obtained from the ruins of the old Roman, Saxon, and, it may be, Norman fortifications, which were known in those early times as "Mancastle." It is also stated that, owing to the insufficiency even of the large sum bequeathed by the founder of the college and the church, the collegiate church was in the first instance built of wood. The site selected for the church was lofty and commanding, lying to the south of the ancient hall of the barons, and near to the fosse, crossed by a drawbridge, by which the demesne was protected in ancient times. These are the only particulars which have been recorded respecting the origin of the timbered edifice dedicated to St. Mary, St. Denis, and St. George, which was first built on the site of the present collegiate church, and which at a later period was supplanted by a more lasting one of stone.\*

Manchester, after a long period of inactivity, began to increase and advance in population, wealth, and trade, in the reigns of Henry VII. and Henry VIII. "One writeth," says Hollingworth, "that about 1520 there were three famous clothiers living in the north country, namely, Cuthbert of Kendal, Hodgkins of Halifax, and Martin Brian (some say Byrom) of Manchester. Every one of these kept a great number of servants at work, carders, spinners, weavers, fullers, dyers, shearmen, &c., to the great admiration of those that came into their houses to behold them." It was at this time that the inhabitants of Manchester induced Parliament to pass an act abolishing the right of sanctuary in Manchester, and removing that dangerous and mischievous privilege to Chester. The following extract from the preamble of the Act will show what was the position of the trade of Manchester at this period:—

"Whereas, the said towne of Manchester is, and hath of long tyme been, a town well inhabited; and the kinge's subjectes inhabitauntes of the same towne are well set a worke in makinge of clothes, as well of linnen as of woollen, whereby the inhabitauntes of the said towne have obteyned, gotton, and come vnto riches and welthy lyuings, and haue kepte and set manye artificers and poore folkes to worke within the said towne; and by reason of the great occupieng, good order, straye and true dealing of the inhabitauntes of the said towne, many strangers, as well of Ireland as of other places within this realme, have resorted to the said towne with linnen yarns, woollies, and other necessary wares for making of clothes, to be sold there, and haue used to credit and truste the poore inhabitauntes of the same towne

\* Dr. Hibbert Ware's History of Foundations of Manchester, vol. i. p. 45.



which were not able and had not redy money to pay in hande for the saide yarns, woolles, and wares, vnto such time the said credites with their industry, labour, and peynes myght make clothes of the said woolles, yarns, and other necessary wares, and solde the same, to contente and pay their creditours; wherein hath consisted much of the common welth of the said towne, and many poore folkes had luyng, and children and servants were vertuously brought up in honest and true labour, out of all ylleness. And for as muche as of necessitie the said lynnyn yarns must lye without, as well in the night as in the day, continually for the space of one halfe yere to be whited before it can be made clothe, and the wollen clothes there made must hange vpon the taynter to be dried before it can be dressed up; and for the saulfigarde thereof it is and shal be expedient and necessary that substanciall, honest, iust, true, and credible persons be and shuld dwell in the said towne, and no maner of lyght persone or persons there to be inhabitautes. And whereas manye straungers, inhabytinge in other towneshyps and places, have used customably to resort to the sayd towne of Manchester with a great number of cottons to be vttered and sold to the inhabitautes of the same towne, to the great profit of all the inhabitautes of the same; and thereby many poore people have ben well set a worke, as well with dressyng and frisyng of the sayd cottons as with putting to sale the same, &c.—Act 33 Henry VIII.

In the year 1524, the 15th Henry VIII., the Free Grammar-school of Manchester was founded and liberally endowed by Hugh Oldham, bishop of Exeter, a native of the town whose name he bore. At that time the whole of the existing literature, at least in the north of Europe, was contained in the Latin and Greek languages, none of the modern literatures, except the Italian, having yet been founded; and therefore, according to the custom of that age, the study of the Latin grammar was regarded as the only entrance to knowledge. The object of the reverend founder of the Manchester school, as set forth in the statutes of the school, "was the bringing up of children to their adolescence, and to occupy them in good learning, whereby, when they should come to age and virility, they might better know, love, honour, and dread, God and his laws." Therefore it was that he established this school, and "for the good mind which he did bear for the county of Lancaster, where the children had pregnant wits, but had been mostly brought up unruly and idle, and not in virtue, cunning (knowledge), education, literature, and good manners," he established and founded a Free Grammar-school, "the liberal science or art of grammar being the ground and foundation of all other liberal arts and sciences." The schoolhouse was to be built adjoining, westward of the College of Manchester; to the school he gave the name of Manchester School; and for the endowment of this foundation he purchased a lease for sixty years of the corn and fulling mills situated on the river Irk. The school so established was to be taught after the manner of the school of Banbury in Oxfordshire, and the election and choice of the master were vested in the president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, or in the warden of the

College of Manchester. The teaching was to be entirely free, the master and sub-master being provided for out of the endowment. The school has proved to be one of the best and most useful ever established in England.

In the reign of Henry VIII., Leland the famous antiquary visited Manchester, on his journey through England under the commission granted to him by the king. He informs us in his "Itinerary" that he rode over the Mersey water by a great bridge of timber (probably the old bridge at Stretford), and then over Medlock river, and so within a mile of Manchester. He describes Manchester as the "fairest, best builded, quickest (busiest), and most populous town in all Lancashire, though with only one parish church; that, however, collegiate, double-aisled, and built of the hardest cut stone." There were several stone bridges in the town; the best of these crossed the river Irwell, "that divides Manchester from Salford, which is a large suburb of Manchester." On this bridge there was then a pretty chapel. The next bridge was that over the Irk river, "on which the fair builded college standeth, as in the very point of the mouth of it." On the Irk were diverse "fair mills, that served the town." In the town, he says, were two fair market-places, and about two flight shottes without the town, beneath, on the same Irwell, are "yet to be seen the dikes and foundations of old Man-castel in a ground now inclosed." The stones of the ruins of this castle were used for building the bridges of the town. "It is not long," says Leland, "since the church of Manchester was collegiated. The town of Manchester standeth on a hard rock of stone, else Irwell, as well appeareth on the west bank (ripe) had been mischievous (noiful) to the town. Irwell is not navigable but (except) in some places for (owing to) shallows (vadys) and rocks."<sup>3</sup>

The first register for the parish of Manchester was begun in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. The first entry is the burial of Robert Fisher, August 1, 1573; the first baptism that of Ellen, daughter of William Darby, August 3; and the first marriage that of Nicholas Cleaton and Ellen Pendleton, August 19, 1573.†

On the 15th May, the 21st Elizabeth (1579), Lord Delawarr, in an evil hour for his own family, sold the manor of Manchester, and all rights and privileges attached to it, to John Lacye of London, citizen and cloth-maker, for the sum of £3000.

\* Leland's Itinerary, v. 5. p. 78.

† Aston's Manchester Guide.

The inhabitants of Manchester adopted the principles of the Reformation early, and clung to them firmly, although great part of the gentry residing in the surrounding district continued to be attached to the Church of Rome. In the latter part of Queen Elizabeth's reign, after the queen had been excommunicated by the pope, and her dominions had been offered to the king of Spain, the contest between the adherents of the two religions became desperate and sanguinary, and neither of them hesitated to adopt any course towards the other which would advance its own objects. Amongst the measures adopted by the Government and the Protestant party was the enforcement of conformity to that religion, amongst the Roman Catholics of Lancashire. This hopeless and painful task was committed to William Hastings, earl of Huntingdon, president of the North, Henry, earl of Derby, and William Chadderton, bishop of Chester. At that time great numbers of Catholic recusants were imprisoned at Chester, and at other places in the two counties. In December, 1581, the recusants were removed to Manchester, which the earl of Huntingdon, in a letter to the earl of Derby, declared to be the "best," that is, the most Protestant place in those parts: and there the earl of Derby and the bishop took up their residence, to superintend the conversion of their unfortunate Romish neighbours, by any means, fair and foul, who, it must be said in justice to all parties, would have just as willingly undertaken to convert them by similar means. One of the places in which the unfortunate Catholics were lodged was the gaol on Salford bridge. Another was the fortified mansion of the Radcliffes, situated in Pool fold, formerly moated round, with a drawbridge giving admittance to the principal entrance. The mansion, which stood in a large garden, "was constructed of timber and plaster, with huge projecting stone chimneys and gable ends." The third place was a prison built specially for the purpose, situate at Hunts Bank, and named the New Fleet prison.\* Most of the cruelties perpetrated at this time were the result of fear of invasion or massacre. As a security against the former danger, which was real and urgent, Manchester raised a quota of men, consisting of thirty-eight harquebussiers, carrying firearms; thirty-eight archers; and one hundred and forty-four billmen and pikemen.†

But whilst the Protestants were thus fierce against the Roman Catholics who were held to believe too much, they were just as cruel with those who were held to believe too little. In the same reign

\* Dr. Hibbert Ware's Foundations of Manchester, vol. i. p. 110.  
VOL. I.

† Ibid. vol. i. 123.  
4 T

the Puritans and Nonconformists became active at Manchester. In the same reign "a most vile book" was published against the earl of Leicester and the queen, which was doubly dangerous for being, if not true, at least very probable. At the same time, Penry, a nonconformist, or, as they were then called, a Brownist, began a sharp attack on the queen and the bishops, in a number of very harmless, but not very mannerly works, which the courtiers and court lawyers of that time denounced as treasonable. Of these were "Martin Marprelate," and other polemical pamphlets. In the course of printing the work, "Ha ye any more work for the Cooper?" says Ames, the press was discovered and seized at Manchester, in Newton Lane, with several pamphlets unfinished. Amongst others were "Paradoxes," "Dialogues," "Martin's Dreams," the "Lives and Doings of Hellish Popes," "Itinerarium or Visitations," and "Lambethisms." To complete the "Itinerarium," the author threatened to survey all the clergy of England, and note their intolerable pranks; and for his "Lambethisms," he would have a Martin Marprelate at Lambeth. For this poor harmless abuse, the unfortunate Penry was tried and executed; but his murder did not put down Puritanism at Manchester.\*

Aston, in his Manchester Guide, gives an illustration of the manners of this time, in the form of an inventory of the personal habiliments and furniture of a widow, residing at Salford, in the year 1588. The widow's clothes consisted of a trained gown lined with camlet, a cassock, frieze gowns, a worsted kirtle with branched damask body and sleeves; a russet taffety kirtle and apron, silk hats, a tammy mantle, a golden girdle, partlets, smocks, cross clothes, and mufflers. The clothes of the widow's late husband comprised "a myllom (Milan) fustian doublet, oylpyold sleeves, breeches, a pair of moulds," a frieze jerkin, two seal-skin girdles, two pair round hose, a felt hat and band, and a dagger. The deceased had been a manufacturer of frieze.†

The manor of Manchester was again in the market in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and in the year 1590 was sold by John Lacye, who had bought it from Lord Delawarr for £3000, to Sir Nicholas Moseley, for the sum of £3500. Two years after this improvident sale, William, earl of Derby, made one not less improvident, by selling the mansion and park of Aldport, at Manchester, to Sir Randle Brereton of Malpas, Kt.; who sold this valuable property to Thomas Rowe, in the county of Chester, by whom it was again sold shortly after to

\* Dr. Hibbert Ware's Foundations of Manchester, vol. i. p. 125.

† Ibid.

Oswald Moseley, the elder, of Manchester, Esq., Edward Moseley, of Grey's Inn, Esq., and Adam Smyth, of Manchester, mercer. "About this time," says Hollingworth, "flourished Sir Nicholas Moseley, lord mayor of London, whom from a low estate God raised up to riches and honour. He bought the lordship of Manchester, and of the Hough and Halls, in the place where his father's tenement stood."

The plague continued to rage at intervals in Lancashire and all parts of England until the end of the seventeenth century, when it gently diminished and ultimately died out, no doubt from improved diet and from cleanliness. The year 1603 was a year of plague at Manchester, "as forty years before and forty years after." In the previous year the whole number of deaths in the parish had been only 188, whilst in 1605 it amounted to 1078. "Amongst those who died," says Hollingworth, "was Mr. Price, chaplain of the college, and his wife, with four children. All the time of the sickness Mr. Bourne preached in the town so long as he durst, by reason of the unruliness of infected persons and want of government; and then he went and preached in a field near Shosters Brook, the people of the town being on one side, he and the country people on the other." In those times the inhabitants of towns and villages were placed in a merciless quarantine. On this occasion plague stones were erected, to which the country people brought provisions for the inhabitants, and where the money paid for them was deposited.

In the year 1625, Henry Montague, Viscount Mandeville, Baron Kimbolton, and lord president of the King's Privy Council, was made an earl by the title of Earl of Manchester.

In the midst of these events Manchester continued to advance in industry, population, and wealth. It was about this time that some of the more skilful of the Manchester manufacturers introduced the use of cotton into the manufactures of Manchester, in which nothing but wool and linen yarn had been used to that time. The first cotton brought to Manchester for manufacturing purposes was grown in the island of Cyprus, in the Levant, imported into London, and thence conveyed by land carriage to Manchester. Articles named Manchester cottons and fustians had long been manufactured at Manchester, but we are told expressly by Camden and other contemporary writers, and it appears from the great weight and nature of the goods, that they were woollens. Friezes and rugs were also manufactured in great quantities, and it appears from Aston's Guide to Manchester, that it was then the custom to convey the goods to

London and to the great fairs of Cambridgeshire on horseback, and there to sell them to home or continental purchasers frequenting those fairs. The following is an account of the manufacturers of Manchester in this age :—Fustians were manufactured about Bolton, Leigh, and the places adjacent ; but Bolton was the principal market for them, where they were brought in the grey by the Manchester chapmen, who finished and sold them in the country. The fustians were made as early as the middle of the seventeenth century, indeed much earlier, when Humphrey Chetham, who founded the Blue Coat Hospital, was the principal buyer at Bolton. The Manchester traders went regularly on market days to buy pieces of fustian of the weavers, each weaver then procuring yarn or cotton as he could, which subjected the trade to great inconveniences. To remedy this, some of the chapmen furnished warps and wools to the weavers. They also encouraged weavers to fetch them from Manchester, and by prompt payment and good wages endeavoured to secure good workmanship.

Thus Manchester, from having been from the earliest times the political and military capital of South Lancashire, became its industrial capital, a position which it has continued to hold to the present day.

We have already given a full account of the military and political events of Manchester and the neighbourhood during the great Civil War.

During the time of the Commonwealth another great foundation was established at Manchester by Humphrey Chetham, of Clayton Hall, near Manchester, and of Turton Tower, near Bolton, one of the first of the Lancashire merchants or manufacturers who applied a large portion of the wealth acquired in trade to the purpose of the intellectual improvement of the people. This excellent man, who had held the office of high sheriff under Charles I. in the year 1635, and who appears to have enjoyed the respect and confidence of all classes of his fellow countrymen through the long and dangerous times of the civil wars and of the Commonwealth, died in December, 1653. By his last will, dated December 16, 1651, he bequeathed to his nephews, George and Edward Chetham, the sum of £7000, to be expended in the purchase of two estates of the yearly value of £420, to be conveyed to twenty feoffees named in trust, for the purpose of founding and endowing an hospital for maintaining, clothing, educating, bringing up, and apprenticing or obtaining other preferment for forty healthy boys, the sons of honest and industrious parents.

The boys were to be chosen from Manchester and the neighbourhood in the following proportions:—Manchester, fourteen; Salford, six; Doylesden, three; Crumpsall, two; Bolton, ten; and Turton, five. These numbers were afterwards largely increased as the funds increased. Humphrey Chetham further bequeathed the sum of £500, to be applied to the purchase of a house or houses in which the boys should live together, and expressed the wish that the buildings known as “The College” might be purchased for that purpose. This was ultimately done, and those premises have been used as the Blue Coat Hospital and Library. A charter of incorporation was obtained in the year 1665, in which the founder Humphrey Chetham is justly described “as a person of eminent loyalty to his sovereign, of exemplary piety to God, charity towards the poor, and good affection to learning.”

The following is a description of the towns of Manchester and Salford at the time of the Commonwealth:—

“The people in and about the town are said to be in general the most industrious in their callings of any in the northern parts of this kingdom. The town is a mile in length; the streets are open and clean kept, and the buildings good. There are four market-places, two market-days weekly, and three fairs yearly. The trade is not inferior to that of many cities in the kingdom, chiefly consisting in woollen friezes, fustians, sackcloths, mingled stuffs, caps, inks, tapes, points, &c.; whereby not only the better sort of men are employed, but also the very children of their own labour can maintain themselves. There are besides all sorts of foreign merchandise bought and returned by the merchants of the town, amounting to the sum of many thousands of pounds weekly. There are in the town forty-eight subsidy men, besides a great number of burgesses; and four quarter-sessions are held in it. The town is governed by a steward, a head-borough, and two constables, with a deputy-constable, and several inferior officers; and great commendation is given to the regular and orderly manner in which things are conducted. The parish is said to be at least twenty-two miles in compass, within which are eight chapels, said to contain twenty-seven thousand communicants.”\*

*Liverpool from the Charter of King John, 1207, to the Restoration, 1660.*—Liverpool owes its origin as a port to King John, whose constant object it was to strengthen himself against the nobility and clergy, with whom he was in continual conflict, by increasing and

\* From Note in Dr. Hlibbert Ware's History of the Foundations in Manchester, vol. I. p. 302.



favouring the population of the boroughs. He also granted charters very freely for the purpose of raising money, of which he was always in urgent want. There was also in the case of Liverpool, as well as of Preston and Lancaster, a strong wish on the part of the king to form sea-ports on the north-west coast of England, whence he might direct military operations against Ireland, which had been added to the dominion of England in the reign of his father, Henry II., but in which country the English interest did not extend beyond the limits of a few sea-ports, and the surrounding districts. For some hundred years after the port of Liverpool was founded it had little trade, except with Ireland, and from the unsettled state of that country its trade was continually interrupted by political causes, and never attained any great magnitude. The wonderful growth of trade and commerce, which has made Liverpool the greatest port of the United Kingdom, did not commence until after the planting of America, about the middle of the seventeenth century. Up to that time the population never exceeded more than from 2000 to 3000 inhabitants, and the trade was proportionately small. We shall pass rapidly over the principal events of this period.

In the first deed in which Liverpool is mentioned, dated 1208, being the ninth year of the reign of King John, the king confirmed to Henry Fitz-Warine a grant of several manors which had been made by his father to Warine de Lancaster, the father of Henry Fitz-Warine; but, at the same time, reserved to himself the manor of Liverpool, which had been one of the manors originally granted to Warine de Lancaster by King Henry II., and substituted for it another manor, named English Lea, situated in the neighbourhood of Preston. By this arrangement King John became possessor of the manor of Liverpool, which he immediately proceeded to form into a borough and sea-port by the grant of extensive privileges.

There appear to have been very few inhabitants in the manor of Liverpool at the time when it was purchased or re-purchased by King John; but he or his advisers perceived the advantages of the position, especially as a place of intercourse with Ireland, and at once proceeded to invite all persons who would, to establish themselves in the new port or borough on the sea, which he had determined to establish there. With this view he issued a proclamation offering to all persons, who would take burgages at Liverpool, all the liberties and free customs—the latter implied freedom from customs—which were possessed by the free burgesses of any borough on the

sea, or sea-port, in his dominions. This invitation, which is regarded as the first charter of Liverpool, is expressed in very few words, but is full of weight and meaning, and secured to the borough to which it related an ample amount of municipal freedom. It is as follows:—

CHARTER OF KING JOHN TO LIVERPOOL.—“The king, to all who may be willing to take burgages at the town of Liverpool, &c. Know ye, that we have granted to all who shall take burgages at Liverpool that they shall have all liberties and free customs, in the town of Liverpool, which any free borough on the sea hath in our land. And we therefore command you that securely, and in our peace, you come there to receive and inhabit our burgages. And in testimony hereof we send you these our letters patent. Witness, Simon de Pateshill. At Winchester, the 28th day of August, in the ninth year of our reign; by Simon de Pateshill.”

Within a short time after the above invitation and promise of liberties had been issued, about 180 burgages were taken by various persons within the new borough of Liverpool. This would make an adult male population of about the same number, or probably of somewhat more, as the burgages were allowed to be divided. Adding to this number of men the usual proportion of women and children, with a few servants or dependents, there might thus be a population of from 1000 to 1200 persons in the borough. To some extent this would be increased by the resort of strangers, chiefly from Ireland, and by the presence of a small garrison. The castle of Liverpool is also supposed to have been erected by King John. At the same time extensive parks were formed in the neighbourhood for the recreation of the king when he visited the castle, and of the governors of the castle in his absence. These consisted of the extensive park of Toxteth on the banks of the river Mersey, a place beautifully situated, and in every way suited for the purposes of recreation. This park, or the land on which it was formed, King John purchased from the Molyneuxes of Sefton, and he increased it by purchasing the adjoining township, or manor, of Smethom, called Esmedune, in the Domesday survey, and by inclosing it in the same haia, or inclosure, with Toxteth. About the same time two other royal parks, or hunting grounds, were also formed by the king—viz., those of Croxteth and Symonswood. These parks continued to be attached to the castle of Liverpool until the time of the Tudor kings and queens, when they were disforested and sold.

Very soon after the castle of Liverpool had been built it was garrisoned by the king, in the course of his wars with his barons, and was victualled for a siege. That siege never took place, owing to the sudden death of the king, which left the barons and their leaders in possession of the kingdom, during the minority of the

youthful King Henry III. But we have in the Pipe-roll of the high sheriff of Lancaster, for the 16th John, an account of the money expended in furnishing the garrison with the needful supplies. This throws much light on the prices of different articles of food at that time. At first these prices appear, most of them, to be very small, 240 quarters of wheat being charged at the rate of 3*s.* 4*d.* per quarter; 120 quarters of barley at 2*s.*; 300 quarters of oats at 1*s.*; eighty cows at 4*s.* each; 130 sheep at 1*s.* each; 20,000 herrings at 3*s.* 2½*d.* a thousand; and sixty quarters of salt at 4*s.* the quarter. But when due allowance is made for the circumstance that there was three times as much silver in the coins of those days as there is in the corresponding coins of modern times, and that silver was five times as valuable before the discovery of the silver mines of Mexico and Peru as it is now, the difference of prices was less than might have been expected. Allowing for this difference, the price of the articles supplied to the garrison of Liverpool in the year 1216 was as follows:—Wheat, 46*s.* a quarter; barley, 25*s.* a quarter; oats, 15*s.* a quarter; cows, £3 each; sheep, 15*s.* each; and herrings, 30*s.* a thousand. The price of salt was higher in proportion than that of any other article, being £3 a quarter in the money of the present day.

On the death of King John the borough of Liverpool became the property of his son and successor Henry III., but was managed during his minority by the leaders of the barons, who formed a regency of the kingdom. In the thirteenth year of Henry's reign he had come into possession of all his rights and properties, and in that year he granted a new charter to his burgesses of Liverpool, confirming to them in detail all the most important rights which his father, King John, had engaged to give to such persons as should take burgages in his borough of Liverpool. Amongst the rights confirmed were those of a guild merchant and a hanse, which implied entire freedom of trading; an exemption from customs and tolls, both within their own borough, and all other boroughs in the kingdom; and also the right of trying prisoners for all offences committed within the borough. Freedom was also given to all merchants to come to the borough aforesaid with their merchandises, of whatsoever places they may be, whether foreigners or others, there to dwell in safety, and thence to depart in safety, rendering the right and due custom.\*

On the same day on which King Henry III. granted the above

\* See Charter of Henry III. in Appendix.

charter to the burgesses of Liverpool, he let to them the whole of the royal rights within the borough, for a yearly rent of £10 of the money of that time, equal in value to from £120 to £150 of the money of the present time. At that time Liverpool was the smallest and poorest of all the free boroughs on the sea in the king's dominions. This appears from a comparison of the amount of fee farm rents paid by that borough and by the other sea-port towns. Turning the amounts paid by the principal sea-ports into modern money, the amount paid by the port of Lyme Regis was equal to £300; that paid by Ipswich was equal to £500; by Chichester, to £600; by Newcastle-on-Tyne, to £754; by Chester, to £1500; by Southampton, to £3000; by Bristol, to £3675; and by London, to £4500. In comparison with these places the rent paid by Liverpool, which only amounted to £10, in the money of those times, and to not more than £150 in modern money, was very small; and this disproportion continued nearly to the time of Queen Elizabeth, and did not disappear altogether until subsequent to the Restoration and to the colonizing of America.

For about 300 years after Liverpool was founded it had only five or six streets—viz., Castle Street, Dale Street, Water Street, originally called Bank Street, Juglar Street, and Chapel Street. The oldest of these was Castle Street, which extended along the brow of the hill on which the castle was built, from the north side of the castle to the High Cross. That stood at the point where Castle Street is now intersected by the line of Dale Street and Water Street. There were several other crosses in Liverpool, the principal being Red Cross and White Cross, on what were then the borders of the town. The markets and fairs were held around the High Cross, and all persons attending them were free from arrest for debt and other civil offences within certain limits around the High Cross, so long as they kept within those limits, which were marked by large blocks of stone sunk in the pavement, one of which is still to be seen in Castle Street. The administration of criminal justice was in the town-hall, which originally was a very small building in Castle Street, though not on the site of the present town-hall. The chief magistrate of the borough in early times was named the Bailiff, or rather the Bailiffs, for there were two of them from a very early period. But in the reign of Edward III. the corporation began to elect an officer, to whom they gave the name of mayor, and from the thirtieth year of the reign (1356) the chief officer of the corporation of Liverpool

has borne the title of mayor. In early times the whole body of the burgesses met in the Common Hall, to consult on all important affairs affecting the interests of the borough ; but gradually the management was transferred to a body representing the burgesses, which assumed the name of the Common Council. This body differed in numbers at different times, but finally settled at forty, which continued to be the number of the common council for many years.

We have scarcely any trace of the existence of trade in Liverpool previous to the Tudor times, though there must have been some intercourse with Ireland and the coast of England and Wales, as the burgesses possessed a number of small vessels, larger than fishing boats, which were continually taken up by the government for the purpose of conveying troops to Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. In those times there was no royal navy ; and whenever vessels were required for naval purposes, they and the men who worked them were impressed in the different sea-ports of the kingdom, from amongst the largest and strongest vessels which could be found. Many such orders to supply men and ships were received at Liverpool. In the ninth year of Edward III. (1336), Simon de Beltoft and Henry de Kendall were ordered to provide, take, and arrest six ships of war of the larger and stronger ships, "which may happen to be found on the sea-coast towards the western parts, from the port of the town of Liverpool, and within the same port, unto the port of the town of Skymburnesse, at the mouth of the Solway, to wage war against the Scots," who are described as "our enemies, and rebels, who have risen against us in war, and endeavour to lead and draw together by sea, men and arms and victuals from foreign parts, to maintain the said war against us." Simon de Beltoft and Henry de Kendall were ordered to cause the ships thus seized to be furnished and prepared with mariners and other fit and strong men, well and sufficiently armed, as also with victuals and other things necessary for war, and to give bonds or other securities for payment of money advanced for those purposes. A few years later the whole navy of the land, competently armed, was ordered to assemble at Liverpool and Chester to meet the king's son, Lionel, earl of Ulster and duke of Clarence, who was proceeding to Ireland to wage war against "our Irish enemies and rebels and others, who have in great manner destroyed our faithful subjects of the land aforesaid, and have wasted their lands and places, and cease not daily to commit such evil and wicked acts, and in process of time much greater are dreaded to be

done, unless their wickedness be soon restrained." In a subsequent order, all ships of burthen of twenty tons and upwards to two hundred tons in the port of Bristol, and in all ports and places from thence to the port of the town of Liverpool, are ordered to be brought to the said port of Liverpool; "so that they be there with all despatch possible, ready and equipped for the passage of our beloved and faithful William de Windsor, governor and guardian of our realm of Ireland, and of the men-at-arms and others about to depart on our service in the retinue of the said William, at his wages and expenses, and there to remain for the preservation and defence of our aforesaid realm, according to the order of the said William." The above are merely specimens of multitudes of orders of the same kind, directing the collecting of ships and the despatching of ships and men to Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, in almost every reign, from that of King John to that of Charles I., when the celebrated attempt to raise ship-money threw the whole kingdom into commotion.

In the reign of Edward III., when the borough of Liverpool was as prosperous as it ever was at any time during the first three hundred years of its existence, a valuation was made of all the royal rights in the borough, and in the neighbouring parks and places. On that occasion the jurors who made the inquiry reported that "there is at Liverpool a certain castle, whose trench and herbage are of the value of 2s. per year; and that there is there a certain dove-cote under the castle of the value of 6s. 8d.; and there is there a certain borough, in which are divers free tenants holding in burgage and paying yearly £8 8s.; and there is there a certain market held on Saturday, whose tolls are worth £10; and there is there a certain ferry beyond or across the Mersey, which is worth 40s.; and that there is there a windmill of the value of 26s., and a water-mill of the value of 24s.; and that there is there a certain fair held on the day of St. Martin, whose toll is of the value of 13s. 9d.; and that there is there a certain park, which is called Toxteth, whose herbage in summer is of the value of £11." These sums make a total of £35 0s. 5d. in the money of the reign of Edward III., equal to fifteen times as much, or to £525 6s. 3d. of money of this time. It will be seen from the above returns that the number of burgages was 168, each burgage being let at 1s. a year, and the whole producing a rental of 168s. Another return, however, of the same reign, giving the burgages at 164 and a fraction, slightly reduces the

number. After making allowance for the wives, children, and servants of burgesses, as well as for burgesses themselves, the population of Liverpool, even in the reign of Edward III., will not much exceed 1000 persons; probably it might be something between that and 1200.

Several grants of pavage, or of the right to raise money for the purpose of paving the streets of Liverpool, were made in the reign of Edward III., and of succeeding kings. This was then considered to be a part of the royal prerogative, or at least was submitted to as the most convenient method of obtaining money for those purposes. In a pavage grant made in the second year of the reign of Edward III. the honest men of the town of Liverpool were authorized to take certain customs in aid of the paving of the said town, for the three years following the date of the grant, at the end of which three years the said customs were altogether to cease and to be abolished. Amongst the tolls which were allowed to be collected for this purpose were—on every horse-load of grain,  $\frac{1}{4}d.$ , equal to about  $3d.$  of our present money; on every horse, mare, and cow sold,  $\frac{1}{2}d.$ , equal to about  $6d.$  modern money; on every hide,  $\frac{1}{4}d.$ ; on every twenty pigs,  $\frac{1}{2}d.$ ; on every hundred skins of sheep,  $1d.$ ; on every hundred skins of lambs, kids, hares, rabbits, foxes, cats, and squirrels,  $\frac{3}{4}d.$ ; on every quarter of salt,  $\frac{1}{4}d.$ ; on every horse-load of cloth,  $\frac{1}{2}d.$ ; on every whole piece of cloth of the value of  $4s.$ ,  $\frac{1}{2}d.$ ; on every hundred yards of worsted cloth,  $2d.$ ; on every hundred yards of linen cloth,  $\frac{1}{2}d.$ ; on every hundred yards of linen cloth, of Aylesham, in Norfolk, which was then one of the principal manufacturing towns in England,  $1d.$ , equal to  $1s.$  or  $1s. 3d.$ ; on every cart-load of sea-fish,  $4d.$ ; on every salmon,  $\frac{1}{4}d.$ ; on every horse-load of ashes,  $\frac{1}{2}d.$ ; on every horse-load of honey, which then supplied the place with sugar,  $1d.$ ; on every sack of wool, that being then the most valuable of the exports of the kingdom,  $2d.$ ; on every cart-load of bark,  $1d.$ ; on every cart-load of lead,  $1d.$ ; on every cask of wine,  $2d.$ ; on every chaldron of sea-coals,  $\frac{1}{2}d.$ ; on every cart-load of iron,  $1d.$ ; on every hundredweight avoirdupois, that is, of heavy goods not mentioned above,  $\frac{1}{4}d.$ ; on every weigh of tallow,  $1d.$ ; on every quarter of wool,  $2d.$ ; on every bale of cordovan leather,  $3d.$ ; on every hundredweight of tin, brass, and copper,  $2d.$ ; on every truss of merchandise exceeding the value of  $10s.$ ,  $\frac{1}{2}d.$ ; and on every other article not enumerated exceeding the value of  $2s.$ ,  $\frac{1}{4}d.$  The above articles constituted much the greater part of the merchandise that was



imported into and exported from the kingdom in the reign of Edward III. Of the articles exported, English wool formed at least five parts in six—the value of the wool exported in 1354 amounting to £195,978 in a total of £212,338, the latter sum being equal in modern money to £3,185,075. At that time the finest wools used in the manufactures of Florence and the other great manufacturing cities of Italy, as well as in those of Flanders, were produced on the sheep pastures of England.

In the reign of Henry IV., that king empowered Sir John Stanley, knight, one of the ablest and bravest of his supporters, and the founder of the family of the Stanleys of Lathom and Knowsley, from which the earls of Derby are descended, to build a fortified house within the borough of Liverpool. Sir John Stanley had recently been appointed chief lord or king from the Isle of Man; and it was to enable him to communicate more easily with his new dominions that this permission was granted to him. The house thus built was a strongly fortified place, known for many ages by the name of the tower, and had extensive gardens on the land side. It stood at the bottom of what was then called Bank Street, now known as Water Street, on the sea-shore, which at that time, before docks were built or thought of, extended up to the churchyard and tower of the Stanleys. A fragment of this tower, forming part of gateway, existed as recently as the year 1819. The following is the patent which authorized the building and the fortifying of the tower :—

“John de Stanley, Knight: the king, to all to whom the present letters shall come, greeting. Know ye that, of our special grace, we have granted and given license for us and our heirs, as much as in us lies, to our dear and faithful knight, John de Stanley, steward of our household, that he may embattle and fortify a certain house, which he has lately constructed of stone and lime in the town of Liverpool, and hold the same so embattled and fortified to him and to his heirs for ever without impeachment or disturbance of us, or of our heirs, or of our officers and ministers whomsoever. In testimony whereof, &c., witness the king at Westminster, the 15th day of January. By writ of Privy Seal.”

It is not known at what time the first works for the improvement of navigation were constructed at Liverpool. A great many grants were made by the crown, or rather permissions were given by the crown, to the inhabitants of sea-ports to construct quays and harbours. These were called keystone grants or “grants of

keyageum," and they seem to have included all works formed for the improvement of ports and harbours. The funds with which the works were constructed were raised by taxes on the trade of the respective ports, much after the manner of the pavage grants described above. No evidence exists of any such grant having been made to the port of Liverpool in old times, when what was called the old haven was constructed. But we have very particular information as to the manner in which the new haven was constructed, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. The following extract from the Corporation Records describes the operation fully:—

"*The New Haven.*—Robert Corbett, mayor, 1561.—Sunday being the 9th November this year, and next after the great wind and storms aforesaid, master mayor called the whole town, as many as then were at home together, unto the hall, where they councilled all in one consent and assent, for the foundation and making of a new haven, turning the fresh water out of the old pole [pool] into the new haven; and then and there before he rose, by the side of the bench, of his free will, gave a pystal of gold towards the beginning, which that day was good and current all England through for 5s. 10d.; although after, in few days, it was not so, but by proclamation in London, by the Queen's Majesty, &c., was prohibited and not current, &c.; also the same day, Mr. Sekerston did give, also all the rest of the congregation did give, so that in the whole was gathered that present day the whole sum of 13s. 9d. current, &c., and put into the custody of Richard Fazakarley and Robert Mosse, who were then appointed to be collectors for that time, &c. On the Monday morning then next, Mr. Mayor, and, of every house in the Water Street, one labourer went to the old pole, and there began to enterprize, digging, ditching, and busily labouring upon the foundation of the new haven; and so the Tuesday, of every house in the Castle Street was a labourer sent to the same work. Wednesday then next after came forth of every house in the Dale Street to the said new haven a labourer gratis. Thursday next after, the Juggler Street, with the More Street, Mylne Street, Chapel Street, every house sending a labourer, and this order continued until St. Nicholas day, then next after, gratis."—*Corporation Records.*

In the year 1565, the 7th Queen Elizabeth, a return was made of the householders and cottagers of the borough, when it was found that they did not amount to more than 138 men; and after making a liberal allowance of women and children, and lodgers, this does not represent a population of more than 1000 persons. The number of vessels at that time belonging to Liverpool was fifteen; their tonnage 268 tons; and the number of men and boys who worked them was eighty. There are particulars of the trade of Liverpool in the year 1586, the 28th of Elizabeth, from which it appears that the whole trade of Liverpool at that time was confined to Ireland; that the whole number of vessels that entered and left the port in three months of that year was twenty-seven. The articles which they imported were Irish yarn for the use of the Manchester manufacturers of linen cloth; sheep and deer skins, tanned hides, salted hides, and tallow. The articles exported were Yorkshire broad cloths and

narrow cloths, Manchester cottons, alum, madder, hops, small wares, coals, Manchester checks, wheat, barley, oat malt, fustian, Chester cups and trenchers, gloves, Kendall and Manchester cottons, Hallamshire (Sheffield) knives, coarse stockings, sail-cloth, and blankets. This is the beginning of a trade which in modern times has grown to an immense magnitude, having extended from the ports of Ireland to the whole world.

It was not until the earlier part of the seventeenth century that the port of Liverpool began to increase in trade and population; and even so late as the year 1635, Humphrey Chetham, who was then high sheriff of Lancashire, described Liverpool as poor and gone a begging, stated that it ought to pay very little towards ship-money on account of its poverty, and let it off with a payment of £25 as its share of a contribution of £3600 towards ship-money, raised in the counties of Lancaster and Chester. Yet some small progress had been made during that period, as it appears that the number of burgesses in the year 1620, the 18th James I., had increased to 245. Liverpool suffered greatly during the civil wars, having been besieged three times and twice taken by storm—once by the parliamentary forces under General Assheton, and a second time by the royalists under Prince Rupert. In the latter years of the Commonwealth there was some improvement, but the great progress of the port does not commence until the opening of the trade with America, about the time of the Restoration.

*The other Lancashire Boroughs.*—None of the Lancashire boroughs except Lancaster, Preston, Manchester, Wigan, Clitheroe, and Liverpool, had attained a commercial or trading position at the time of the Restoration which renders it desirable to give a separate notice of them in this chapter. We shall give full accounts of the origin and progress of all, in a subsequent part of this work.

*Distribution of Property in the reign of Charles I.*—There have been preserved, in the papers of the celebrated Humphrey Chetham, who was high sheriff of Lancashire at the time when ship-money was imposed by the government of Charles I., accounts of various sums of money raised in the two counties for that purpose. The first was a comparatively small sum, and was raised in the following proportions:—County of Chester, £300; city of Chester, £100; county of Lancaster, £475; borough of Lancaster, £8; borough of Liverpool, £15. In the following year a sum of between £3000 and £4000 was raised in the county of Lancaster alone, to which the different hundreds and

parliamentary boroughs were made to contribute in the following proportions:—Hundred of West Derby, £757; Salford, £490; Leyland, £315; Blackburn, £622; Amounderness, £625; and Lonsdale, £530. This was independent of the parliamentary boroughs of Lancashire, which were taxed as follows:—Lancaster, £30; Preston, £40; Wigan, £50; Liverpool, £25; Clitheroe, £7 10s; and Newton, £7 10s. These assessments of the Lancashire hundreds were made according to a long recognized scale of taxation; but in the case of the boroughs there was a meeting of the mayors of the different towns, and an inquiry as to the amount which each borough ought in fairness to pay. It will be seen from these figures how small the resources of the two counties were, down to the middle of the Stewart period. At this period, and amidst the excitement of the Commonwealth, the ancient history of Lancashire and Cheshire ends, and the modern history of the two counties commences.

END OF VOL. I.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

## CHAPTER I.

### DESCRIPTION OF THE NORTH-WESTERN DIVISION OF ENGLAND, CONSISTING OF THE COUNTIES OF LANCASTER AND CHESTER.

	PAGE		PAGE
The Object of this Work—to trace the Rise and Progress of Society in the Palatine Counties of Lancaster and Chester, . . . . .	1	Wenning, the Grets, the Roeburn, the Hindburn, with Leck and Artle Becks—the River Wyre, with its Water-shed, and its tributaries, the Giseldale, the Calder (the first of three rivers of that name found in Lancashire), and the Brock—the Ribbles with its Water-shed, its Salmon fishery, and its tributaries, the Hodder, Langden, and Loud, on the North; and the Rivers Calder, Bran, Don, Colne Water, Pendle, and other brooks, the Darwen, the Raddlesworth, the Douglas, the Yarrow, the Lostock, and the Tawd, on the South—the River Calder, the third river of that name rising in Lancashire, and the only Lancashire stream flowing into the German Ocean—the River Mersey, with its two great tributaries, the Irwell and Weaver, and the Water-shed of their valleys; the River Mersey; the Main stream of the Mersey, from the junction of the Etherow and the Goyt, to the Tide-water near Warrington. The Streams that enter the Mersey on the North, or Lancashire side:—The River Tame—The River Irwell, from its springs in Rosendale Forest to its junction with the Mersey—the River Medlock—the River Irk—the River Roch—the Rivers Tonge and Coal—Eagle Brook, Bradshaw Brook, the Rosendale Brook, Glaze Brook, Sankey Brook, Ditton Brook, and the River Alt. The Streams that enter the Mersey on the South, or Cheshire side:—The River Bollin—the River Weaver, with the Dane, the Wheelock, and many smaller Streams—the River Gowy—the River Birket—the River Dee, from Bala Lake to the Sea. The tributaries of the Dee, from the North and West; from the South and East, . . . . .	80
The Mineral Wealth of Lancashire and Cheshire. The Coal-field of Lancashire and Cheshire: its extent, richness, and value for industrial purposes—The Upper or Manchester Coal-field—the Middle or principal Coal-field—the Lower or most Ancient Coal-field—Total Thickness of the Three Divisions. The Origin and Mode of Production of the Lancashire Coal-field. Natural Sections of the Coal-field on the banks of the Irwell, the Etherow, the Goyt, Poynton Brook, the Tame, and the Medlock. The Strata and Seams of Coal in the Upper Coal-field, near Manchester. The Strata and Seams of Coal in the Middle Coal-field, near Manchester, Dukinfield, Ashton, Oldham, St. Helen's, and Wigan. The Strata and Seams of Coal in the Lower Coal-field, near Chorley, Bacup, Burnley, Rochdale, New Mills, and Macclesfield, . . . . .	106		
The Salt-field of Cheshire:—Its extent and richness, and the value of its Produce for Manufactures, Commerce, and Domestic use. Description of the Valleys of the Weaver, the Dane, and the Wheelock. The Produce of the different Salt districts; the Working of Salt Mines and Brine Pits; Opinions as to the Origin of the Cheshire and other Salt-fields, &c., . . . . .	139		
The Iron Mines of Lancashire. Extensive Deposits of Iron Ore in South Lancashire, in the Coal Measures. Great Richness and Value of the Hematite Iron Ores of Furness, North Lancashire, . . . . .	155		
The Object of this Work—to trace the Rise and Progress of Society in the Palatine Counties of Lancaster and Chester, . . . . .	1		
Introductory Sketch, . . . . .	2		
Position of Lancashire and Cheshire on the North-western Coast of England, . . . . .	8		
Approaches to the Coasts of Lancashire and Cheshire from the Atlantic, by the North and South Passages. The Tides and prevailing Winds of the Channel and the Ocean; the Bays, Estuaries, and Harbours of Lancashire and Cheshire:—Morecambe Bay; the Estuaries of the Duddon, the Leven, and the Kent; and the Harbour of the Pile Fouldry—Lancaster Bay; the Estuary of the Lune; and the Port of Lancaster—the Estuary of the Wyre; and the Port and Harbour of Fleetwood—the Coast of North Lancashire, and the Watering-place of Blackpool; the Estuary of the Ribbles; the Port and Harbour of Preston; and the Watering-place of Lytham—the Coast of South Lancashire, and the Watering-places of Southport and Waterloo—Liverpool Bay; the Estuary of the Mersey; the Port and Harbour of Liverpool and Birkenhead; and the Harbours of Garston, Widnes, Rainern, and Frodsham; Ellesmere Port; and the Ferries of the Mersey—the Sea-coast of Cheshire, and the Watering-places of New Brighton and Hoylake; the Estuary of the Dee; and the Ancient Port and City of Chester, . . . . .	9		
The Fisheries on the Coasts of the two Counties, . . . . .	25		
The Soil, Climate, Vegetable and Animal Products of Lancashire and Cheshire:—The Alluvial Plain along the Coast of Lancashire, from the Lune to the Mersey, and its Soil and Products—the New Red Sandstone Plain and Hills, extending from Lower Furness to the Southern border of Cheshire—the Soil of the Coal-fields of Lancashire and Cheshire—the Limestone Soils in the Valleys of the Ribbles and the Lune, and around Morecambe Bay—the Soils on the Hills of the Millstone-git Formation—the Soils on the Silurian Rocks of Higher Furness. Description of the Mountain Ridges bounding Lancashire on the North and East, and Cheshire on the East, . . . . .	30		
The Climate of Lancashire and Cheshire, in Summer and Winter, . . . . .	58		
The Vegetable Products of the two Counties:—the Grasses; Grain Crops; Root Crops; Garden Produce; Shrubs and Forest Trees, . . . . .	62		
The Animal Products:—The Breeds of Animals, including Cattle, Sheep, Horses, and Swine, with Poultry and Game. Account of the Ravages of the Rinder-Pest or Cattle Plague, . . . . .	69		
The Rivers, Streams, Lakes, Rainfall, and Water-power of the two Counties:—The River Duddon, its course, and the valley which it drains—Conistun Water, and the River Crake—the River Brathay—Windermere Lake, and the River Leven—the River Kent—the Keer—the River Lune, its course, and the valley which it drains; its Salmon fishery; and its tributaries, the			

	PAGE	PAGE	
Copper Ores of Coniston, Higher Furness; and of Alderley Edge, Cheshire. . . . .	158		
Sand for Glass Furnaces; and Moulding. . . . .	159		
The Brick-clay of Lancashire and Cheshire:—Its extensive use for Building purposes and Tile Draining; value of House, Warehouse, and Mill Property. . . . .	160		
The Rocks and Stones of Lancashire and Cheshire:—Red and White Sandstones; the Magnesian Limestones of Ardwick, Bedford, Bispham, and Lower Furness: Their Composition and Uses—Limestones, Millstone-Grit, Slates and Rocks of the Silurian formations. Comparative hardness and power of resisting pressure of the different kinds of stone and rocks forming the framework and foundation of the two Counties, and used in the construction of public buildings. . . . .	162		
Natural Products of the different Districts of Lancashire and Cheshire, and their influence on the Population, Industry, and Wealth of each. . . . .	169		
The County of Lancaster—Natural Products, Wealth, and Population of the different Districts:—Ulverston and Higher and Lower Furness; Lancaster, or Lonsdale south of the Sands, and Borough of Lancaster; Hun-			
		dred of Amounderness—Districts of Garstang, Fylde, and Preston, and Borough of Preston; the Hundred of Blackburn—the Districts of Clitheroe, Burnley, and Borough; Blackburn and Borough; Haslingden and the Towns of Haslingden, Bacup, and Accrington; Leyland Hundred and Chorley District, Salford Hundred—Districts of Bolton and Borough; Bury and Borough; Rochdale and Borough; Oldham and Borough; Ashton-under-Lyne and Borough; the City and District of Manchester and District of Chorlton; Salford and Borough; Barton on Irwell; Leigh; the Hundred of West Derby—Warrington and Borough; Wigan and Borough; the Districts of Ormskirk, Prescott, St. Helena, and West Derby; and the Port and Borough of Liverpool. . . . .	170
		The County of Chester; the Districts of Stockport and Borough; Macclesfield and Borough; Congleton and Town; Nantwich and the Towns of Crewe and Nantwich; Northwich and the Town; Altringham; Chester and the City; Runcorn and the Town; Wirral and the Borough and Port of Birkenhead. . . . .	199
		Property and Income of Lancashire and Cheshire. . . . .	206

## CHAPTER II.

## LANCASHIRE AND CHESHIRE UNDER THE ROMANS, SAXONS, AND DANES.

Discovery of Britain by the Merchants and Seamen of Tyre and Carthage. . . . .	207	Ribchester; Richness and Abundance of Roman Remains found at Ribchester, and at other points on the River Ribble. . . . .	271
Commerce of the People of Massilia, or Marseilles, with Britain in early times. . . . .	208	The Roman Alanna, or Longovic, now Lancaster; Account of the Remains of the Ancient Walls, Buildings, and other objects of Roman Antiquity. . . . .	277
The First Roman Expeditions to Britain by Julius Cæsar, Strabo's Account of Britain. . . . .	209	The Roman Station of Bremetonacæ, now Burrow or Overburrow, on the River Lune. . . . .	283
The Invasion and Conquest of the Southern part of Britain by the Romans. . . . .	212	Decline and Fall of Roman Power in Britain, and Departure of the Roman Legions. . . . .	284
The Insurrection of the Britons under Queen Boadicea. . . . .	216		
Conquest of the Cornavii and the Brigantes, the British Tribes inhabiting the districts forming the present Counties of Lancaster and Chester, by Julius Agricola. . . . .	219		
Ptolemy's Account of the Country of the Cornavii and the Brigantes. . . . .	222		
The Roman Roads in Lancashire and Cheshire. . . . .	227		
The great Roman Road from the Coast of Kent, through London, to Chester (Deva), Manchester (Mamucium), York (Eboracum), and the Roman Wall. . . . .	228		
The Roman Roads from Chester. . . . .	229		
The Roman Road from Middlewich to Manchester, and from Manchester to the Wall. . . . .	232		
The Roman Road from Northwich, through Warrington, Preston, and Lancaster. . . . .	235		
The Roman Road from the River Wyre and the Fylde, by Preston, Ribchester, and Olicana, to York, and the Humber. . . . .	238		
The Roman Road from Manchester to Wigan. . . . .	241		
The Roman Road through the district of Furness. . . . .	241		
The Cities, Towns, and Stations of the Romans in the present Lancashire and Cheshire. . . . .	241		
The Roman City of Deva or Devana, now Chester; the Walls, the Streets, the Bows, and the numerous Baths, Mosaic Pavements, Antiquities, Altars, and Coins, belonging to the Roman period, found at Chester. . . . .	242		
The Agriculture, Mines, Trade, and Commerce of the Romans. . . . .	256		
The Roman Stations at Northwich and at Kinderton, or Condate. . . . .	262		
Meeting of the Roman Roads at Condate. . . . .	263		
The Roman Mansation, or Mamucium, now Manchester; Advantageous Position of the Roman Station; the Garrison chiefly composed of Frisian Auxiliary Troops; Account of the numerous Remains of Roman Antiquity found at Manchester. . . . .	264		
Roman Station on the Douglas, near Wigan. . . . .	271		
The great Roman and British Station of Rihodunum, or			
		THE ANGLES AND SAXONS IN LANCASHIRE AND CHESHIRE.	
		Condition of the North-western Division of England after the Departure of the Romans. . . . .	287
		Account of the Saxons or Anglo-Saxons, and of their Origin, Places of Abode, and Naval Expeditions. . . . .	287
		Great Migrations of the German and Gothic Races, in consequence of the irruption of the Huns into Germany, Battles between the Saxons and the Britons on the Banks of the River Douglas. . . . .	292
		Formation of the Anglian or Saxon Kingdom of Northumberland, extending southward to the Humber and the Mersey. . . . .	294
		Formation of the Anglian or Saxon Kingdom of Mercia, extending northward from the Thames and the Severn to the Humber and the Mersey. . . . .	294
		Manners and Habits of the Anglian and Saxon Tribes, and their gradual spread over the whole of England. . . . .	294
		Advance of Ethelfrid, the Anglian or Saxon King of Northumberland, to the City of Chester, and Battle with the Britons. . . . .	295
		Introduction of Christianity among the Angles and Saxons by Augustine and Paulinus, and Disputes with the British Christians. . . . .	296
		Edwin, the First Christian King of Northumberland, Conquers the Meravian Islands, or Anglesæ and Man, and is conquered by Penda, Pagan King of Mercia. . . . .	299
		Oswald, son of Ethelfrid, restores the Independence of the Kingdom of Northumberland, and the Profession of the Christian Religion; but is ultimately Defeated and Killed by Penda, at Maserfield, supposed to be Makerfield, near Winwick and Warrington, in Lancashire. . . . .	301
		Oswy, the Brother of Oswald, Defeats and Kills Penda at Wynweide. . . . .	303



PAGE	PAGE		
Introduction of Christianity into the Kingdom of Mercia, and Establishment of the Bishopric of Lichfield, whose Jurisdiction extended over great part of the Midland and North-western Districts of England, . . . . .	305	Death of Alfred the Great, followed by a General Rising of the Northern Danes, . . . . .	313
Growth of the Christian and Saxon Kingdom of Mercia, . . . . .	305	Edward the Elder, the son of Alfred the Great, Defeats the Northumbrian Danes, . . . . .	313
Chester taken by Offa, King of Mercia, . . . . .	305	Memory of the Danish Chiefs, Agmund, Orms, and Gar, still preserved in names of Lancashire Hundreds and Towns, . . . . .	313
St. Werburg, her Fams and Shrine at Chester, . . . . .	305	Line of Fortresses from Chester to Manchester founded by Edward the Elder and Ethelred, the Queen of Mercia, England again Invaded by an immense army of Danes and other nations, commanded by Anlaf, the Danish Chief of Dublin, who are defeated with great loss at Brunenburgh by King Athelstane and Edmund Atheling, the grandsons of Alfred the Great, . . . . .	315
Numerous Villa, or Villages, built by them in Lancashire and Cheshire, . . . . .	305	Disputed position of Brunenburgh, . . . . .	316
The Danes and Northmen, . . . . .	306	Authority of Athelstane and his immediate successors established over the whole of England, . . . . .	316
Their extensive Conquests and Settlements in Lancashire, Cheshire, and all the Northern and Eastern Counties of England, . . . . .	306	Cheshire, and the Country between the Ribble and the Mersey, Governed by the Saxon Earls of Mercia, some of whom took the title of Earls of Chester, . . . . .	317
Towns and Villages founded and peopled by them, . . . . .	306	King Edgar at Chester received Homage of the Kings of the Western Isles and Seas, . . . . .	318
The River Mersey becomes the boundary between the Danish Kingdom of Northumberland and the Saxon Kingdom of Mercia, . . . . .	308	Death of Edgar followed by Internal Confusion and the loss of the Navy constructed by Alfred, Athelstane, and Edgar, . . . . .	318
England divided between the Saxons and the Danes, by Treaty between Alfred the Great and Guthorn, King of the Danes, . . . . .	310	The Danes, under their Kings Sweyn and Canute, again invade England, . . . . .	319
Watling Street, the Boundary Line of the two Kingdoms, nearly from London to Chester, . . . . .	310	Feeble Rule of Edward the Confessor, . . . . .	319
The Treaty kept during the Life of Guthorn, . . . . .	310	The Crown assumed by Harold on his death, . . . . .	319
Hasten, a Northern Danish Sea-king, invades England after the death of Guthorn, . . . . .	310	England claimed by William the Conqueror, as Heir to the Throne, under the Will of Edward the Confessor, . . . . .	319
Campaigns and Numerous Battles between the Armies of Alfred and Hasten, . . . . .	310	Battle of Hastings (A.D. 1066) and Overthrow of the Saxon Kings, . . . . .	319
Chester taken by the Danes, but recovered by Alfred the Great, . . . . .	311		
Hasten driven out of England with great loss, . . . . .	312		
Alfred Builds a Fleet, the Commencement of the British Navy, . . . . .	313		

## CHAPTER III.

## LANCASHIRE AND CHESHIRE FROM THE NORMAN CONQUEST TO THE REVOLUTION OF 1688.

Creation of the Norman Earldom of Chester, . . . . .	321	The Estates of Earl Roger Pictavensis again forfeited, . . . . .	339
Hugh Lupus made Earl of Chester by William the Conqueror, . . . . .	322	The Honour of Lancaster, with the other Possessions of Roger Pictavensis, and the Estates of his brother-in-law, the Earl of Morton, or Mortaigne, given to Stephen, Earl of Morton and Boulogne, by his uncle Henry I., . . . . .	339
Cheshire made a County Palatine, . . . . .	322	Earl Stephen founds the Abbey of St. Mary of Furness, in North Lancashire, . . . . .	340
Richard, the Second Earl of Chester, drowned at sea, on his return from Normandy, . . . . .	325	Stephen seizes the Crown, on the death of King Henry I. as the nearest male heir of the King, . . . . .	340
Randolf, or Ranulf first, surnamed De Meschines, succeeds to the Earldom of Chester, . . . . .	326	Long War between the Supporters of Stephen and of Matilda, daughter of Henry I., . . . . .	340
Randolf, or Ranulf, the next Earl of Chester, named De Gernons or De Briseard, . . . . .	326	William de Blois, Earl of Morton, succeeds to the Honour of Lancaster and the other private Estates of Stephen, . . . . .	341
Extensive Grants made to this Earl by King Stephen, and afterwards by Henry II, the first King of the Plantagenet line, . . . . .	327	The Honour of Lancaster passes to King Henry II., on the death of William de Blois, . . . . .	341
Hugh Kevelioc succeeds to the Earldom of Chester, Ranulf De Blundeville becomes Earl of Chester, and holds the Earldom for Fifty-one years; the land between the Mersey and the Ribble granted to him by King Henry III.; his extensive Purchases of lands in Lancashire; and his Death in the year 1233, . . . . .	329	The Honour of Lancaster, with all the Estates of the Earls of Morton, granted to Prince John, on the accession of his brother Richard I. to the Throne; but forfeited by his Treason, . . . . .	342
John, the Scot, the nephew of Earl Ranulf de Blundeville, succeeds to the Earldom of Chester, but dies in the year 1238, . . . . .	331	Fines imposed by Richard I. on the Supporters of Prince John in Lancashire, . . . . .	344
The Earldom of Chester United to the Crown, by King Henry III., and given to his son, Paines Edward, afterwards King Edward I., . . . . .	332	King John succeeds to the Throne, . . . . .	346
Account of the Estates of the Earldom of Chester, in the reign of Edward I., . . . . .	332	Grants Charters to Knights and Thanes of Lancashire to Kill Game in their own Woods, . . . . .	346
History of the Honour, Earldom, and Duchy of Lancaster, The Honour of Lancaster, and other great estates, given by William the Conqueror to Earl Roger de Montgomery, known as Roger Pictavensis, . . . . .	336	King John requires the Manor of Liverpool, and offers all the Rights possessed by the inhabitants of any free Borough on the Sea, to those taking Burgages there, . . . . .	347
Account of the Family of the De Montgomerys, . . . . .	336	The Honour of Lancaster passes to King Henry III., on the Death of his father King John, . . . . .	347
The Estates of Earl Roger Pictavensis forfeited to the Crown, . . . . .	337	Henry III. Grants all his Lands between the Ribble and the Mersey to Ranulf de Blundeville, Earl of Chester, . . . . .	348
The Estates of Earl Roger Pictavensis restored to the Crown, . . . . .	337	Amounts Paid in Tallage or Tax in the reign of Henry III. by the boroughs of Lancaster, Liverpool, Preston, Salford, &c., . . . . .	351
The Estates of Earl Roger restored by William Rufus, . . . . .	338		



	PAGE		PAGE
On the Death of Ranulf de Blundeville, Earl of Chester, his Lancashire and Staffordshire Estates granted to Agnes de Ferrers, his sister, and to William de Ferrers, Earl of Derby, the husband of Agnes, . . . . .	351	Blanche Plantagenet, the wife of John of Gaunt, Earl of Richmond, . . . . .	367
On the Death of William and Agnes de Ferrers, Earl and Countess of Derby, in the year 1247, their Estates between the Ribbles and the Mersey descend to their son William de Ferrers, Earl of Derby, . . . . .	352	Henry of Bolingbroke, the son of John of Gaunt, succeeds his father, John of Gaunt, but is banished from the kingdom by the youthful Richard II. Returns from banishment, seizes the Crown, and is acknowledged King by Parliament, with the title of Henry IV., . . . .	369
The King grants the right of Free Warren to William de Ferrers, Earl of Derby, on his Demesnes in Liverpool, West Derby, Salford, Bolton, Chorley, . . . . .	353	Sir John Stanley of Lathom, commander of the forces in Ireland, recognizes Henry IV. in that country, and supports him in the great insurrection of the Percys of Northumberland; receives the Kingdom of Man for his services, . . . . .	371
King Henry III. grants to the same Earl the right to hold a Market and Fair at Balton, and to the Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield the right to hold a Market and Fair at Heywood, . . . . .	354	The estates of the Duchy of Lancaster formed into a separate estate from the Crown lands, and held by a distinct title, . . . . .	372
Robert de Ferrers, Earl of Derby, a boy eleven years of age, succeeds his father, . . . . .	355	Duchy of Lancaster and Earldom of Chester held by King Henry V., . . . . .	372
Robert de Ferrers, Earl of Derby, joins in the insurrection commenced by Simon de Montfort and the other Barons; is defeated by the King's forces, and forfeits the whole of his Lancashire Estates, . . . . .	356	Duchy of Lancaster held by Henry VI., . . . . .	373
King Henry III. confers the forfeited Estates of Robert de Ferrers, Earl of Derby, and Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, on his own younger son Edmund Plantagenet, whom he soon after creates Earl of Lancaster; commencement of the power and wealth of the House of Lancaster, . . . . .	357	Commencement of the wars of York and Lancaster, . . . .	373
Edmund, the First Earl of Lancaster, of the Plantagenet Family, dies at Bayonne, . . . . .	359	Great influence of the Stanleys; their connection with the Houses of York and Neville, . . . . .	375
Thomas, the Second Earl of Lancaster, succeeds his father, and adds greatly to the Wealth of the House of Lancaster by marrying Alicia de Lacey, the only child and sole heir of Henry de Lacey, Constable of Chester and Earl of Lincoln, . . . . .	359	March of the Yorkist army through Lancashire and Cheshire, to join the Mortimers on the borders of Wales, . . . .	376
Thomas, Earl of Lancaster, engages in rebellion against his cousin Edward II., is defeated, tried, and executed in his own Castle, at Pontefract, Yorkshire, . . . . .	359	Visit of Queen Margaret and the young Earl of Chester to the city of Chester, . . . . .	377
Henry Plantagenet, the younger brother of Earl Thomas, recovers all the honours and estates of the family, . . . .	363	Great victory of the Yorkist army at Drayton, on the borders of Cheshire and Shropshire, . . . . .	377
Henry, the son of the above Earl Henry of Lancaster, raised to the rank of Earl of Derby during his father's life, . . . . .	365	Heavy losses amongst the gentry of the two counties in that battle, . . . . .	378
Henry, Earl of Lancaster, raised to the rank of Duke of Lancaster by King Henry III., with Palatine Rights in the County of Lancaster, "given as freely and as fully as the Earl of Chester, within the said County of Chester, is known to have," . . . . .	366	Victory of the Lancastrian army at Wakefield, and death of Richard, Duke of York, . . . . .	378
Henry, Duke of Lancaster, dies in the year 1361, and the whole of his estates pass to his daughter Lady		Decisive victory of the Yorkist party at the battle of Towton, and accession of King Edward IV. to the throne, . . . . .	378
		The Duchy of Lancaster and all its possessions settled on the House of York, . . . . .	379
		Large grants from the Duchy made to Richard, Duke of Gloucester, the brother of King Edward IV., . . . .	380
		Usurpation of the throne, and murder of the young Princes by Richard, . . . . .	381
		Landing of Henry Tudor, Earl of Richmond, at Milford Haven, and advance into England, . . . . .	381
		Joined by Lord Stanley and Sir William Stanley, with the forces of Lancashire, Cheshire, and North Wales, . . . .	381
		The Victory of Bosworth-field decided by the advance of Lord Stanley, . . . . .	382
		Henry crowned King, as Henry VII., by Lord Stanley, who is himself raised by the new king to the rank of Earl of Derby, . . . . .	382

## CHAPTER IV.

## LANCASHIRE AND CHESHIRE UNDER THE HOUSE OF TUDOR.

The Claims of the Houses of Lancaster and York to the throne of England, combined by the marriage of Henry Tudor with Elizabeth Plantagenet, . . . . .	383	Execution of Sir William Stanley and seizing of his estate of Holt, and his great wealth and estates, by the king, . . . . .	387
Attempts to raise insurrections, . . . . .	383	Visit of King Henry VII. to Cheshire and Lancashire in the year 1496. His progress through the two counties, and his visits to Chester, Knowsley, Lathom House, Warrington, Manchester, and Macclesfield, . . . . .	387
Landing of Lambert Simnel, the pretended Earl of Warwick, in North Lancashire, . . . . .	384	Raising of two reasonable aids throughout the kingdom, producing £40,000, of which Lancashire contributes £317 2s. 3½d., . . . . .	388
Lord Strange, the son of Thomas, the first Earl of Derby, joins the army of King Henry VII., . . . . .	385	Accession of Henry VIII. to the Throne, . . . . .	388
Defeat of the army of Lambert Simnel, at Stokefield, near Newark, . . . . .	385	Invasion of England by James IV., King of Scotland, . . . .	388
The estates of Sir Thomas Broughton of Furness, given to the Earl of Derby, . . . . .	385	Total defeat of James' army at the battle of Flodden-field, . . . .	389
Landing of the second Pretender, Perkin Warbeck, claiming to be Richard, Duke of York, in the south of England, . . . . .	385	Sir Edward Stanley raised to the rank of Lord Montagu for his great services in that battle, . . . . .	389
Sir William Stanley, the brother of the first Earl of Derby, tried for High Treason, and found guilty, for saying, that "If he was sure that Perkin Warbeck was King Edward's son, he would never bear arms against him," . . . .	386	Quarrel of Henry VIII. with the Pope, . . . . .	389
		Suppression of Monasteries. Sketch of the religious houses suppressed in the counties of Lancaster and Chester, . . . .	390
		Insurrection of Roman Catholics in the North of England, known as "the Pilgrimage of Grace," . . . . .	394

	PAGE		PAGE
The insurrection suppressed in Lancashire by Edward, the third Earl of Derby, . . . . .	394	Earl of Northumberland, and Nevill, Earl of Westmoreland; defeated and checked in Lancashire by the Earl of Derby and Lord Montague, . . . . .	402
Wars with Scotland in 1544 and 1547. Desperate battle of Musselburgh, . . . . .	395	Great military masters in Lancashire and Cheshire, . . . . .	406
Conflicts of religion in the reign of Queen Mary. Lancashire and Cheshire martyrs put to death in the Marian persecution, . . . . .	397	Preparations to invade England by Philip II., of Spain, Account of the fitting out of the Spanish Armada, forwarded to the English Government by Humfray Brooke, Merchant of Liverpool, . . . . .	407
Musters of Lancashire Forces in the year 1553, . . . . .	398	Number of armed and able Men in Lancashire and Cheshire, . . . . .	409
Accession of Queen Elizabeth in 1558, . . . . .	399	Defeat of the Spanish Armada, . . . . .	411
Military musters in the year 1560, . . . . .	401	Expected Landing in North Lancashire, . . . . .	412
Insurrection of the Roman Catholics, known as "the Rising of the North," under the command of Percy, . . . . .	401	Close of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, . . . . .	413

## CHAPTER V.

## LANCASHIRE AND CHESHIRE UNDER THE HOUSE OF STUART.

Accession of James I. to the Throne of England, . . . . .	414	The Raising of Ship-money in Lancashire and Cheshire, List of Justices of the Peace for the County of Lancaster in the year 1636, . . . . .	438
Lancashire and Cheshire Gentlemen knighted by James I. Religious discords prevalent in the two Counties, . . . . .	417	General Rising in Scotland against the Measures of Archbishop Laud and other advisers of King Charles, . . . . .	440
Original Account of the Discovery of the Gunpowder Plot, . . . . .	419	Letter of the King to William, the sixth Earl of Derby, and to his son James, Lord Strange, ordering them to raise the Military Force of Lancashire and Cheshire, . . . . .	441
Increased Persecution of the Roman Catholics, . . . . .	421	Letter of James, Lord Strange, to William Farrington, Esq., requiring him to raise Forces in the Hundred of Leyland, . . . . .	443
Order to Disarm all Recants not attending the Service of the Church, . . . . .	422	Similar Request to Sir George Gerard, of Halsall, to raise Forces in the Hundred of West Derby, . . . . .	444
Apprehension and Prosecution of the Pendle Forest and the Samsbury Witches, . . . . .	423	Similar Request to Sir Cecil Trafford, of Trafford, with regard to the Military Forces of the Salford Hundred, . . . . .	445
Trial and Execution of the Pendle Forest Witches, . . . . .	428	Purchase of Arms and Gunpowder by Lord Strange, by order of the King, . . . . .	446
King James' Progress through Lancashire in the year 1617; his Visits to Hornby castle, Lancaster, Myerscough, Preston, Houghton tower, Lathom house, Bewsey hall, Warrington, Halton, Chester, and Nantwich, . . . . .	431	Meeting of Royalists at Wigan, and arming of the Forces of the two Counties, . . . . .	449
James' Rebuke to the Puritans of Lancashire, and the issuing of "The Book of Sports," . . . . .	435		
Sale of the Royal Estates and those of the Duchy of Lancaster by James and Charles I., . . . . .	436		

## CHAPTER VI.

## THE GREAT CIVIL WAR.

The King leaves London, and the Royalist and Parliamentary Parties both prepare for War, . . . . .	451	Parliament passes a Vote of Thanks to the Inhabitants of the Town of Manchester, "for their valiant resisting of the late Lord Strange, and now Earl of Derby, and to Encourage them in their valour which they have showed for their own Defence," . . . . .	467
Both Parties take Arms in different parts of the two Counties, . . . . .	457	James, Earl of Derby, and the Lancashire Royalists are Ordered to join the King at Shrewsbury; and take part in the Great Battle of Edge Hill, in Warwickshire, . . . . .	468
James, Lord Strange, the representative of his Father, the Lord Lieutenant, and of the King, Collects a Large Force and Seizes on the Arms and Ammunition of the County at Lancaster, Preston, Chorley, and Liverpool, . . . . .	457	The Earl of Derby returns to Lancashire, and raises Fresh Forces in support of the King, . . . . .	469
The Parliamentary Party obtain possession of the Arms and Ammunition of the County at Manchester and Blackburn, . . . . .	457	Comparative Strength of the Royalist and Parliamentary Parties in different districts of Lancashire and Cheshire, . . . . .	470
Attempt of James, Lord Strange, to obtain Possession of the Arms and Ammunition of the County at Manchester, resisted by Sir Thomas Stanley, Bart., of Bickerstaffe; Sir George Booth, Bart., of Dunham Massey; Robert Holland, of Heaton; Ralph Assheton, Esq., Middleton, and other Parliamentary deputy-lieutenants, and by the whole of the trained bands of the Salford Hundred, . . . . .	458	The Parliamentary Forces of Salford Hundred assemble at Manchester, under the command of Sir John Seaton, and march out to attack the Royal Garrisons of Preston and Lancashire, both of which places they take, . . . . .	473
The First Siege of Manchester, being the Commencement of the Great Civil War, . . . . .	458	The Earl of Derby attacks the Parliamentary Fortifications at Bolton, but is repulsed after a very severe battle, . . . . .	474
Lord Strange compelled to Retire from before Manchester, Lord Strange raises a larger Army and Advances on Manchester, . . . . .	463	The Earl of Derby marches northward and Recaptures both Preston and Lancaster, . . . . .	476
James, Lord Strange, becomes the seventh Earl of Derby by the Death of his Father, Earl William; Summons Manchester to Surrender, and Commences the Second Siege; all his attacks are repulsed, and he is again compelled to Retire, . . . . .	465	The whole of the Royalist Forces of the County assemble at Preston, under the Earl of Derby, and the Parliamentary Forces assemble around Blackburn, under Colonel Assheton, . . . . .	477
		The Royalists advance into the Blackburn Hundred, are attacked by the Parliamentary Forces, and are driven back with very heavy loss. Retreat and dispersion of the Royal Army into the garrison towns of the county, and to Lathom house, . . . . .	478

	PAGE		PAGE
Charlotte de la Tremouille, Countess of Derby, refuses to surrender Lathom house, and Defends it for nearly Two Years against the Parliamentary Forces, . . .	484	Prince Rupert retreats through Lancashire and Cheshire, Liverpool Retaken after a third siege, by the Parliamentary Army under Sir John Meldrum, . . .	501
Advance of Prince Rupert into Cheshire and Lancashire, Account of the military movements in the County of Chester, previous to the Advance of Prince Rupert, . . .	484	Renewal of the siege of Lathom house. Long and Resolute Defence; final Surrender, after Two Years' Resistance, Siege of Chester resumed by the Parliamentary Forces. Long and Gallant Defence of the Royalist Party, . . .	502
Commencement of the Civil War at Chester, . . .	484	King Charles attempts to raise the siege of Chester with the Royal Cavalry, which is Defeated by the Parliamentary Cavalry on Rowton Heath, . . .	505
Visit of King Charles I. and his son Charles to Chester, Nantwich occupied and fortified for the Parliament, by Sir William Brereton, . . .	486	The Defence of Chester continued to February 16, 1646, when the Royalists Surrendered, after having sustained a Three Years' Siege, . . .	507
Defeat of the Royal Forces at Middlewich, and their Retreat to Chester, . . .	486	Complete Overthrow of the Royal Cause in every part of England, and Triumph of Cromwell and Parliament, . . .	508
The City of Chester Strongly Fortified, and Held by the Royalist Party throughout the War, . . .	487	Rise of the Presbyterians of Scotland in Defence of the King and the Covenant, . . .	508
Landing of the Irish Royalist Army at Chester, . . .	488	Large Scottish Army under the Duke of Hamilton marches into England, . . .	508
Lord Byron appointed to the Command of the King's Forces in Cheshire; Overruns the greater part of the County; takes Beeton castle, Northwich, and Middlewich, and lays siege to Nantwich, . . .	489	Cromwell, with a powerful army, attacks the Duke of Hamilton at Preston in Lancashire, and destroys or captures the whole of his force, . . .	509
Advance of Sir Thomas Fairfax and General Assheton with the Parliamentary Forces of Yorkshire and Lancashire, The Royalists defeated at Nantwich by Sir Thomas Fairfax, and driven back into Chester, where they are again besieged, . . .	498	Miserable condition of Lancashire at the close of the Campaign, from plague and famine, . . .	514
Dangerous position of the Royal Cause in Lancashire and Cheshire, . . .	493	Another Scottish army marches through Lancashire and Cheshire, under the command of Charles II. and his Scottish Generals, and is defeated at Worcester, . . .	516
The King urged to send an Army to raise the siege of Chester and of Lathom house, . . .	494	James, Earl of Derby, lands from the Isle of Man, and raises the Royalists of Lancashire; but is defeated near Wigan, . . .	518
Prince Rupert advances Northward with Ten Thousand Men, . . .	496	The Earl of Derby joins the King's army at Worcester, is taken prisoner, tried for High Treason against the Commonwealth, and beheaded at Bolton, . . .	518
Raises the siege of Newark and Chester, and advances into Lancashire by way of Stockport, . . .	496	The rising of Sir George Booth, and the Royalists and Presbyterians of Lancashire and Cheshire, after the death of Oliver Cromwell, . . .	519
Prince Rupert Attacks Bolton and Takes it after a Storm, Lays siege to Liverpool, and Takes it after an Obsolete Resistance, . . .	497	The army under General Monk declares for the King, who is restored and crowned as Charles II., . . .	520
Advances rapidly to York and Raises the Siege of that City, but is afterwards Defeated in the Great Battle of Marston Moor, near York, . . .	500		

## CHAPTER VII.

## PROGRESS OF SOCIETY IN LANCASHIRE AND CHESHIRE, FROM THE TIME OF THE DOMESDAY SURVEY (1085-86), TO THE TIME OF THE RESTORATION OF THE MONARCHY (1660), AND THE PLANTING OF AMERICA BY THE ENGLISH RACE.

Lancashire, at the time of the Domesday Survey, divided into Eight Hundreds, since consolidated into Six, . . .	522	The Broxton Hundred, . . .	547
The Hundred of Lonsdale, description of, with quantity of arable land, towns, and villages, . . .	523	The Salt Springs and Salt Works of Cheshire, with their value and their laws, . . .	547
The Hundred of Amounderness, . . .	527	The City of Chester, with its laws and customs, its population and wealth, at the Domesday Survey, . . .	551
The Hundred of Blackburn, . . .	530	Account of the principal Manors, Townships, and Ville of the County of Chester, at the Domesday Survey, . . .	554
The Hundred of Leyland, . . .	530	Population of Lancashire and Cheshire at the Domesday Survey, compared with that of the other English Counties at the same time, . . .	564
The Hundred of Salford—its area, arable land, population, and value, . . .	532	Lancashire and Cheshire, at that time the most thinly peopled districts of England, . . .	565
Manchester and Rochdale at the time of Domesday Survey, The Hundred of Warrington (now incorporated with the West Derby Hundred), . . .	533	Slow progress of the two Counties in population and wealth, and principal causes, . . .	566
The Hundred of Newton (now also incorporated with West Derby), . . .	534	The Forests of Lancashire and Cheshire, their great extent and gradual reclamation, . . .	572
The Hundred of West Derby, according to the Domesday Survey, and also with its modern limits, area, population, and value, . . .	535	The Forest Laws of England, . . .	573
The Laws and Tenures of Land between the Mersey and the Ribble, . . .	539	Survey of the Lancashire Forests, in the year 1228, the 12th Henry III., . . .	574
CHESHIRE at the time of the Domesday Survey, . . .	541	The Forests of Cheshire in the same age, . . .	578
Ancient and modern limits of the County of Chester, . . .	542	The Administration of Justice in Lancashire and Cheshire under the Norman and Plantagenet Kings, . . .	580
The ancient and modern Hundreds of Cheshire, . . .	41	The Tenure and Ownership of Lands in Lancashire and Cheshire, in the same age, according to the great survey, known as "Testa de Nevill," . . .	583
The present Hundred of Macclesfield, as described in the Domesday Survey—its value and extent; the Norman and Saxon owners of the soil, . . .	543	Lands held by the King in Lancashire, . . .	585
The Bucklow Hundred, at the Domesday Survey, . . .	544	The number of Knights' Fees in Lancashire at that time, . . .	587
The Eddisbury Hundred, . . .	545	The Estates of Wards of the Crown then held by the King in Lancashire, . . .	588
The Nantwich Hundred, . . .	546		
The Wirral Hundred, . . .	546		

	PAGE		PAGE
The Lordship of Sir Michael le Fleming in Furness, its original extent and its subdivisions by successive Lords, . . . . .	589	Additional Charters of Chester, . . . . .	644
The Lordship and Estates of the Abbots of Furness, . . . . .	590	The Commercial Importance of Chester in Early times, . . . . .	645
The Barony of Montbegon, in Lonsdale and Salford Hundreds, . . . . .	591	The Bishopric of Chester, established at the time of the Reformation, . . . . .	647
The Lordship of the Gernets, chief foresters of Lancashire, . . . . .	592	Extent of the Diocese of Chester, . . . . .	647
The Barony of Lancaster, with the Lordship and Estates, . . . . .	593	The Cathedral of Chester and its Ancient Architecture, . . . . .	648
The Burgesses and Burgages of Lancaster, . . . . .	594	The Early Literature of Chester, . . . . .	651
The Barony of Theobald Walter, Baron of Preston or Amonderness, . . . . .	597	Henry Bradshaw's Poem on the Life and Virtues of St. Werburg, . . . . .	651
The Churches of Preston, St. Michael in Wyre and Kirkham, . . . . .	598	Close of the Ancient Period, . . . . .	656
The Knights' Fees between the Mersey and the Ribbles, . . . . .	599	Nantwich, Middlewich, and Northwich, and the ancient Salt Trade of Cheshire, . . . . .	656
The Knights' Fees held by William de Ferrers, Earl of Derby, and Agnes de Ferrers, his wife, sister and heiress of Ranulf de Blundeville, Earl of Chester, . . . . .	599	The Origin and Early History of Birkenhead, . . . . .	658
The Fees of the De Lacey, Constables of Chester and Earls of Lincoln, . . . . .	600	Stockport, its Origin and Early History, . . . . .	664
The Fee of Clitheroe, . . . . .	600	Macclesfield, its Charters and Early History, . . . . .	664
The Barony of Penwortham, held by the De Boisens, . . . . .	601	Congleton, its Origin and Early History, . . . . .	665
The Barony of Manchester, held by the De Gresleys, . . . . .	603	The Boroughs of Lancashire from the Norman Conquest to the Restoration, . . . . .	665
The ancient Fee of William Peveril, . . . . .	606	The Borough of Lancaster in Early Times, . . . . .	665
The possessions of the De Traffords, of Trafford, . . . . .	606	The Castle and the Priory, . . . . .	665
The possessions of the Hultons, of Hulton, . . . . .	606	William de Lancaster and Warin de Lancaster, Governors of the Castle of Lancaster, . . . . .	669
The Fee of William de Ferrers, Earl of Derby, in Salford and the West Derby Hundreds, . . . . .	606	Lancaster receives its first Charter from King John, . . . . .	670
The Fee of the De Lacey in Widness, . . . . .	608	Attack on the Charters of Lancaster by King Edward I, . . . . .	672
The Estates of the De Lathoms, Lords of Lathom and Knowley, and their descent to the Stanleys, . . . . .	608	The old Constitutions and Orders used in the Town of Lancaster, as examined and ratified in the 36th year of King Edward III., 1362-63, . . . . .	674
The Estates of the Family of Le Norreys, . . . . .	608	Account of the Manners, Customs, and Laws of the Borough, . . . . .	674
The Fee of the Butlers, Barons of Warrington, . . . . .	609	Lancaster burnt by Robert Bruce in 1320, and again destroyed by the Scotch in 1389, . . . . .	676
The Fee and Estates of the Moynennes of Sefton, . . . . .	611	John of Gaunt's Charters to Lancaster, and Charters of Richard II., Henry IV., Henry V., and Henry VI., . . . . .	677
The Barony of Newton, held by the Banistres and the Langtons, . . . . .	611	Condition of the Borough in the reigns of Henry VII. and Henry VIII., . . . . .	678
The Fee of the De Waletons, High Bailiffs of West Derbyshire, . . . . .	611	Charter granted to Lancaster by James I., . . . . .	678
The Fee of the De Gerard, . . . . .	612	Lancaster repeatedly attacked during the great Civil Wars : Close of Ancient Period, . . . . .	672
The Earldom of Chester, . . . . .	612	The Borough of Preston in Amonderness in Early Times, . . . . .	679
The Manors held by the Earls of Chester, . . . . .	612	Origin of the Town, and great Natural Advantages of its Position, . . . . .	679
The Barony of Halton, held by the Fitz-Nigels, and afterwards by the De Lacey, Constables of Chester and Earls of Lincoln, . . . . .	613	The Customale or Collection of Municipal Laws at Preston; its great Antiquity and curious Contents, . . . . .	680
The Manor of Longdendale, . . . . .	613	The other Charters of the Borough of Preston, . . . . .	680
The Manor of Alderley, held by Robert de Monte Alto, and by the Stanleys of Alderley, . . . . .	613	Contest of the Burgesses of Preston with the Crown, in the Reign of Edward I., . . . . .	682
The Manor of Aston, held by the De Astons, . . . . .	613	Destruction of Preston by the army of Robert Bruce, . . . . .	683
The Manor of Clifton, held by Sir John Savage, . . . . .	614	Battle near Preston between the adherents of the King and those of the Earls of Lancaster, . . . . .	683
Congleton, held by the Countess of Lincoln, . . . . .	614	The first Preston Guild, . . . . .	683
Halton, held by the Earls of Lincoln, . . . . .	614	The Religious Houses at Preston, . . . . .	683
Halton, Stretton, Sale, and Nether Walton, held by Godfrey de Warburton, . . . . .	614	Preston, as described by Leland, in the Reign of Henry VIII., and by Camden, in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, . . . . .	683
Knutsford Booths, held by John de Leigh, . . . . .	615	Preston in the Reign of Charles I.; its Payments towards Ship-money, . . . . .	684
Tabley, held by Adam de Tabley, . . . . .	615	Preston repeatedly attacked during the great Civil War; its sufferings in that Contest; Close of the Ancient Period, . . . . .	684
Over Tabley, held by John de Leicester, . . . . .	616	Cliitheroe in Ancient Times; its Military Position and Ancient Castle, . . . . .	685
The various Tenures of Land existing in Lancashire and Cheshire; namely, Baronage, Knight's Service, Thanage, Drengage, Eleemosyna or Religious Service, Serjeantia or Civil Service, and Villenage or Cultivation, . . . . .	617	Its early Charters from the De Lacey family, confirmed by Edward I. and Henry IV., . . . . .	685
The Estates and Influence of the Earls and Dukes of Lancaster, . . . . .	618	Borough of Wigan; its early Charters and extent of Trade; the Causes of its Prosperity, . . . . .	685
Household Book of Thomas, Earl of Lancaster, in the year 1313, 6th Edward II., . . . . .	619	Early working of the Lancashire Coal-fields at Wigan, . . . . .	686
The Roads and other Public Works of Lancashire and Cheshire, and the mode in which Funds were raised for their Construction, . . . . .	624	Manchester, from the Norman Conquest to the Restoration, The De Gresleys—the early Barons of Manchester, . . . . .	687
Comparative Wealth and Trade of the different English Counties in the year 1341, the 15th Edward III., . . . . .	630	Charter authorizing the holding of a Fair at Manchester in the Reign of Henry III., 1222, . . . . .	687
Valuation of Property in the County of Lancaster, and in each of the Hundreds and Boroughs of the County, in the year 1341, . . . . .	632	Charter confirming and extending the previous Grant of Fair, . . . . .	687
Progress of the Towns and Town Population of Lancashire and Cheshire, from the Domesday Survey, 1085-86, to the Restoration of the Monarchy and the Planting of America, 1696 to 1660, . . . . .	635	The Value and Extent of the Barony of Manchester in the year 1282, the 11th Edward I., . . . . .	688
The City of Chester: its Early History, Rise, and Progress, . . . . .	637	The Borough and Barges of Manchester in the year 1282, . . . . .	689
The Customale of Chester, or Ancient Laws and Rights of the City, . . . . .	639		

	PAGE	PAGE
Thomas De Greesley's Charter to the Burgesses of Manchester, . . . . .	691	
Attack on the Franchises of Manchester by Henry, Duke of Lancaster, . . . . .	692	
The Delawarrs become Barons of Manchester, . . . . .	693	
The College and Collegiate Church of Manchester founded by Thomas Delawarr, Baron of Manchester, in the year 1422, . . . . .	693	
The Wests succeed the Delawarrs as Barons of Manchester, Manchester a Manufacturing Town, in the Reign of Henry VIII., 1520, . . . . .	694	
Act of Parliament removing the Sanctuary for Criminals from Manchester to Chester, . . . . .	694	
The free Grammar School at Manchester, founded in the year 1524, the 15th Henry VIII., by Hugh Oldham, Bishop of Exeter, . . . . .	695	
Leland's account of Manchester in the Reign of Henry VIII., . . . . .	696	
The first Register of the Parish of Manchester, . . . . .	696	
The Manor of Manchester sold to John Lacey of London, Citizen and Cloth Maker, for the sum of £3000, 1579, . . . . .	696	
Progress of the Reformation at Manchester, and contests with the Roman Catholics and the Puritans, . . . . .	697	
The Manor of Manchester again sold by John Lacey to Sir Nicholas Moseley, for the sum of £3500, . . . . .	698	
Ravage of the Plague at Manchester in the year 1603, . . . . .	699	
Henry Montague, President of the King's Privy Council, made an Earl, with the title of the Earl of Manchester, . . . . .	699	
Rapid increase of Trade at Manchester, . . . . .	699	
Cotton first introduced into Manchester from the Island of Cyprus, . . . . .	699	
The Blue Coat Hospital and Library at Manchester, founded by Humphrey Chetham, . . . . .	700	
Description of the towns of Manchester and Salford at the time of the Commonwealth, . . . . .	701	
Conclusion of ancient period, . . . . .	701	
Liverpool, from the Charter of King John, 1207, to the Restoration, 1660, . . . . .	701	
Liverpool made a Borough by King John, . . . . .	702	
Charter of King John, offering all the liberties and free customs enjoyed by any borough on the sea or seaport in England, to such persons as might take burgages at Liverpool, . . . . .	703	
The Castle of Liverpool built, and the parks of Tuxteth, Croxteth, and Simonswood formed, . . . . .	703	
The Castle of Liverpool provisioned for a siege in the war between King John and his Barons, . . . . .	703	
Cost of the different articles supplied to the Castle, in the money of that time, and of the present, . . . . .	703	
Charter granted to Liverpool by Henry III., . . . . .	704	
Small value of Liverpool to the Crown, in comparison with most of the other seaports of the Kingdom, in this age, . . . . .	705	
The original streets of Liverpool, five in number, . . . . .	705	
Smallness of trade at Liverpool, but port furnishes vessels for the Scotch and Irish wars, . . . . .	706	
Population of Liverpool in the reign of Edward III., . . . . .	707	
Pavage grants for the streets of Liverpool, . . . . .	708	
Nature and extent of the Trade of England at this time, . . . . .	709	
Sir John Stanley, knight, authorized by Henry IV., "to embattle and fortify a certain house, which he has lately constructed of Stone and Lime, in the town of Liverpool." This house afterwards known as the Tower of the Stanleys, . . . . .	709	
The founding of the New Haven, at Liverpool, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, . . . . .	710	
Population of Liverpool in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, not exceeding one thousand persons, . . . . .	710	
The only trade of the port at that time with Ireland, . . . . .	711	
Small amount paid by Liverpool as Ship-money in the year 1635, . . . . .	711	
Humphrey Chetham the High Sheriff's account of the sums paid as Ship-money by the counties of Lancaster and Chester; by the hundreds of West Derby, Salford, Leyland, Blackburn, Amounderness, and Lonsdale; by the city of Chester; and by the boroughs of Lancaster, Preston, Wigan, Liverpool, Clitheroe, and Newton, . . . . .	711	
Close of the ancient history of Lancashire and Cheshire, . . . . .	712	

END OF VOL. I.











