

## CHILDWALL: A LANCASHIRE TOWNSHIP IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

*R. G. Dottie, B.A., M.Phil.*

### THE PARISH CONTEXT

The ancient parish of Childwall was approximately ten miles long and five miles wide at its greatest extent and was the most southerly parish of Lancashire. Its southern boundary was the River Mersey, which lapped the shores of its townships of Garston, Speke, Hale and Halebank. The parish contained ten townships, these being, apart from those already mentioned, Childwall (the township which contained the parish church), Wavertree, Allerton, Much Woolton, Little Woolton and Halewood.<sup>1</sup> The principal physical feature of the former parish is a sandstone ridge which runs from Wavertree, through Childwall, to Much Woolton and there is evidence of the activities of prehistoric man in this area<sup>2</sup> where the heaths of the plateau summits will have provided open, dry sites for dwellings, as well as frequent rock outcrops suitable for building stone, light soils and purer water than neighbouring districts.<sup>3</sup> Physical factors will have affected the order in which settlement took place, for the boulder clay districts of Garston, of Little Woolton or Halewood will have been heavily wooded and consequently less attractive than the drift-free areas. The boulder clay of Speke and Hale, however, was further overlain by deposits of Shirdley Hill sand, which produced extremely fertile agricultural land. These surface forms were not exclusive of one another, however, and each settlement had different types of land within its boundaries.<sup>4</sup>

Not all of the townships had necessarily been settled in the prehistoric period and, indeed, settlement seems to have become widespread only in the Saxon period.<sup>5</sup> The parish apparently developed almost entirely within natural boundaries, provided by the Mersey and streams such as Childwall Brook and Ditton Brook; other water courses were plainly used to create the boundaries between townships. Only Brettargh Holt (part of Little Woolton) and Thingwall<sup>6</sup> formed extrusions beyond the natural boundaries of the parish and may represent former enclaves of British and Scandinavian settlement respectively.<sup>7</sup>

The development of communities within the parish will have been slow because South West Lancashire remained isolated throughout the medieval period. This isolation has been attributed to the mosses and marshes which acted as barriers to movement within the area and to the difficulty of access from the region to the rest of the country.<sup>8</sup> Before the nineteenth century the Mersey could be crossed at Liverpool and at Widnes only by ferry, leaving Warrington as the sole bridging point to provide an uninterrupted route into the region from the south. Childwall township was sited on Liverpool's eastern upland, whose central low divide has always provided the natural routeway between Liverpool and Warrington: the railway of the nineteenth century and the M62 motorway of the twentieth century have continued to follow Childwall's boundary. Within the parish, Childwall's sandstone ridge provided a good and comparatively dry route towards Hale where a traveller on foot or on horseback could cross the Mersey at an irregular and dangerous ford.<sup>9</sup>

Offering important communications links within this isolated area then, Childwall and its related townships had reached a fully developed parochial form by 1571, when the communal activities of the parish at its annual meeting may first be glimpsed through the survival of the churchwardens' accounts. The accounts, which were presented annually (at Easter, from 1608 onwards), are concerned principally with material affairs and costs — yet they can also provide insights into spiritual concerns. It is possible to find evidence from other sources relating to the existence of recusancy and of puritanism in the parish in the early seventeenth century.<sup>10</sup> It has recently been observed, however, that contemporaries 'exaggerated the nature and extent of the religious divisions in Lancashire, concentrating on the roman catholics and puritans, and virtually ignoring the anglicans' and that 'no scholar has yet seriously tried to assess the strength of anglicanism in Lancashire.'<sup>11</sup>

It is difficult to find terms of reference by which one might assess the strength of anglicanism, since there must always have been apathy and indifference among church attenders when attendance was compulsory. The churchwardens' accounts make it possible to study the behaviour of anglicans, however, and it is possible to observe William Lewis, who had been instituted as vicar of Childwall in December 1632,<sup>12</sup> conforming to the controversial liturgical strategy of William Laud — who became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633. Laud was concerned to place the altar against the east wall of the church, to fence it with rails, to require communicants to come forward to the altar and to require 'the Ante-Communion to be read at the altar, not in the reading pew.'<sup>13</sup> The Childwall churchwardens paid £3.4s.0d. 'to the joiners for making the rail about the Communion table' in 1635,<sup>14</sup> whilst Laudian pressures not to

read the ante communion in the reading pew compelled Lewis to face the fact that Childwall church had no such pew. Accordingly, the churchwardens recorded a great deal more work to 'contrive a reading place' after viewing one at neighbouring Huyton.<sup>15</sup> Further work was needed to enlarge the pulpit, previously regarded as 'indecent and unseemly',<sup>16</sup> and in the chancel<sup>17</sup> — the beautification of which was another Laudian ideal.

It is difficult to recognize at Childwall the grievances which were to lead the nation to Civil War but it is possible to see the effects of growing national tensions. In September 1641, the House of Commons passed a series of resolutions aimed at stamping out the Laudian innovations.<sup>18</sup> Before the end of October the churchwardens had paid sixteen pence 'to them that pulled the rails down about the Communion Table.' In January 1642 they paid ten shillings for 'Lime, at Liverpool, for the Church walls': clearly, all traces of painting and decoration were to be removed.<sup>19</sup> Laudianism had been quickly abandoned and the ensuing Civil War brought many further disruptions. Childwall's location will have ensured that it saw the passage of troops on many occasions — though such passages are recorded only with reference to the Mersey crossing at Hale.<sup>20</sup> William Lewis was ejected and replaced by David Ellison, a vicar of more presbyterian mould: he was clearly not acceptable to everybody, for the churchwardens were compelled to spend two shillings in 1645 on twelve soldiers to guard him.<sup>21</sup>

There is little evidence of the involvement of Childwall's parishioners in the armies. Gilbert Ireland, lord of the manors of the Hale quarter,<sup>22</sup> was committed to puritanism and rose high in the service of Parliament.<sup>23</sup> By contrast, the Lathoms, catholic lords of Allerton, supported the king as did the Norris family of Speke and Garston. Hugh Houghton, who had leased Childwall House,<sup>24</sup> and six others from the parish were later found guilty of delinquency,<sup>25</sup> whilst Nehemiah Brettergh was concerned in the defence of Lathom House in 1644.<sup>26</sup> These men and their families consequently suffered from the depredations of the sequestrators, but the greatest loss which may be related to the parish, perhaps, was reserved for the Earl of Derby.

The earl, lord of the manors of Childwall, Wavertree, Much Woolton and Little Woolton, supported the king throughout the Civil Wars. In 1651, Parliament ordered that the estates of seventy leading royalists be sold for the benefit of the Commonwealth: the earl was one of these and in the same year he was executed. The lands which had thus been sequestrated were surveyed, preparatory to being sold: the survey made of the manor of Childwall in 1653<sup>27</sup> survives and provides a major source for the study of Childwall at that date.

## CHILDWALL IN 1653

The survey of course was of the manor of Childwall, not the township: the boundaries of the two were not precisely co-terminous, since the Childwall demesne included part of the township of Little Woolton. The survey was effectively divided into three parts; the first listed the demesne tenants. The second part listed tenants who could produce no lease for their holdings whilst the third section listed tenants holding various properties under leases for lives. By far the most important of all these tenants was Isabel Houghton,<sup>28</sup> widow of Hugh Houghton: she was in possession of the manor house and a large area of the demesne lands.

The demesne occupied a total of four hundred and sixty three acres and three roods, four acres of which were allotted to Childwall House and its yards. The remainder — all agricultural land — was considered by the surveyors to be 'worth upon improvement' a yearly value of £198 3s.6d., representing an average value of 8s.7d. per acre. Two hundred and seventy three acres had already been enclosed: this area had an annual estimated value of £112 17s.8d. — an average of 8s.6d. per acre. This enclosed area represented fifty nine percent of the total agricultural area; the remaining forty one percent — one hundred and eighty seven acres — was composed of parcels of land in the common fields. These had been valued at £84 5s.10d. per annum by the surveyors, at an average of 8s.8d. per acre.

The common fields numbered six in all.<sup>29</sup> The Grangefield was the largest of these, containing fifty five acres and used solely as arable land. Its six tenants, who held eleven parcels between them, were all residents of Little Woolton. The only other field devoted exclusively to arable farming was the Church Ashfield, containing twenty eight acres: Ferdinando Calcott of Little Woolton held two parcels amounting to sixteen acres, whilst Edmund Wainwright and Thomas Hitchin both held parcels of six acres. The Old Marled Field contained fourteen acres of pasture land, held by four tenants. Six tenants with lands in the Score used the field as pasture land but Ellen Glover's two parcels were employed as arable and Thomas Longworth's six acres were arable and pasture. The mixed use of land in this field of thirty acres must have created problems, but it was matched in two others. The White Ashfield contained only twenty three acres: five tenants used their holdings as arable land but William Carter's two acres were described as pasture. The forty one acres of the Slack included three and a half acres of meadow, sixteen and a half acres of arable and meadow land and twenty one acres of pasture. These acres were evidently among the most valuable in the demesne, being valued at twelve to fourteen shillings per acre. Richard Carter's holding of four acres and three roods of arable and meadow land in this field was described as a close and the mixed use

which is evident in these fields suggests that enclosure of consolidated holdings within the common fields was proceeding. Indeed, there are other indications of the advanced state which consolidation had reached: the holdings of the elder Henry Carter, Edward Carter, Richard Carter and Thomas Eddleston in the White Ashfield abutted upon their holdings in the Slack. Edward Carter's holding in the Score seems also to have been aligned with that in the White Ashfield whilst James Abbot's only parcel of land in the common fields adjoined his own field in his consolidated farm. Common field farming was clearly moribund in 1653.

There were thus twenty three tenants with parcels of land (usually measured in multiples of two acres) in the six common fields. Four of them held land in three fields, but none in more than three. Only Edmund Wainwright held land in two fields, leaving as many as eighteen tenants with land in just one of the common fields. Four tenants held only enclosed land, whilst five held some enclosed land in addition to their parcels in the common fields. The closes of Isabel Houghton occupied a total area of one hundred and sixty two acres and were valued at £68 *per annum*. Only thirty one of these acres were in use as arable land; a mere four acres were set aside as meadow land and two other closes totalling four acres were in use as arable and meadow: the remaining one hundred and nineteen acres provided pasture land. Her largest closes — Woodshey, Coneygre, Nearer Mire Lake and Rushy Hey — totalling respectively twenty eight, twenty seven, twenty two and twenty acres — should be seen in context alongside the common fields: Church Ashfield, White Ashfield and Old Marled Field were respectively of twenty eight, twenty three and fourteen acres.

Almost half of the demesne lands were used for arable farming and almost thirty eight percent for pasture farming.<sup>30</sup> The remaining fifteen percent provided for mixed usage. A significantly larger proportion of the common fields was used for arable farming than was the case in the enclosed lands, however; more than sixty two percent of the common fields was used as arable land. A much higher proportion of the closes (forty five percent compared with twenty five percent) was used for pastoral purposes than in the common fields.

The second portion of the survey described the holdings of a number of manorial tenants who lacked leases. John Broughton was unable to produce a current lease for his house and five acres of ground but was clearly in a different category from the other seven tenants, whose cottages were mostly built on the common land of Childwall Hill. Their encroachments were very small, ranging from one rood to three acres; they were mostly recent and at least one was probably unofficial.

The third section of the survey concerned the tenants who held land and properties of the lord of the manor by indentured leases for lives. There were fifteen such tenants in all, including Isabel Houghton's lease of a windmill and the two barns and two shippens leased to Robert Mercer of West Derby. Of the remaining thirteen tenants, only John Mercer and William Abram had not already been listed as demesne tenants. It is evident from this section of the survey that the accumulation of lands around a house to constitute a farm, was well advanced. The holdings of James Abbott, Thurston Eddleston, Richard Carter, William Carter and the younger Henry Carter make this particularly evident: all of these had four, five or six small enclosed fields fathered around their houses, apart from the lands which they also held in the common fields and in closes separate from their farms. The convenience and greater flexibility of this must have hastened the end of the common field system, and may have begun in 1629 if not earlier.<sup>31</sup> These home farms added one hundred and two acres to the available farmland noticed in the demesne. Their rents were remarkably low, ranging from 3s. to 10s. *per annum* apart from the exceptional 17s. 2d. paid by William Carter; entry fines ranged from 6s. 8d. paid by John Lyon for his cottage and two roods of ground to the £40 paid by Henry Carter the younger for his house and fourteen and one half acres.

The addition of lands held at the home farm to those held in the demesne lands makes evident how misleading an account of the demesne lands alone might have been. William Carter, for example, with only two acres of pasture land in the common White Ashfield, is revealed as a substantial farmer with an additional block of seventeen acres surrounding his farmhouse. Similar examples can be found in James Abbott and Henry Carter the younger, but the reverse is true of Ellen Glover and John Lyon: practically all of their land was in the demesne.

In terms of overall size, no farm could compare with Isabel Houghton's demesne farm. John Broughton commanded a total of fifty nine and one half acres and Edmund Wainwright controlled thirty one acres. The remainder had between twelve and twenty five acres; only Robert Darwin's holding fell substantially below this level with a total of five and three quarter acres. When one totals the valuation placed on these lands by the surveyors, however, and calculates the average value per acre of each farm, it seems clear that there was an optimum size of farm in the conditions which applied in Childwall in the mid-seventeenth century: those providing the best value for their size were the farms between fourteen acres and twenty five acres in size. Less than, or more than this range of size seems to have provided diminishing returns in terms of value per acre.

The agricultural conditions prevailing in Childwall in the first half of the seventeenth century may be discerned from a small group of

probate inventories surviving from that period.<sup>32</sup> All of the farmers thus indicated kept cattle — at least three cows — and at least two horses. All kept small flocks of sheep — from eight to about thirty. Only Richard Marser kept no swine, whilst only Thomas Standish kept no poultry or geese. Standish and Richard Carter kept bees. Together they raised a wide range of crops: corn, hay, peas, wheat, barley, French wheat, oats, beans and vetches are all mentioned. Despite this wide range of crops there was a constant struggle to obtain more ground. Four of these farmers died possessed of ‘tacks’ of ground — leases of pasture land from one’s neighbours — and there is one reference to the practice of ‘heyng’ the commonfields.<sup>33</sup> Intensive cultivation, which is implied here, would have heightened the problem of maintaining the land’s fertility: the growth of peas and beans, the spreading of muck and the system of grassleys (implied where meadow and arable are found side by side)<sup>34</sup> would all have helped in tackling this problem.

Apart from the crops previously mentioned, at least three of these farmers also grew flax. Standish owned two spinning wheels, whilst Carter possessed a spinning wheel, a loom, woollen yarn, sack yarn and ten ells of linen cloth; he was evidently a weaver. Marser called himself a shoemaker in his will, whilst Standish owned carpentry tools as well as “timber in the workhouse and upon the bench” and Johnson’s possessions indicate that he worked as a blacksmith. Four of the five thus practised a craft as well as farming.

In 1653, then, it is evident that agriculture was profitable at Childwall: the surveyors were able to present an attractive picture to potential purchasers. It was a small community of busy farmers undertaking a wide range of mixed farming and craft activities and seemed ripe for speculative purchase and subsequent exploitation. It is, however, difficult to indicate with certainty how large or small the community was in terms of population.

#### THE POPULATION OF CHILDWALL, 1653-1701

The survey of 1653 provided a basis for estimating the population in that it referred to the manor house, nine other houses and ten cottages. One may add to these the vicarage<sup>35</sup> and suggest that the use of the common multiplier of 4.5 persons per household<sup>36</sup> on these twenty one houses would produce a projected population of approximately ninety five persons. The survey had also referred to a large number of persons, both tenants and their dependents, whose names and ages were recorded in leases for lives: these form a basis for beginning the process of identifying individuals and of noting the vital events which affected them and their families.

The process of identification may be continued with the aid of a number of other sources. In 1658 the manors of Childwall, Much Woolton and Little Woolton were sold to Peter and Isaac Legay<sup>37</sup>

and in 1659 the tenants of Childwall began to attend the court of Little Woolton: the manor was no longer in the same ownership as Knowsley.<sup>38</sup> Thereafter, the Little Woolton court papers provide a regular list of Childwall's tenants. The Hearth Tax Returns of 1663, 1665 and 1672 provide lists of seventeen, fourteen and eighteen householders respectively, although they fail to list exemptions from the tax. Many other sources of demographic information exist — probate records, removal orders, quarter sessions recognizances and the Lancashire oath rolls, for example, but their value should be merely to supplement the vital events recorded in the Parish Registers and to aid in identification.

Childwall's registers<sup>39</sup> were evidently kept very carefully by George Astley from October 1653 until May 1657; thereafter the supplementary sources already mentioned merely cast doubts on their reliability and suggest under-registration on a large scale. Twelve marriages involving residents of the township were recorded between 1653 and 1659, but only eighteen more between 1659 and 1701. Between 1653 and 1701 only one hundred and thirty eight baptisms and one hundred and forty one burials were recorded — yet an examination of all available sources indicates no less than one hundred and four family names present in Childwall between 1653 and 1701. Admittedly, some of these names represent individuals who lacked families or were briefly resident at Childwall.<sup>40</sup> Yet even the recorded death of a bachelor such as Gabriel Mercer is a reminder that other sources indicate that he had a brother, John, and a niece, Elizabeth;<sup>41</sup> neither of these people was ever recorded in the parish register and the scale of the problem this indicates is enormous. At least forty five persons named Carter may be identified in this period: how many other persons may be similarly unrevealed by the registers in relation to each of these? Many other examples might be quoted, such as references to the burials of Thomas Woanes, son of Thomas Woanes, in January 1673, of a daughter of John Gregson in August 1681, or of Alice Vernon, wife of John Vernon in September 1691. All of these were residents of Childwall, their existence implies the existence of other members of the family — yet in each case these are the only occasions that these particular family names appear in the parish register. The constant impression given by the register between 1653 and 1701 is that it records only a fraction of the people actually present.<sup>42</sup>

Such under-registration is difficult to explain. Human failings, differences of interpretation, recusancy and nonconformity, and the incidence of epidemic disease are among many general causes of under-enumeration.<sup>43</sup> Of these causes it may be that human error contributed most at Childwall. Accused in the consistory court of a number of offences including negligence, Joshua Ambrose, vicar from 1664 to 1686, admitted in 1683 that he 'Hath for all the time

of late kept in his own custody the Register Book for Christenings and Burials and Weddings' — but claimed that he had 'never denied the churchwardens the sight or use of it.'<sup>44</sup>

This apparent under-registration makes it difficult to draw firm conclusions from the surviving statistical evidence relating to the population of Childwall. However, on the basis of forty four families which provide evidence between about 1620 and 1701, there was a strong tendency to favour the small family of one, two or three children — and family limitation methods may well have been practised. For the children born to these families, the prospects of surviving the first five hazardous years of life were only about one in five: at least twenty nine of one hundred and thirty eight children died before reaching the age of six and nineteen of these died before the end of their first year.<sup>45</sup> The use of all available sources produces a list of twenty two persons whose ages at death may be calculated (excluding children of five or under) and this suggests an average age at death of forty. The fairly short expectation of life which is implied did not usually lead to early marriages: most brides seem to have been in their early twenties, their husbands a few years older. There were always exceptions: the marriage licence of Richard Carter and Cicely Jameson, issued in August 1625 when they were respectively seventeen and fifteen years of age, was endorsed to the effect that 'the parties had been long time in company by and with the consent of their parents.'<sup>46</sup> Illegitimate births were exceptional at Childwall, only four being recorded in half a century.

#### WORK AND WEALTH

The development of craft skills and by-employment already noticed in the first half of the century clearly continued after 1653. Henry Carter was described in 1664 as a carpenter;<sup>47</sup> his father, John, had been described in the same way in 1627.<sup>48</sup> No doubt many crafts were thus passed from father to son, although there is nothing to indicate the degree of skill in carpentry developed by these men, nor the extent to which they practised carpentry rather than husbandry. There is also evidence of a tailor and a shoemaker<sup>49</sup> and five millers:<sup>50</sup> the windmill which they leased had been called the 'new milne' in 1653 and stood on Childwall Hill. No less than twelve alehousekeepers may also be identified at Childwall in the second half of the seventeenth century: for most of that time three alehouses existed simultaneously. This might seem an excessive number for the population of the township to maintain although it must be remembered that Childwall's position alongside the main routeway to Warrington may have brought a good deal of business to its inns. Certainly, the alehousekeepers seem generally to have prospered,<sup>51</sup> despite the regularity with which they were each fined one shilling in the manor court for breaking the assize of ale and bread — a

regularity which suggests that the fines formed something akin to a tax.<sup>52</sup>

Linen weavers also formed a large group at Childwall: eight were at work in Childwall between 1653 and 1701, as many as five of them working as contemporaries. There is no evidence that they were outworkers for a clothier, nor does much evidence exist relating either to the sources of supply of raw materials available to them<sup>53</sup> or to the marketing of their linens.<sup>54</sup> It is equally difficult to comment on the wealth of this group in relation to the value of their properties concerned with their trade; Richard Carter's trade properties amounted to less than £12 and he owned corn worth as much as this in an estate valued at £87, whereas William Carter's 'loom and other implements' were valued at only £1 in an estate of £157 — although £140 worth of that consisted of debts owing to him.<sup>55</sup> The only remaining occupation group concerns those engaged in farming: differences between these may be considered social rather than occupational. Henry Hoake is the only known example of what must have been a large group of labourers whereas only Jonathan Williamson called himself 'yeoman'.<sup>56</sup> Between these extremes were a large number of men who would have described themselves simply as 'husbandmen'. Williamson was a prosperous farmer, evidently leasing the demesne farm, formerly held by Isabel Houghton, from 1665 until his death in 1691: at that time he owned livestock valued at £111 within an estate valued at £384 11s.4d. Where his contemporary farmers are concerned, however, a small number of relevant inventories leave the overall impression that the number and value of animals kept at Childwall declined as the century progressed and that there was a withdrawal from the richly varied agriculture evident before 1653.

Although agricultural prosperity may have been declining after 1653, the stock of homes available at Childwall had increased from the twenty one noticed at that time. John Woods had been possessed of a 'new house' in 1687<sup>57</sup> and in 1684 John Norris became tenant to 'a tenement or cottage in Childwall formerly by him erected'.<sup>58</sup> Encroachment on the commons must have continued and with it much unlicensed building — although the manor court took cognizance of unlicensed building when such building was a nuisance. When Robert Welsby built a shippon and oven house in the road to the church, for example, he was threatened with a fine of fifty shillings if he did not remove them.<sup>59</sup> The court also concerned itself with the care of existing buildings: in 1676 Elizabeth Lee was ordered to 'repair her house in Childwall that James Hunt lives in' and in 1682 John Lunt was fined 3s.4d. 'for letting his house fall down and not repairing it'.<sup>60</sup> Not all buildings were subject to the manor court, however: in 1686 a house at Childwall was leased to Thomas Broughton of Much Woolton by the earl of Derby, who

also insisted that Broughton must grind his corn at the earl's mills in Childwall and Little Woolton.<sup>61</sup> The earl was no longer lord of the manor, but he had clearly retained — or re-acquired — properties at Childwall. Indeed, in the 1690's, the earl still obtained rents from Childwall and Woolton to the value of £5 1s. 6d. *per annum*, in addition to a number of rent hens.<sup>62</sup> This is a considerable non-manorial rent roll: it should be compared with Childwall's manorial rent roll in 1701 of £6 4s. 3d and implies a large number of houses.

The flimsy nature of those houses<sup>63</sup> is matched by the flimsy hold on life which is implied by the paucity of possessions of several of Childwall's inhabitants in the later seventeenth century. Only thirteen inventories survive from the period 1653 to 1701 and such a small group must be examined with various cautionary provisos in mind.<sup>64</sup> However, the group indicates a wide range of personal wealth, from Jonathan Williamson's estate valued at nearly £400 to Richard Foster's, valued at £11 9s. 6d. Those in between included Ellen Butler and William Carter who had loaned sums of money amounting to £85 and £148 respectively whilst apparently living in abject poverty, the remainder of their estates being valued at less than £10 in each case. After 1670 appraisers were less concerned to record small items such as cash, food<sup>65</sup> or stocks of fuel, possibly because they were coming to take their existence more for granted. Nevertheless, when one examines the hardware of household utensils and beds, and the semi-permanent items of bedding and linen, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the people of Childwall, on the evidence of these inventories and with the exception of Jonathan Williamson, grew poorer as the seventeenth century wore on.

#### THE PRACTICE OF AUTHORITY

The people of the township were not greatly burdened by the incidence of parochial office. Seven men served as churchwardens between 1653 and 1701 at imprecise intervals averaging eight years, whilst two served three year terms as school reeves and Richard Carter and James Jerrom served respectively as overseer of the poor and supervisor of the highways during the brief periods when such parochial appointments were made. However, Childwall men were always convenient for the church's business and the churchwardens' accounts are littered with small payments to the people of Childwall for the many jobs which had to be carried out in and around the church.

Far more burdensome for the people of Childwall were the offices they had to serve which were necessary for the administration of their own township community. The instrument of that administration was the manor court, whose authority could reach into all aspects of the villagers' affairs. The court normally met each year in October and from 1659 onward three Childwall tenants usually joined their

counterparts from Little Woolton on the jury. The court also began to appoint a number of officers for Childwall — a constable, two ley layers, two highway surveyors, two burleymen, aletasters, firelookers and appraisers of distress and one hill looker. Eight men could be thus burdened with these offices annually.

Arguably, the office of constable was the most important of these appointments, since the constable was responsible in every way for the maintenance of law and order.<sup>66</sup> The men of Childwall resisted the imposition of this office, which seems to have been laid upon them only when the manor was in the ownership of the state, for they claimed 'that the constableness began in Childwall in or about the year 1651 and before that time the office was performed by the Lord's officers.'<sup>67</sup> Despite their obvious grievance the court began a series of annual appointments, though resistance to the office continued and in January 1662 a petition was presented to the Quarter Sessions at Wigan from all its inhabitants, complaining that they had never been 'anciently charged' with the office, the burden of which they believed should be borne, as before, by the 'possessor of the demesne.'<sup>68</sup> The struggle against this imposition was eventually lost and constables continued to be appointed annually by the court, the duty of provision apparently being attached to the various houses of the township.<sup>69</sup>

The duties of the two ley layers were evidently less onerous, as they had to apportion the various church leys and any other taxes or rates, according to the tax-payer's stake in the community, measured by his property. James Abbott and Robert Darwin shared the task every year from 1663 to 1683 and Abbott served a total of 28 times — despite being illiterate. The duties of the highway surveyors went little beyond caring for the fabric of the roads and embraced the adjoining hedges and ditches, so that in 1698 Timothy Welsby and John Yates recorded that 'the highways in our town are in good repair, the hedges cut, the ditches scoured.' The office of burleyman was a composite one but he was mainly concerned with those aspects of agriculture which required a common code of conduct such as controlling the movement of animals. Presumably the function of ale-tasting was a pleasanter part of the burleyman's duties and certainly it was not normally ignored, for local alehouse keepers were frequently presented for breaking the assize of ale — although in 1697 the former aletasters Richard Hutchin and John Holden were presented by the jury for not presenting the alehousekeepers.<sup>70</sup> As firelookers also, the function of the burleymen was akin to that of poor law officials: in 1696 they made the simple presentment that 'all persons are provided with firing.' Only twelve men held the office of hill-lookers between 1659 and 1701 and it may be that only those who lived on or near the hill or common were eligible for the office: only they could properly maintain surveillance over it and so deal

with waifs and strays or observe strangers taking turf from the hill.<sup>72</sup>

Over the period of forty eight years under consideration, a total of forty two different men served the eight annual township offices. Several held more than one office at the same time — and in 1689, Joseph Longworth served as constable, leylayer and highway surveyor. During the same period, from 1659 to 1701 there were no less than seventy seven tenants of Childwall farms listed by the manor court: thirty five tenants thus never held any township office. Admittedly a number of these were women — and women were privileged. They never served in any township office and it was only on rare occasions that they clearly had to bear the expense of office: in 1662, for example, when William Smallshaw served as burleyman for Margaret Eddleston.<sup>73</sup> At least twenty one men served no office, however, although some were tenants for lengthy periods; Edmund Wainwright and his son Francis retained tenancy between them from 1659 to 1682 yet served no office. Not only were there tenants who were not township officers, there was also township officers who were not tenants, despite being appointed by the manor court: John Holden served as constable and overseer of the highways in 1693 and as burleyman in 1696,<sup>74</sup> but was never a tenant. It is not clear why the burden of office was greater for some than others but certainly there is no indication that the burden increased with wealth.

Clearly, records of office holding indicate the formal lines and relationships which were maintained between the members of the community. Sometimes the sharing of a particular office, as leylayers or as burleymen, by the same two men on a number of occasions is suggestive of less formal links between them — of bonds of friendship. Direct references to friendships are rare, but do exist. Edward Carter of Garston in 1679 nominated as executor of his will 'my friend, James Abbott of Childwall'; Carter had moved from Childwall soon after the survey of 1653 but retained the friendship of Abbott. The groups of witnesses to wills and the groups of appraisers drawing up inventories for probate purposes also reveal the friends and kinfolk whom the men of Childwall chose to accompany them on such occasions. Thus Robert Darwin, acting as scribe of many wills locally, was accompanied on a number of occasions by James Abbott, sometimes leaving the township together for the appraisal of an estate in Halewood<sup>75</sup> or a will-making in Little Woolton. Joseph Longworth, whose recognizable handwriting also distinguishes him as a local scribe was similarly accompanied to Garston or Little Woolton by Jonathan Williamson.<sup>76</sup> Clearly, such evidence of friendship groups is limited and gives no indication of the strength and depth of such relationships; nevertheless, it provides a further dimension and

occasional insights which can be of importance in the study of a small community such as Childwall.

#### RELIGION AND EDUCATION

At the Restoration of 1660 it seems evident that the people of Childwall returned quickly and with little difficulty to the religious situation which had prevailed before the Civil War. David Ellison had died in 1655 and been replaced as vicar in December 1657 by John Litherland whose presentation by Cromwell with certificates from Gilbert Ireland leads one to presume upon his puritanism.<sup>77</sup> However, in April 1658 the churchwardens were ordered to 'pay Mr. Lewis 20 shillings for this year past':<sup>78</sup> the Laudian vicar was resident at Little Woolton until 1660 and although officially ejected, may have retained some influence locally throughout the Commonwealth period. In the Restoration period which followed, the prayer book was re-introduced in 1662, a surplice was made for the vicar in 1663 and the communion service was held on Easter Sunday, 1664,<sup>79</sup> apparently for the first time since 1647. In 1665 the communion table and pulpit were freshly adorned and in the same year it cost just four shillings to set up 'the rails about the Communion Table': the wheel had come full circle.<sup>80</sup>

Despite these activities, the period following the Restoration was one of increasing absenteeism from church services. Recusancy was not new to the parish, but it was accompanied by the growing problem of protestant dissent. The 'smallness of the congregation at church of late' had been noted in 1669<sup>81</sup> and dissent within the parish was supported by a group strong enough to build a permanent chapel for itself at Gateacre by 1700. Yet there is no indication that any person from Childwall township was a member of that dissenting group at any time. Equally remarkable, perhaps, is that in a parish where more than one hundred recusants were regularly recorded in this period,<sup>82</sup> the widowed Catherine Carter in 1666 became the only person from Childwall township to be charged with recusancy between 1653 and 1701. It is difficult to explain this remarkable conformity on the part of the people of Childwall unless it was induced by sheer proximity to the parish church.

The children of Childwall lacked the same proximity where the parish school was concerned, since that was sited at Much Woolton. George Astley was master there from 1646 to 1657<sup>83</sup> and Richard Almond from 1666 to 1715.<sup>84</sup> However, the school children from Childwall in this period were not necessarily taught by Almond: they had at least one alternative for Nicholas Fearnese of Wavertree was presented in 1670 for teaching a private school without a licence.<sup>85</sup> William Harrison of Speke was similarly presented in 1703<sup>86</sup> and there was clearly a demand within the parish for alternative opportunities in education.

It is impossible to estimate the extent of the formal education which any of these people of Childwall received and the only indication of their education, or lack of it, must be their ability or inability to write a signature. There are many documentary sources including wills, depositions of witnesses, manorial papers and lists of signatories to oaths and declarations which reveal such signatures. However, it may be that studies of literacy which are based solely or principally on lists of signatories may be suspect. In 1668 Gilbert Tarleton had been elected constable at a meeting of the inhabitants of Childwall — and a statement to that effect was apparently signed by eleven of his fellow townsmen and supplied to the justices of the peace.<sup>87</sup> The signatures might well mislead a research seeking evidence of literacy among the quarter sessions papers, however. Close examination indicates that although the first four signatures on the list (those of Jonathan Williamson, William Carter, Henry Carter and John Carter) may well be genuine since comparable examples may be produced, some and perhaps all of the remainder were written by Robert Darwin. There can be no mistaking the characteristic letter 'R' which commenced not only his own name but also those of Richard Fazakerley and Richard Foster — whose names appear on this list but who indicate on other documents that they could only mark. James Abbott's name is also listed — although many examples of his mark exist. There are no marks alongside the signatures: they appear to *be* signatures but they are not.

It has been claimed by David Cressy that wills are 'the most troublesome source' for historians of literacy because although they were signed or marked by testators and ought to produce important information about literacy, they are 'seriously marred as a source . . . by their closeness to death.'<sup>88</sup> It is true that testators who had been literate were often compelled to attest their wills by a mark during terminal illness, but it is possible to obtain evidence of literacy from probate records. Wills normally bear the signatures or marks of two or more witnesses whilst inventories and letters of administration were usually witnessed by two, three or four people. It is thus possible to trace people's ability to write their signatures or make their marks at times other than when on their death beds. Thus, Margaret Eddleston marked her renunciation of the administration of her daughter's estate some ten years before her own death — and was witnessed by William Smallshaw who also made his mark although presumably in good health.<sup>89</sup> Elizabeth Lee and James Abbott both made their marks when obtaining letters of administration concerning John Lee's estate, whilst Gilbert Tarleton joined Sarah and Joseph Longworth in witnessing the will of Israel Edge.<sup>90</sup> It should also be noted that even where testators make a mark, it is often clear that they were normally illiterate and not merely hampered by sickness: thus Edward Carter carefully

marked his will with a painstaking 'A' and other testators and witnesses made their marks in similarly painstaking fashion — often the first letter of their own names.<sup>91</sup> These people patently exhibited illiteracy rather than 'declining powers.'<sup>92</sup>

From a variety of sources it is possible to compile lists of nineteen men and three women resident in Childwall township between 1653 and 1701 who were sufficiently literate to write their names, and of twenty three men and six women who could only make a mark.<sup>93</sup> These figures provide an overall illiteracy rate of 57% and an illiteracy rate for men of 55%. The Lancashire association oath rolls of 1696 closely parallel these figures by indicating an illiteracy rate for male householders of 57%: only Allerton of the parochial townships revealed worse illiteracy ratings. Despite this evidence of slight formal education the mental horizons of the people of Childwall were not necessarily confined to the township nor even the parish: they had a number of points of contact which provided news, gossip and information from the region, the country and even from overseas.<sup>95</sup>

#### CHILDWALL IN 1701

It has already been observed that there are indications of agricultural decline and withdrawal from the strong variations in farming which characterised Childwall in 1653. In 1701 the manor was surveyed once more, following the death of Samuel Legay and the reversion of Childwall to the estate of his mother, Katherine.<sup>96</sup> The two surveys are not easy to compare with one another because although the 1653 survey was recorded in statute measure (i.e. using a perch of 5½ yards) but only in acres and roods, the survey of 1701 was recorded in acres, roods and perches: it is evident, however, that on this occasion it was recorded in 'Lancashire long measure,' using a rod, pole or perch of 8 yards.<sup>97</sup> It is thus necessary to correct the 1701 figures to restore comparability with the survey of 1653.

When comparability is restored, the impression of decline is reinforced. By 1701 the estimated value of the manor was reckoned at £32 10s. 4d. less than in 1653. It is evident that some fields had survived from 1653 to 1701 with their boundaries unchanged but it is equally evident that the estimated value of the Rough Horse Close, of the Eleven Acres and the Nine Acres had been reduced by eight, fourteen and ten percent. Other boundaries had changed: Edmund Wainwright's close called Harrowfield was divided into Little and Great Harrowfield and his Four Acres was split into the Four Acres and Four Acres Meadow by 1701; remarkably, division had increased their values by twenty two percent and four percent respectively. The common fields had disappeared or shrunk — eroded by piecemeal enclosure. The Grangefield had been reduced from more than fifty acres to the combined twenty acres of Childwall Grange, Woolton Grange and Grange Close. The eleven parcels of land in the Slack in 1653 were still eleven distinctive Slacks in 1701.

The piecemeal enclosure which had eroded the common fields had not brought greater prosperity. Several fields — Orchard Meadow, the divided Harrowfield and Mercer's Meadow — had increased in value by amounts between 19% and 42%. Yet these had already been enclosed in 1653. The Score and Further Score fields of 1701 corresponded in area to little more than half of the thirty acre Score of 1653 yet their value was only 38.5% of the original Score. The Ashfields of 1701 represented 81.5% of the total area of the Ashfields of 1653, but they represented 71.5% of their value. The Slack had lost nothing in area, but its value had been reduced by more than £6 or 23%.

This decline in real values was not confined to the common fields. The Conygreys' value declined by more than £6 — 34 percent of its 1653 valuation when held by Isabel Houghton. Even the value of Childwall manor house was reduced by 33 percent although the area of ground associated with it had been increased by more than three acres. The windmill's annual value was estimated at only £2 compared with £5 10s. in 1653 and its rent had been reduced from 3s. 4d. to 2s. 6d. This suggests a significant reduction in the produce of arable farming after 1653. A few rents had increased slightly but a number of farmers in 1701 paid the same amount as their predecessors of half a century earlier. Entry fines had been increased, however: that on the farm of Henry Carter had been £12 but when John Yate was granted a new lease on the same farm in 1701, he paid £16, and Thomas Hornby at the same time paid a fine of £12 for the cottage held by Robert Darwin in 1653 for a payment of £2. Indeed, entry fines may have provided the opportunity for a certain amount of profit stripping by the lords of the manor.

The survey of 1701 reveals boon services were still required of the tenants<sup>98</sup> and Childwall seems to have entered the eighteenth century with its manorial institutions unusually intact and active over a wide range of activities revealed at the manor court. Few of the tenants who performed boon services in 1701 were directly related to the tenants of 1653, however. Of the 15 tenants of 1653 only Richard Carter was directly represented by his son, John, in 1701. Robert Darwin's lease had passed to his son-in-law, Thomas Hornby; James Abbott was represented by his grand-daughter Mary; Henry Carter's farm had passed by 1701 to his great-grand daughter Katherine and her husband John Yate. The other Childwall families of 1653 had not survived into the eighteenth century. The number of families at Childwall at the end of the seventeenth century remains problematic, however. It is sometimes assumed that the oath roll of 1696 provides at least a reasonably complete list of householders<sup>99</sup> but whilst the oath roll at Childwall recorded some 14 adherents, the survey of 1701 and the manor court papers of the period indicate that at least 13 other householders may have been

present in 1696. This casts doubt on the reliability of the oath roll of 1696 as an indicator of the numbers of households which formed local communities at that date; doubts have already been cast on the reliability of the parish register and it clearly appears dangerous to trust any single source of demographic information. The township of Childwall thus seems to contribute little that is positive to the study of English local history: it nevertheless contributes important warnings against the danger of over-reliance on generalisations within that study. The early indications of agricultural consolidation and withdrawal from mixed farming at this period also serve as reminders of the unique nature of each historical community.

## NOTES

- 1 Cheshire Record Office (hereafter C.R.O.) Return to Articles of Enquiry Preparatory to Visitation . . . EDA 6/7/4: Theophilus Kelsall, as vicar of Childwall, listed the ten townships of his Parish in 1722. For discussion of the townships and other matters in this paper, see R. G. Dottie, *The People of Childwall in the Stuart Period*, Liverpool University M.Phil., 1981.
- 2 Principally in the form of Bronze Age burial urns found at Wavertree, two of which are still displayed in the National Museum and Art Gallery, Merseyside and the Calderstones, displayed until recently in Harthill Park.
- 3 Cf. H. King, 'The Geography of Settlements in South West Lancashire' *Geography*, XIV (1927), p. 194.
- 4 W. Smith, *Physical Survey of Merseyside* (Liverpool, 1946), Chapter 2 *passim*.
- 5 On the basis of E. Ekwall, *The Place-Names of Lancashire*, Chet. Soc. N.S. 81 (1922), pp. 110-112.
- 6 Although physically separated from it by Childwall and Little Woolton, the district of Thingwall was normally included with Much Woolton for assessment purposes; e.g. Liverpool City Record Office (hereafter City R.O.) Childwall Churchwardens' Accounts, 1571-1674, 1677-1772, transcript, Miss E. B. Saxton, H 238.I ALL, (hereafter C.C.A.) Vol. I, p. 50.
- 7 Again suggested on the basis of place-name studies: E. Ekwall, *op.cit.*, p. III, and J. J. Bagley, *History of Lancashire* (1956), p. 9.
- 8 F. Walker, *The Historical Geography of South West Lancashire*, Chet. Soc. N.S. 103 (1939), pp. 8-10.
- 9 C. Poole, *Old Widnes and its Neighbourhood* (Widnes, 1906), pp. 39-41.
- 10 Twenty four parishioners compounded with the crown for the two-thirds of their estates which might have been sequestered for recusancy between 1630 and 1632; J. Brownhill, 'Lancashire Recusants about 1630,' *T.H.S.L.C.*, 60 (1908), pp. 171-180. Katherine Brettergh was a noted Puritan of Little Woolton, whose death in 1601 was followed by the publication in London in the same year of 'Death's Advantage little Regarded, or the Soule's Solace against Sorrow, preached in two funeral sermons at Childwall in Lancashire, at the Buriall of Mistris Katherine Brettergh, 3 June 1601. The one by William Harrison, and the other by William Leygh, B.D., whereunto is annexed the Christian life and goodly death of the said gentlewoman.' See also Roy G. Dottie, 'The Recusant Riots at Childwall in May 1600: A Reappraisal', *T.H.S.L.C.* 132 (1983), pp. 1-28.

- 11 B. G. Blackwood 'The Catholic and Protestant Gentry of Lancashire during the Civil War Period' *T. H. S. L. C.* 126 (1977), p. 1.
- 12 Public Record Office, London (hereafter P. R. O.) Chester Institution Books, Series A 1555-1660, Volume I.
- 13 H. Davies, *Worship and Theology in England: Vol. II From Andrewes to Baxter and Fox, 1603-1690*, Princeton, New Jersey 1975), p. 338.
- 14 C. C. A. Vol. I, p. 171.
- 15 C. C. A. Vol. I, pp. 178-179.
- 16 *Victoria County History of Lancashire*, Vol. III, ed. W. Farrer & J. Brownbill (1907), p. 106, n. 20.
- 17 C. C. A. Vol. I, p. 179.
- 18 Cf. H. Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 343.
- 19 C. C. A. Vol. I, p. 189.
- 20 William Beaumont ed., *A Discourse of the Warr in Lancashire*, Chet. Soc. LXII (1864), pp. 39, 52, 54, 142.
- 21 C. C. A. Vol. I, p. 197.
- 22 The parish was composed of the township of Childwall and three 'quarters.' These respectively consisted of, first: Hale, Halebank and Halewood; second: Speke, Garston and Allerton; third: Wavertree, Little Woolton and Much Woolton (including Thingwall).
- 23 Ireland achieved the best of both worlds: in 1657 he was one of the Members of Parliament who voted in favour of offering the Crown to Oliver Cromwell but joined the Royalist rising of Sir George Booth in Cheshire in 1659 and was knighted in 1660 for aiding the Restoration; C. Poole *op. cit.*, p. 141.
- 24 *Royalist Composition Papers*, Vol. III, ed. J. H. Stanning, Rec. Soc. Lancs. & Chesh. XXIX (1894), pp. 267, 268.
- 25 *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660*, eds. C. H. Firth and R. S. Rait (1911), Vol. II, pp. 625-628, *R. C. P.*, Vol. III, pp. 306-307.
- 26 *Civil War Tracts of Lancashire*, ed. G. Ormerod, Chet. Soc. II (1844), pp. 169-170.
- 27 City R. O. 920 SAL 15/2.
- 28 Isabel was erroneously referred to as Isabell Broughton in *Royalist Composition Papers*, Vol. II ed. J. H. Stanning R. S. L. & C., 26, (1892), p. 237. This error was followed by *V. C. H.*, III, p. 109, in referring to her as Isabel Broughton.
- 29 G. Youd, 'The Common Fields of Lancashire,' *T. H. S. L. C.*, 113 (196), p. 8 pointed out that 'in multiple field townships . . . the number of fields was sometimes large: Speke, Garston and other places in south Lancashire had ten or more fields'; it is not surprising to find that Childwall was another multiple-field township within the parish.
- 30 These figures, derived from a single manor, are in remarkable accordance with the composite image presented by Joan Thirsk (ed.), *The Agrarian History of England and Wales*, IV, 1500-1640 (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 84-85. She described South West Lancashire as 'a region in which 48 percent of the cultivated land was arable, 14 percent meadow and 38 percent pasture.'
- 31 The evidence suggests that in 1629 the earl of Derby began to organise his property in Childwall in such a way as to administer it through his court baron of Knowsley. In the process, he presented new leases to most of his Childwall tenants and the consolidation of some of their holdings may date from that time.
- 32 Lancashire County Record Office (hereafter L. C. R. O.): Richard Carter of Childwall, 1612; John Halsall of Childwall, 1618; Henry Johnson of Childwall, 1649; Richard Marsler of Childwall, shoemaker, 1612; Thomas Standish of Childwall, husbandman, 1620.
- 33 Cf. G. Youd, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-22.
- 34 Cf. D. C. Coleman, *The Economy of England, 1450-1750*, (Oxford 1977), pp. 40-41 or L. A. Clarkson, *The Pre-Industrial Economy in England 1500-1750* (1971), pp. 55-56.

- 35 *Commonwealth Church Survey* ed. H. Fishwick, R.S.L.C., I. (1878), p. 195.
- 36 Such a multiplier is commonly used in conjunction with Hearth Tax Assessments; see, for example, R. Schofield and L. Bradley, 'Estimates of Population Size: Hearth Tax' *Local Population Studies*, I (Autumn 1968) pp. 32-34 or J. Patten 'The Hearth Taxes, 1662-1689' *L.P.S.*, 7 (Autumn 1971), pp. 14-27.
- 37 City R.O. 920 SAL 649/31.
- 38 City R.O. 920 SAL 9/34 (I); See note 31 above.
- 39 *The Registers of Childwall Parish 1557-1680*, ed. R. Dickinson, Lancashire Parish Register Society, 106 (1967); City R.O. Childwall Parish Registers 1653-1750, transcribed by H. Brierley and R. Stewart Brown, Hq 929.3 ALL. *The Register of the Parish of Childwall, Part II, 1681-1753*, ed. Irene Foster, L.P.R.S., 122 (1983) has since been published.
- 40 Richard Beaumont may be taken as an example: the Register recorded his burial in November 1669 and his probate records (*Infra*) of the same year also describe him as being 'of Childwall.' In fact he was an itinerant tobacco seller, also known as Rice Beaumont, who lodged at Gilbert Tarleton's alehouse and often stayed there from Saturday to Monday; *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, Charles II, 1665-1666*, ed. M. A. E. Green (1864) pp. 321-322.
- 41 City R.O. 920 SAL 15/2, 920 SAL 9/41 (2).
- 42 D. G. Hey, *An English Rural Community: Myddle under the Tudors and Stuarts*, (Leicester, 1974), p. 45, similarly found that the Registers 'certainly do not record every baptism and burial that must have taken place at the parish church.'
- 43 See for example, J. T. Krause, 'The Changing adequacy of English registration, 1690-1837' in *Population in History*, eds. D. V. Glass and D. E. C. Eversley (1965).
- 44 Cheshire Record Office (hereafter C.R.O.) EDC 5 (1683) No. 9 Childwall.
- 45 The deaths of nineteen babies out of one hundred and thirty eight suggests an infant mortality rate of about one hundred and thirty seven per thousand. Writing of England as a whole in the period 'mainly to 1650', D. C. Coleman, *op. cit.*, p. 17, claimed that 'Infant mortality was often very high, from one hundred to two hundred and forty per thousand dying in their first year of life.'
- 46 *Chester Marriage Licences, Vol. III 1624-1632*, ed. W. Fergusson Irvine, R.S.L.C. 57 (1909), p. 37.
- 47 L.C.R.O. Probate Records: James Carter of Childwall, husbandman, 1665.
- 48 City R.O., 920 SAL 15/2.
- 49 L.C.R.O. Probate Records: William Carter of Childwall, weaver, 1696.
- 50 *Childwall Parish Register*, p. 87; City R.O. 920 SAL 9/62, 9/63, 9/67, 9/70.
- 51 Hearth Tax records indicate that Gilbert Tarleton's house was expanded from 5 hearths to 8 between 1663 and 1672, Edmund Wainwright's from 3 hearths to 4 between 1665 and 1672 and John Woods' from 1 to 2 between 1665 and 1672 — indeed, Woods had also acquired a new house before 1687. P. R.O.; E 179/250/6, E 179/250/9, E 179/132/355 and City R.O. 920 SAL 9/62.
- 52 The same suggestion has been made concerning other Lancashire leets by W. J. King, 'Regulation of Alehouses in Stuart Lancashire: an example of discretionary administration of the law' *THSLC*, 129 (1980).
- 53 Eleven townspeople had maintained hemp yards in 1653 but the quantities produced will have been very small; City R.O. 920 SAL 15/2.
- 54 Some of the linen produced at Childwall may have been exported in the 1660's from Liverpool aboard the ships of James Jerrom, a prominent merchant who wielded enormous influence at Childwall, both as agent of Peter and Isaac Legay and later in his own right; P. R.O., E 199 1338/10.

- 55 L.C.R.O. Probate Records: Richard Carter of Childwall, 1662; William Carter of Childwall, weaver, 1696.
- 56 L.C.R.O. Probate Records: Richard Beaumont of Childwall, 1669 (Infra); Jonathan Williamson of Childwall, yeoman, 1692.
- 57 City R.O. 920 SAL 9/62.
- 58 City R.O. 920 SAL 9/59.
- 59 City R.O. 920 SAL 9/56.
- 60 City R.O. 920 SAL 9/51, 9/57.
- 61 City R.O. 920 SAL 659/6.
- 62 L.C.R.O. DDK 1553/86, 1553/87, 1553/88.
- 63 Such flimsiness may be illustrated by the action of Mary Whitfield who evicted her tenant John Harrison of Little Woolton by the simple process of pulling down the house 'over the head of his wife and poor children' in his absence, L.C.R.O. QSB 1/214 (81), QSB 1/218 (42).
- 64 Cf. B. C. Jones, 'Inventories of Goods and Chattels', *The Amateur Historian*, Vol. 2, No. 3 (1954-55).
- 65 With the notable exception of £40 worth of cheese in Jonathan Williamson's house.
- 66 A useful summary of the constable's duties is provided by E. Trotter, *Seventeenth Century Life in the Country Parish* (1919, reprinted 1968), pp. 83-117.
- 67 City R.O. 920 SAL 9/34 (I).
- 68 L.C.R.O. QSP 219/18.
- 69 Richard Hitchen was constable in 1692 for 'that house formerly called Lyons' whilst John Holden served in 1693 for 'Fleetwood's house'; City R.O. 920 SAL 9/67, 9/68.
- 70 City R.O. 920 SAL 9/72.
- 71 City R.O. 920 SAL 9/71.
- 72 City R.O. 920 SAL 9/68.
- 73 City R.O. 920 SAL 9/37.
- 74 City R.O. 920 SAL 9/68, 9/71.
- 75 L.C.R.O. Probate Records: Henry Harrison of Halewood, 1672.
- 76 L.C.R.O. Probate Records: Edward Carter of Garston, yeoman, 1679; Thomas Justice of Little Woolton, 1674; David Henshall of Little Woolton, 1683.
- 77 *Plundered Ministers Accounts, Part II*, ed. W. A. Shaw, R.S.L.C. 34 (1897), p. 209.
- 78 C.C.A. Vol. I. p. 224.
- 79 C.C.A. Vol. I. p. 245.
- 80 C.C.A. Vol. I. pp. 249-251.
- 81 C.C.R.O. EDV 1/35.
- 82 C.C.R.O. EDV 1/34-1/55.
- 83 *Registers of Childwall*, p. 18. R. Stewart-Brown 'Notes on Childwall,' *T.H.S.L.C.*, Vol. 65 (1913), p. 149, assumed that William Waring succeeded Astley as schoolmaster, presumably because he succeeded him as registrar, but there seems to be no other evidence for this.
- 84 C.C.R.O. EDV 2/8.
- 85 C.C.R.O. EDV 1/35. Despite this presentation Fearnese still called himself a schoolmaster when he made his will in 1679; L.C.R.O. Probate Records, Nicholas Fearnese of Wavertree, 1679.
- 86 C.C.R.O. EDV 1/74.
- 87 L.C.R.O. QSP 319/7.
- 88 D. Cressy, 'Literacy in Seventeenth Century England: More Evidence' *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, VIII: I (Summer, 1977), p. 149.
- 89 L.C.R.O. Probate Records: Margaret Johnson of Childwall, 1662.
- 90 L.C.R.O. Probate Records: John Lee of Childwall, 1666 Infra; Israel Edge of Childwall, 1684.

- 91 L.C.R.O. Probate Records: Edward Carter of Garston, 1679.
- 92 D. Cressy *op. cit.*, p. 149.
- 93 D. G. Hey *op. cit.*, found that at Myddle the signatures of 24 men and 2 women survive, whilst 10 men and 5 women made a mark.
- 94 *Lancashire Association Oath Rolls*, ed. W. Gandy, (1921).
- 95 John Barton of Wavertree assisted Henry and Richard Carter to appraise the estate of Henry Johnson of Childwall in 1649 and also assisted in the appraisal of James Carter's estate in 1665. A survey of the manor of West Derby in or about 1653, referred to a property held by Barton by a lease for lives and indicated that the lives concerned were those of his wife Ellen, his son William and his daughter 'Anne Barton in New England, aged twenty and eight years, heard of about two months since': City R.O. 920 SAL 15/5.
- 96 City R.O. 920 SAL 15/6.
- 97 Cf. E. E. Smith 'Lancashire Long Measure', *T.H.S.L.C.* 110 (1958), pp. 101-104.
- 98 Boon services were certainly performed at Speke in 1693 — City R.O. 920 NOR 2/561.
- 99 W. Gandy, *op. cit.*, p. XXV; D. Cressy, *op. cit.*, p. 144, claimed that 'in parts of Essex and perhaps in some other counties, local initiative extended the oath to the entire male population.'