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MANY people have heard of the Forest of Pendle because two novelists have written books about the Pendle Witches romanticising the events recorded by Thomas Potts in his book The Discoverie of Witches, in which he said of Anne Whittle, who was on trial at Lancaster in 1612, “She lived in the Forest of Pendle amongst this wicked company of dangerous witches”. Of Elizabeth Device he said, “… by her enchantment, charms and Sorceries she hath murthered and cut off; sparing no man with fearful execrable curses and banning; such in general was the common of the country where she dwelt, in the Forest of Pendle (a place fit for people of such condition) that no man near her neither his wife, children, goods or cattle should be secure or free from danger”. The facts that emerge from a study of the wills and inventories of men and women who lived in the Forest of Pendle in the seventeenth century present a different picture of an industrious and prosperous community.

The Forest of Pendle is in the north-east corner of Blackburn hundred in Lancashire. It stretches from the Yorkshire border in the east to the boundaries of Padiham in the west; it extends from the whole length and highest ridge of Pendle Hill, 1,831 feet high, to the lower valley of the Pendle Water only 260 feet above sea-level. Close to the western slopes of the Pennines it is a district of hills and valleys. Pendle Hill rises steeply from the gently sloping land in Barley with Wheatley booths which is from 900 feet to 1,300 feet high. Many small streams flow down to form the Barley Water which flows through the gap at Whitough into the glacial valley stretching from Sabden to Roughlee. The Sabden Brook, flowing westwards, and the Roughlee Water flowing eastwards, make small valleys within the wider one which is for the most part over 600 feet above sea-level. Separating this valley from the main Pendle Water valley is the long ridge rising to 900 feet, which has many names, from Higham to Watermeetings. The north-westerly slope is steep but to the south-east the gradient is much more gentle. Here is an
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Looking north-west across the Roughlee valley to Whitough, Barley and Pendle Hill. On the extreme left is the Spen Brook valley. See map on page 95.
extensive area of more fertile land which was used, when it was within the forest, as launds and closes especially for the deer, young horses and agisted cattle.

The nature and productiveness of the land vary greatly. The valleys here, high, tributary valleys of the Calder, are not to be compared with the richer alluvial valley of the Ribble beyond Whalley. On the hills the soil is thin and the growing season short. The wide and even distribution of seventeenth-century farm houses, not only in the valleys but in the high places like Firber and Black Moss, show that all parts of the Forest had been brought into cultivation. Mostly the Forest of Pendle is a treeless area: there are only sheltering clumps of trees by the farms, scattered trees fringing the streams, and scrub in a few rough places. For the most part the Forest of Pendle has retained its agricultural character though on the south and south-eastern edges there has been some industrial and suburban development. The names of the townships or booths are shown on the accompanying map.

On the perimeter of Pendle Forest are Colne, Burnley and Padiham. In the seventeenth century each had a parochial chapel; the Colne and Burnley chapels were established in the twelfth century and the one at Padiham in the fifteenth. The chapel of ease, the New Church in Goldshaw, was consecrated in 1544, though there was a chaplain there as early as 1529. All were within the parish of Whalley. There were grammar schools at Burnley, Whalley, Clitheroe and Colne. Pendle Forest was a part of the manor of Ightenhill within the honor of Clitheroe.

Pendle Forest was originally a hunting area of the de Lacys of Clitheroe, and therefore, strictly speaking, a chase and not a forest. Later, through marriage, it became the property of the earls and later the dukes of Lancaster. When Henry became king in 1399 it remained part of the duchy of Lancaster. Sometimes during the thirteenth century the de Lacys, following the example set in the royal forests of Lancaster, started to develop their chases of Pendle, Rossendale and Trawden by establishing vaccaries or cow farms for the production of oxen.\(^{(1)}\) Two vaccaries were established in each of the five booths. There was an area within the fence where the deer could be protected, and launds and pastures in the Pendle Water valley where they could find good grazing. At different times in the fourteenth century these vaccaries were alternately farmed in demesne or

\(^{(1)}\) *De Lacy Compoti*, Chetham Society O.S., Vol. 112. The accounts of the vaccaries in the Forest of Pendle for the year September 1295 to September 1296 are on pp. 131-4, and for 1304 to 1305 on pp. 158-161.
let out to rent, sometimes on short lease to well-known people who would, no doubt, sublet to the men on the spot. Before the end of the fourteenth century direct farming had ceased.

Considerable development must have taken place during the next century. A survey of the chases of “Blackburnshire” was made in 1507, prior to the granting of forest land by copy of court roll by Henry VII. In each booth where there had previously been only two vaccaries there were by 1507 from nine to thirteen separate tenant farmers. In almost all cases the copyholds were granted to the existing tenants. The launds and closes too were let out so that from 1507 all the Forest was held by copyholders. Rents had been increased; the nine tenants of Barley Booth agreed to pay £10, an improvement for the king of £3 19s. 4d. Even so rents were comparatively low, and the rental for 1662 shows that the copyhold rent was still being maintained at the 1507 level. This is important to remember when studying seventeenth-century Pendle that rents remained constant during this long inflationary period.

The entries in the Clitheroe court rolls show that the copyholders had the right of inheritance on payment of a fine equal to one year’s rent. Though copyhold in name, the tenure was near to the nature of freehold, with the same stability of tenure and a fixed rent. In 1608, James I, in search of new revenue, revived some of the forest laws and claimed that these “new-holds” were not copyholds at all, but only assarts. A sum, equal to twelve years’ rent had to be paid to have the copyholds confirmed by act of parliament, though the rent itself was not increased.

I THE PEOPLE OF THE FOREST OF PENDLE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY, THEIR STATUS AND WEALTH

In the Lancashire Record Office at Preston are the wills and inventories of men and women who lived in the Forest in the seventeenth century, and this study is based on 123 inventories and 103 wills, concerning in all 133 different people. This was a random selection, but it is over 80% of all the Pendle wills that remain for that period.

Many of the families of these people had been farming the


(4) Ibid., pp. 390-3.
same copyhold farms from 1507, and probably longer, for in the
survey of that year it is especially mentioned that in Barley,
Goldshaw, Higham and Barrowford that the “same is let again
to the old tenants”, and New Laund, which had not been
farmed “because of the dere there but hath been agisted yearly
with a certain number of cattle ...” was let to Robert Nutter,
“the old agister”. There are forty-nine wills of people named
Banester, Hargreaves, Parker, Nutter, Foldes, Robinson and
Bulcock, all names which appear in the list of tenants and free-
holders for the year 1443. In 1531 John Robinson of Old Laund
was the defendant in a dispute concerning land, and he said that
he and his father had been “seized of the same for a space of four
score years”.\(^{(5)}\) These families had had all the benefit of the long
inflationary period. J. E. Neale in his essay, “The Elizabethan
Age”, wrote, “There was prolonged and severe monetary
inflation in the second half of the sixteenth century; but—
subject to the vagaries of the English climate—rising prices,
coupled with an expanding market, brought great prosperity to
those landholders who were fortunately situated as regards rent
and showed enterprise and ability.” These seventeenth-century
inventories show that many Pendle people were prosperous,
living in well furnished “yeomen’s houses”.

The wills give information about the investments these men
had made by buying or leasing more land. Ellis Nutter, who
enjoyed a twelve-room house in Reedley, said in his will that he
had “certaine freehould lande in fie sempel (fee simple) ...
lying and being in Salterfoeth in the Countie of Yorke wich I
have latly pourched of John Ellis of Coulne According to a
diede or Indentuere bearing date the tenneth daie of Aprill in
the yeare of our Lord God 1654 and being of the yearely Rente
to the Lord of the Manor there of thiretie Eyght shillinges”.
This he bequeathed to his younger son. John Hargreaves of
Higham, in 1652, had properties let to tenants, so had
Christopher Jackson of Reedley in 1612. Hugh More of Higham
Dean, in 1602, had recently bought another messuage in
Higham Dean, “of John Roe and Ann his wife, Roger Hindle
and Ellin his wife, Henrie Birtwistle and Dorothis his wife” of
the yearly rent of 2s. 6d. He also possessed “one messuage, one
garden one new house lately builded with one roode of land in
Padiham”. Nearly twenty years before another More of Higham
had invested in a share of the manor of Foulridge.\(^{(6)}\) In 1586-7,
John, son of Nicholas More of Higham, and Henry Banester of
Parkhill in Barrowford, gentleman, were two of the twenty-five

\(^{(5)}\) Clitheroe Court Rolls, Vol. 2, p. 105.
\(^{(6)}\) Lancashire Record Office, DDB/62/1.
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From the early sixteenth century manor courts were held at Higham Hall, the home of the More family.
men of Colne and district who were joint purchasers of the manor and mill of Foulridge.

By the seventeenth century the land had been made productive and enclosed. In the will of Bernard Parker of New Laund some fields were called the marled, and in that of John Crombock, also of New Laund, other fields were called the limed, indicating by what methods they had been improved. John Hargreaves of Higham, in 1652, had a field called the great Intacke and another called the little Intacke. Rough land enclosed so that it could be improved to make good arable, meadow or pasture was often known as intakes. In 1607 the copyholders made a vigorous reply to the royal demand for a large payment to have their copyholds confirmed. Allowing for some exaggeration to strengthen their arguments, part of their reply revealed the work that had been done. They said that much labour had been expended in inclosing, manuring and tilling the lands which were “extremely barren and unprofitable and as yet capable of no other corn but only oats—and that but only in dry years and not without continual charge of every third year’s new manuring, but also in building their houses and habitations thereon, having no timber there nor within many miles thereof”. They had placed all the fruit and increase of their ancestors, their own labours and industries and the estates and maintenance of themselves, their families and posterities upon the same copyholds.(7)

These families had social contacts with the neighbouring gentry. In the Clitheroe court rolls it was recorded on 18 January 1556-7 that Ellen Nutter was the daughter and next heir of Ellis Nutter, and inherited land in New Laund and Goldshaw Booth. The feoffees she named included Edward, son and heir of John Bradill, Gilbert, son of George Shuttleworth, and William, son of John Crombock, all of the local gentry. Later Eleanor Nutter of Greenhead in New Laund married John Crombock of Clerkhill, gentleman, and a line of the Crombock family was still living in New Laund in 1700.(8) It is not surprising, therefore, that fourteen men from the Forest of Pendle were, by 1600, looked upon as gentlemen rather than as yeomen, and were listed as such in the list of freeholders of Blackburn hundred made in that year.(9) In 1631 Edmund Robinson and John Robinson both of Old Laund, gentlemen, paid £10 each

composition fee for refusing knighthood. The same Robinson family of Old Laund were royalists during the Civil War and in the Royalist Composition Papers a particular of the estate of John Robinson is given. He had lands, tenements and gardens in Colne, Pendleton, Church, Marsden, Burnley and Slaidburn, and three coal mines “in Little Marsden and ye Oulde Launds”. He paid to the manor of Ightenhill of old and new rents £5 6s. 9d. yearly, but his income from them was £69 13s. 3½d.

Some families had continued to live in Pendle Forest from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries into the seventeenth century, but the population of the area was not static in that century. The lists of copyholders in the rent-rolls of 1608 and 1662 printed in Clitheroe Court Rolls make clear that there was movement from one booth to another, and that new people with names quite foreign to the district were becoming copyholders. The first was often the result of a daughter or her children inheriting. John Baldwin of Wheathead in 1664 named his daughter as his sole heir, and in the same year John Stevenson of Whitough stated that his daughter’s son, Robert Bulcock, was to be his heir.

But more significant changes were taking place throughout the Forest, particularly in certain areas. There was a marked increase in the number of medium or small copyholds. This change might be more apparent on paper than it was in fact. Entries in the Clitheroe court rolls show that large copyholders leased or let parts of their land as separate farms. John Lawe in his will dated 5 May 1630 said he had a lease from Mr. Barcroft of the Lodge in Pendle of “one messuage and tenement with other buildings thereunto belonging”. The larger copyholds may have been so subdivided before they became separate copy­holds. In Hunterholme, in Higham, in 1608 there were three copyholders, in 1662 there were thirteen; in Barley Booth in 1608 ten, in 1662 twenty-seven; in Goldshaw Booth fifteen in 1608 and forty-one in 1662; and in Barrowford Booth the increase was from twenty-seven to forty-eight. Many of the new copyholders had local names like Stevenson, Blakey and Bulcock, but others were new to the district like Henry Druell, esquire, Richard Waddington of Whalley, William Yates, Randal Holcar and Henry Trelfield.

A different kind of change again is indicated in the will of Anthony Wilson, yeoman of Over Barrowford, in 1640. His inventory was a large one, but his copyhold lands were composed of seven separate parts. On these he had five houses with their barns, gardens and crofts. Besides being a yeoman

(10) Ibid., p. 217.
farmer he was a landlord of house property. This also implies a class of small tenants making their living in Barrowford in some other way than by full-time agriculture.

When making a will in the seventeenth century it was usual for a man to make known his status. Of the ninety people whose wills indicate rank only one, Richard Towneley of Carr Hall, was esquire, four, including John Banester of Park Hill in Barrowford, were gentlemen, fifty-six were yeomen, six more were widows of yeomen, twenty-two were husbandmen and two more widows of husbandmen. This high proportion of yeomen families is an interesting and significant feature of this former forest area, which originally had been let by copy of court roll. The valuations of the 123 inventories, including the tradesmen and those whose status was not given as well as those already mentioned, were evenly graded from £603 of Richard Towneley to £5 10s. 0d. of Richard Nutter, a husbandman, of Goldshaw Booth, though the mean was between £70 and £90. Perhaps the distribution of wealth can best be shown by a table of the valuations which is set out below. Comparisons of the distribution of wealth of people living in a completely different economic community can be made if this table is set alongside a similar table made from the valuations of the seventeenth-century inventories published in *Farm and Cottage Inventories of Mid-Essex, 1635-1749* by Francis W. Steer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PENDLE FOREST</th>
<th>MID-ESSEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121 Inventories</td>
<td>187 Inventories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over £200</td>
<td>Over £200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£150—£200</td>
<td>£150—£200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£100—£150</td>
<td>£100—£150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£50—£100</td>
<td>£50—£100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under £50</td>
<td>Under £50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were greater extremes of wealth in Roxwell and Writtle in Mid-Essex than in the Forest of Pendle in Lancashire. In Mid-Essex 20% of the valuations were above £200, in Pendle 7%; in Mid-Essex 45% were under £50, but in Pendle only 28%. One gentleman in Mid-Essex [inventory no. 136] had a valuation of £1,338 in 1686, and a yeoman [inventory no. 158] a valuation as high as £1,200. The two highest in Pendle, with money owing to them and money in hand to make them comparable with the above, added on, were Richard Towneley, esquire, with a total of £692 and John Hargreaves of Higham Booth, yeoman, with a total of £585 in 1652. At the other end of the scale were men like the bricklayer of Roxwell [inventory no. 164] whose valuation...
was £3 17s. 3d. The lowest in Pendle was that of Richard Nutter, a husbandman of Goldshaw Booth, in 1671; all the goods in his house were valued at £1, two coverlets at 5s. 0d., his apparel at £1, and one cow and some hay at £3 10s. 0d., making a total of £5 10s. 0d. Comparison also shows that in Pendle 54% of the people came in the two middle groups ranging from £50 to £150, in Mid-Essex in these groups there were only 30%.

On the evidence of the inventories the title yeoman was one of social rather than of financial status. Of the fifty-six yeomen fifteen had valuations over £150, twelve valuations between £100 and £150, twenty-one valuations between £50 and £100, and eight valuations of less than £50. Men of very different financial circumstances were looked upon as of the same social status. Families, rich and prosperous by Pendle standards, lived in all the booths. John Hargreaves of Barrowford was a typical prosperous yeoman. When he died in 1687, his farm stock and implements were valued at £120 out of the total of £235. His house of eight rooms was comfortably furnished and well provided with brass, pewter and some silver plate; there was a clock and a total of seven beds in the upstairs rooms and the parlour. The value of the household goods was £63. The funeral expenses amounted to £24 3s. 0d. John Cronshaw of Hunterholme in Higham did not live—or die—in such style. His household goods were valued at £22, the five pairs of bedstocks being worth only £1. His greatest wealth was in his cattle and farm goods worth £83 out of the total valuation of £124. Edmund Stephenson of Goldshaw Booth was a yeoman who lived even more simply but his many bequests of money to his godchildren and gifts of animals to relatives give a sense of generosity not associated with poverty. Though all the furniture and equipment for the house was worth only £10 14s. 0d., there was a stock of food, butter, flesh and cereals valued at £9. His thirteen cattle, sheep, horses, hay and corn were worth £47 out of the valuation of £76.

When yeomen had periods of financial difficulty they still kept their social status. In 1632 Christopher Foulds of Barrowford, yeoman, had farm and household goods worth £51. He owed £107 to various people and had only 11s. 0d. owing to him. Thirteen years before he had inherited land of annual rent of 5s. 3d. from his father, James Foulds. Though his goods were only worth £38 and his debts amounted to £43, James had said that Christopher must, “well and truly” pay £40 to his sister in three annual instalments. If he defaulted the trustees were to take possession until the money had been raised. A loom in the house and large stocks of oak and ash, stones “wrought and
unwrought”, and limestones suggest that both father and son had extra sources of income. Some forms of business do not require the same amount of capital investment as farming does. Christopher Foulds’ household goods were valued at £13 3s. 4d. which is rather more than that of Edmund Stephenson.

The wealth of the husbandmen also varied from £87 down to £8. In fact three of them had valuations over £80 and so were better off than twenty-three of the poorer yeomen. Nearly half of the twenty-two husbandmen had goods worth more than £50, and so were in a better financial position than James Foulds. John Stephenson of Moss End in Goldshaw, in 1623, had a valuation of £81 and had £55 owing to him. Though he was more prosperous than many of his yeomen neighbours he was called husbandman. The rooms of his house were not listed but five were mentioned incidentally. The bedstocks and bedding in the parlour were worth £2, and a stand-bed with its tester and bedding in another room was worth £1 19s. 0d. Altogether his furniture and furnishings were valued at £32, so that his house was as well furnished as those of yeomen who had total valuations of over £150. Another husbandman, John Lawe of Reedley, in 1630, had an inventory valued at £87 and made money bequests amounting to more than £45 including one to Margaret Nutter “my servant” to whom he bequeathed “fifteine poundes to be paid her within one whole yeare after my decease. And a bed and the bedclothes belonginge to it which she nowe lyeth in.”

Nicholas Stevenson of Wheatley Lane, in 1665, was a poorer husbandman with a valuation of £16; he had only five heifers, and his stock of hay indicates a small holding. Yet his household goods were valued at £9, an assessment equal to that of John Nutter of Bullhole in Goldshaw Booth, a yeoman. Nicholas Stevenson had £39 owing to him, £28 of which was by “specialty”. His debts amounted to £6 1s. 7d. but these included the £3 spent on his “Founerall expences”.

The social classes, therefore, cannot be separated or put into different economic compartments. A husbandman could be wealthier than a yeoman, and the wealthier yeomen had a higher valuation than the few gentry of the district. There is evidence of social contact as well. In 1619 Lawrence Towneley of Stonedge (a minor branch of the Towneleys of Barnsett and Carr Hall) was a trustee for James Foulds of Barrowford, who though a yeoman seemed to be in rather impoverished circumstances. Again, a husbandman, Lawrence Smythe of Pasture in Barrowford, in 1609, left a legacy to Elizabeth Towneley, daughter of Lawrence Towneley of Stonedge.
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Consecrated in 1544 and dedicated to St. Mary the Virgin.
The women whose wills and inventories survive formed a cross section of the community; the valuations of their inventories range from £4 10s. 0d. to £180. Eleven out of the sixteen had farm stock, though one, Elizabeth Mitton of Barrowford, in 1677, had only two cows and some implements, and another, Ruth Shuttleworth, also of Barrowford, in 1679, had “toe kine, a sterke and two hogs” worth £5, a horse and “his furniture” worth £3 and hay to the value of £1 10s. 0d. But the other nine had full farm inventories, from the small husbandman type of Jenet Forte of Goldshaw, in 1671, who had ten head of cattle, two horses and a filly, eleven lambs, three geese, pullen and farm equipment worth in all £27 16s. 0d. out of a total of £38, to the large yeoman type of Isabel Mitton of Roughlee, in 1620, who had six oxen, twenty-eight other cattle of various ages, two horses, a mare and a foal, seed corn and all the usual tools and implements valued at £100 out of the total of £180. All these women had continued to carry on the farms after their husbands had died.

Some, like Isabel Mitton, whose husband, in his will of 1619 said, “John Mitton, my son is now young of age”, had young children. They were expected to be able to maintain and educate them at least until the heir was of age. Robert Smith, a yeoman, of Roughlee Booth, in 1609, said in his will: “It is my will that Elizabeth, my wife, shall have the rueling and governmente of the said Roberte Smith . . . and Alice my daughter . . . dureing their minority and to paie all such sumes of money as the profitt of the said landes and goodes will amount unto over the fyndinge of the said children with necessities fite for their calling duringe their minoritye”. Four of these women mentioned servants in their wills. Jennette Radcliffe, of Heyhouses in Goldshaw Booth in 1636, bequeathed £1 each to William Banester and Margaret Radcliffe, her servants. Earlier, in 1593, Sybil Nutter of Reedley, owed 13s. 2d. to Robert Nutter, her servant. Even to the present day farm workers who “live in” are called servant-men by the older generation.

The 1655 list of all the alehouses licensed in every township within the hundred of Blackburn gives twelve names for Pendle Forest. Three were women and Ruth Shuttleworth was one of the names. Ruth Shuttleworth of Barrowford mentioned above had “brewing vessells and other wooden vessel” valued at £1 10s. 0d.

Two other women were probably young and unmarried. Their goods consisted mainly of clothes and a chest, and the nearest relative was the mother. Two others were old, living in

(11) L.R.O., QDV/29.
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At the trial of the Lancashire witches in 1612, Anne Whittle was accused of bewitching Robert Nutter of Greenhead.
someone else’s house. Margaret Crook of Greenhead in New Laund, in 1697, had clothes and money in her purse worth £5 12s. 6d. The rest of her goods included a bed and bedding, a few chests and cushions, a cupboard and some cooking utensils. She mentioned grand-daughters in her will. Margaret Baldwin of Stonedge, in 1690, had besides her apparel and money, “one seiled bed and bedding thereupon, one Chest and one Coffer and one other Chist”. But she had £72 2s. 6d. owing to her by specialty. This, apart from a few small legacies, she bequeathed to Christopher Hartley, son of James Hartley “with whom I now live and inhabit”, but did not state what relationship there was between them.

Ellen Pollard of West Close in Higham was a single woman who died in 1679. She was a copyholder in her own right, paying an annual rent of 8s. 1d. This she left to her brother on two conditions. The first was that he paid yearly £5 13s. 4d. for eight years and then £3 10s. 0d. yearly to her sister Mary Paitfield, for the rest of her life. Ellen shared the house with her brother but lived separately, in the equivalent of an upstairs flat. The second condition was that her brother should “suffer Mary Paitfield . . . my sister . . . to have, hold and quietly enjoy all that part of the dwelling house in which I now live commonly called the Chamber over the Parlowr and two little chambers over the Butterie and over the milk house for her life . . .” Her rooms were well furnished. Her stand bed, or four-poster, with its feather bed and bedding, was valued at £3 13s. 0d.; all her beds and bedding were worth £7 4s. 4d. out of a total of £15 1s. 6d. which was much more than the value of the household furniture of many a yeoman.

II AGRICULTURE IN THE FOREST OF PENDLE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

Pendle Forest, on the moist westerly slopes of the Pennines, is nowadays a completely pastoral area, but in the seventeenth century corn was grown in every part of the Forest. Out of the 123 inventories 101 valued either the stores of grain in the barn “thrashed or unthrashed”, or the ploughing and sowing, or the growing crop, or the harvested crop still in the fields, varying with the season of the year. For instance, in January 1617 at Hunterholme in Higham, “wheate sowne upon the grounde” was valued at 50s.; in May 1652 John Hargreaves of Higham had “seed corne, plowinge and soweinge” worth £5; and on 24 September 1674, at Moor Isles in Filly Close, there was “Corne howsed and in the Feilde” worth £30.
The comprehensive word *corn* was frequently used. In some inventories oats and barley are valued together whilst in others corn and barley are linked together as if *corn* were being used synonymously for *oats*. Where the cereals are named separately oats and barley are almost equally mentioned, but in what proportion there is little evidence. James Stephenson of West Close in Pendle, a husbandman, with an inventory totalling £50 of which £28 was the value of the farm stock, crops and implements, had, on 3 May 1631,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in wheate and ote sawne at West Closse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ote sawen at Sabden</td>
<td>1 13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ote and barlie sawen at Sabden also</td>
<td>0 3</td>
<td>4(12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both West Close and Sabden here mentioned are in the valleys. Wheat was also grown in four other areas of the Pendle Water valley, at Park Hill in Barrowford, Hunterholme in Higham, Moor Isles in Filly Close and in New Laund.

No acreages of arable land were given. It would be difficult to try to estimate them because of the differing values of a growing crop from January to August, and the diminishing stocks in the barn from October to April. It is more useful to compare valuations made at the same time of year or to see what percentage the value of the corn was to the total farm valuation.

Robert Bulcock of Whitough, with an inventory totalling £303 of which £190 was the farm total, had on 28 May 1640,

"In Corne groweing att Whitoughe and elsewhere £20 0 0".

Though this must have been a larger area than the husbandman’s, it is only 10% whereas on the smaller farm it was 17% of the farm total. The September and October inventories gave a truer picture of the actual amount of corn harvested or at least the amount of corn needed by the farm stock and the household until the next harvest. On 24 September 1674, Christopher Towneley of Moor Isles in Filly Close, had corn valued at £30, this was 22% of his farm total.

The seventeenth-century farmers in Pendle varied the amount of their arable land according to the suitability of the soil, though they all followed the general pattern of mixed husbandry. Farms which had more level land and deeper and richer soil produced a larger proportion of corn than the average. In January 1634 Abraham Wilkinson, out of a total farm valuation of £29 10s. 0d. had £20 worth of corn and only one cow.

(12) Roman numerals were used in the inventory.
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A date stone states that the large house was built by Christopher Bulcock and Jenet, his wife, 1593.
The value of the corn was 60% of his farm valuation. This was quite exceptional for the region. Holme End is a small farm by the riverside in New Laund, now all part of Reedley. A reference to it in the Clitheroe court rolls of 1567 shows that it was producing corn then. Following a complaint about the obstruction of a right of way, the jury said there was to be a sufficient way in or by “Le Holme” at all times “except when the said Le Holme shall be planted or sown”. John Lawe of Haughrawe in Reedley, whilst not concentrating on arable to such an extent as at Holme End, was using the land for growing a considerable amount of corn. On 12 May 1630 “Corn growinge on the ground” was valued at £20, a good 35% of his farm valuation. He had two oxen and two horses, nine head of cattle and a flock of sheep. In the higher districts on poorer land it was quite different. At Firber in Roughlee, 1,100 feet above sea level, at harvest time, 21 September 1607, the value of the corn was £2, only 6% of the total valuation of the farm.

There is evidence in the list of debts that the farms in the valleys grew corn for sale. In 1602 John Mylner, late of Kirkegate in Halifax, owed Hugh More of Dean in Higham for one load of meal. In the quarter sessions records at Preston there is the entry for 14 January 1600-1 concerning “George Smyth of Whittlefeilde in Brunley”, badger. He was presented because he had “bought from George Spenser on 31 August 1600 all the oats on ten acres at Philliclose [Filly Close] with the intention of reselling”.

The barley grown would be used mainly for malting. The innkeeper in New Church, Edmund Hargreaves, in 1693, owed £27 “to severall persons for Malt”. Robert Nutter of Holme End in New Laund, in 1613, noted a debt at the end of his will, “by John Nutter my nephew . . . for one load of mault”. Only in one inventory, that of Richard Hargreaves of Higham in 1602, was a crop of peas and beans mentioned.

Winnowing cloths, variously described as *winding cloths*, *wynow sheetes* or *window clouts* were prominent items in the inventories. Sacks were plentiful but costly for they were worth up to 2s. 0d. each. In 1687, John Hargreaves of Barrowford had “fifteene corne seckes” worth £1 10s. 0d: in 1632, Robert Haworthe of Filly Close had “in sakes and twoe window clothes” . . . 12s. 4d. The threshing and winnowing of the grain would be done in the barns. Grain for the household would have to be ground at the local mills. Carr mill and Roughlee mill were both mentioned in Richard Towneley’s inventory in 1630. There was also a corn mill in Barrowford, for at the inquisition post-mortem held after the death of Robert Banester of Park-
hill it was said that he was seised of one corn mill and one fulling mill in Parkhill.\(^{(13)}\)

All the farms with the larger valuations of corn had oxen as well as horses. Eleven farms had as many as six oxen each, twenty-six had four, and thirteen had just one yoke of oxen. They all had horses as well, sometimes two or more. Many of the husbandmen and small yeomen farmers who had no oxen had two horses; such men were Giles Spenser of Wheatley Lane, whose total valuation was £44 in 1627, and Christopher Varley of Goldshaw whose valuation was £55 in 1676. Even in the second half of the century practically as many oxen were being used as in the first half. Over half of the farmers had two, three, four or more horses and many had pack and load saddles. A good horse was worth about £5 but the general run of farm horses was about £2 10s. 0d. The usual price for a yoke of oxen was £9, but varied from £7 to £11. This must have been due to the quality of the beasts and the fluctuations of the market price from season to season, for both extremes were found at the beginning and at the end of the century.

In all cases, except at Holme End in 1634, the cattle were the most important of the farm stock. Corn had to be grown to maintain the household and to supply winter keep for the stock but that was the subsidiary part. The herd of cattle, whether small or large, was the mainstay of the farm. The district was most suitable for grazing, the keeping of dairy cows and the raising of young stock. The weather with its fairly high rainfall made harvesting hazardous but ensured a good supply of grass. There was, too, the tradition of cattle farming continuing from the thirteenth century when there were vaccaries in the Forest. The cattle consisted of milk cows and young stock of various ages, calves, twinters, stirks and heifers. Their value formed about 60% of all the value of the farm livestock, crops and equipment, whether it was a large, medium or small farm. Edmund Stephenson, senior, a yeoman of Goldshaw Booth, in 1614 had a medium-sized herd, consisting of five milk cows, one calf, one heifer twinter (two winters old), two heifer stirks, two stottes (young oxen) and two oxen all valued at £33 13s. 4d. The inventories show that about half the farms supported herds of this size. Of the fourteen holdings which had less than five animals most had three, four or five milk cows and at most only one or two young ones. It is true that William Hargreaves of Barrowford, in 1694, had five twinters and only two oxen, but his inventory shows that farming was not his main enterprise.

The rest, more than a third, had larger numbers rising to the forty-seven kept by Robert Bulcock of Whitough in 1640. They were worth £118 3s. 4d. and consisted of ten cows, fifteen twinters, seven stirks, seven calves, six oxen and two bulls. Bulls were kept on the larger farms only. Owners of small herds would have some arrangement for payment for the service of bulls, as has been the custom until the introduction of artificial insemination in recent years. This type of herd was kept throughout the century. Lawrence Hartley of Barrowford, in 1613, had twenty-nine cattle consisting of nine milk cows, fifteen young stock, four oxen and one bull; in 1687 John Hargreaves, also of Barrowford, had six cows, seventeen young ones, four oxen and one bull. This kind of herd is self-contained. As the heifers mature they can be taken into the milking herd to replace the older animals, and the steers become oxen.

The milk cows were the important part of the herd. From the surplus milk cheese and butter were made. Every house had its dairy or milk-house equipped with earthen pots, wooden vessels and "stones to set the milk on" or "milk bordes of stone". Churns and butter prints, cheese boards and cheese presses were also valued. Many had stocks of butter and cheese. In 1604 Jane Hargreaves of Higham had two stones of butter worth 5s.; Ambrose Towneley, yeoman, of Moor Isles in 1641 had seven stones of butter worth £1 12s. 0d. and cheese worth 4s. 6d. Some must have made cheese and butter for sale: Richard Fearnesyde of Whalley owed Hugh More of Higham Dean 12s. 0d. for three stones of butter.

There is no evidence of large scale slaughtering in the winter in these seventeenth-century inventories nor indeed in the thirteenth-century account of the vaccaries. The inventories, made in different months of the year, show that the number of animals did not vary between summer and winter and that there was still the same proportion of calves, stirks, heifers and cows in February as in July. Nicholas Stephenson the younger, a yeoman of Goldshaw Booth, on 20 December 1610 had six cows, five calves, one stirk, three twinters, two steers, four oxen and one fat ox. This is exactly the same pattern as the vaccary farming of over three centuries before, when the accounts were made from September to September. Each vaccary keeper reported the number of calves born during the year as well as the numbers of the previous year’s calves which were then yearlings, of the yearlings which had become steers or heifers, of the heifers which had been added to the milking herd and of the steers collected to be sold as oxen. Any decrease in numbers had to be accounted for. Seventeenth-century farmers also sold
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Built in 1594. Before deforesting, the area of the Fence was reserved for the herd of stags. It lay between the bounds of Goldshaw and Higham Booths.
surplus animals. "Elizabeth late wief of Myles Whittaker of Symondston" owed John Cronshaw of Hunterholme £7 for a yoke of oxen in 1617, and farmers in Clayton and Rishton and butchers at Blackburn market had so steady a supply of calves throughout the year that, between June 1664 and May 1665, they could sell one family, the Walmesleys of Dunkenhalgh, thirteen calves and ten sides of fresh veal. The only two months the Walmesleys did not buy were September and October.

Many of the inventories value the salt flesh and salt beef stored in the house. The value of such at the beginning of the winter when the stocks would be largest suggests that not more than one beef animal was killed in the autumn. One inventory records the price of a quarter of a cow as 10/- . The highest separate entry for salt flesh is £3; another has salt beef and bacon worth £5, and James Hargreaves of Watermeetings in Barrowford, in 1673, had seven pieces of beef, but these were all in the large houses of the wealthy yeomen. The usual figure is from £1 10s. 0d. to £2 for salt flesh.

W. Harwood Long in his article on "Regional Farming in seventeenth-century Yorkshire", gives the average value of sheep kept on the farms in the West Riding as £5 per farm. In Pendle Forest the average value of sheep per farm was £2 6s. 0d. Only a third of the inventories mentioned any sheep at all. Most sheep were kept in the booths, which included the slopes of Pendle Hill, Goldshaw and Barley with Wheatley. Richard Radcliffe of Heyhouses had forty-six old sheep and twenty-one lambs worth £20. More frequently there were twenty or thirty sheep valued from £4 to £6: some like John More of the Height in Higham had only seven. The custom of low-lying farms taking on other people's sheep for the winter was illustrated by the debt owing to Hugh More of Higham Dean "for wintering of sheep 4s."

Pigs were evidently only kept to provide food for the household. Seldom is more than one valued. Giles Spenser of Wheatley Lane, a husbandman, in 1627, had "one swyne with meate readie for him to eate" worth 18s. Others also had "ground meat" and John Slater of Graystones in Pendle in 1639 had "swine meale" showing that pigs were fed on ground cereals.

Poultry, too, were only kept in small numbers as such entries as these show; "five pullen 1s. 8d.", "five hens and one cock 1s. 5d.". The average value was about 2s. Some also kept a few geese. In one inventory ducks were valued and in another capons were mentioned.

There is evidence of some bee-keeping though only seven inventories mention hives. Ellis Nutter of Reedley, in 1667, had a hive in the garden and John Baldwin of Wheathead, in 1620, had “the halfe parte of two hyves”.

The ploughs with their coulters and shares, and the harrows are usually specially mentioned and priced. Most farms seem to have been well equipped with the tools needed for daily and seasonal work. John Nutter of Bullhole in Goldshaw, yeoman, whose inventory totalled £61, possessed picks, wedges and gavelocks [crowbars], shovels, spades and a turf spade, rakes and a scythe, an axe, a thixell [cooper’s adze], wimbles for making straw ropes, pincers, hammer, shears with one whet-stone and other “husbandry toilles”.

Horses were used for the different forms of transport both on and off the farms. Riding on horseback both for men and women when travelling any distance was usual, and many had the necessary bridles and harness or “furniture” and saddles, side-saddles and pillion saddles. The horses were used for carrying loads or packs. John Jackson of Reedley, in 1662, had two mares and two pack saddles with other “furniture” worth £10, and John Hargreaves of Higham in 1652 had eleven pack cloths. Usually just one or two are listed. Carts and wains were important forms of transport and were needed for carrying out the work of the farm. Both iron and hempen traces were used to connect the hames to whatever implement or cart was being drawn. James Hargreaves of Watermeetings in Barrowford, yeoman, in 1673 had “one waine and two Cartes, two Coupes and fower sleddes”. Carts had two wheels and were smaller than wains or wagons which had four. Occasionally the use to which they were put, “the hay cart” or “the turf cart”, is recorded. Both peat and coal were used as fuel, the former being cut in the turbaries and carted home. Three people had stone carts or wains suggesting that they worked carrying stone from the quarries. Coupes were in general use; they had closed sides and ends making a “box” cart specially designed for carting manure, lime and marl. Sleds were useful for carrying loads of hay and corn on steep or uneven ground for the load at ground level was much less likely to overturn. Difficult land was made to produce. “Hottes”, which were paniers or creels for carrying lime or manure on the back, were mentioned in two inventories. They would be used in fields of steep ascent where it would not be possible for a cart or coup to go.

Many repaired their own carts and wooden implements. John Cronshaw of Hunterholme in 1617 had “one gauge of speakes [spokes] and felighes” [fellies—the curved pieces of wood,
which joined together formed the circular rim of the wheel] worth 8s. 0d. Christopher Towneley of Moor Isles in 1674 had in stock “wood for a pair of new waine wheeles” worth 12s. 0d.

III OTHER CRAFTS AND INDUSTRIES IN THE FOREST OF PENDLE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

Farming was the chief occupation in the Forest of Pendle but other domestic industries and crafts were carried on, and the textile industry played a not unimportant part in the economic life of the period. Amongst all these wills and inventories only twelve people were named as tradesmen. There were three clothiers, two weavers, one tailor, two masons and a waller, one miller and two blacksmiths. Four more blacksmiths were mentioned in the lists of debts at the end of other wills. John Stephenson, a cooper of Goldshaw Booth, was an appraiser in 1614, and in 1697 John Nutter of Waterside in New Laund, made a bequest to his daughter, Ann, wife of John Pate of Dimpenley in Roughlee, a shoemaker. Other craftsmen, however, are mentioned in the quarter sessions records—a butcher, a cornmiller and a dyer in Barrowford Booth, a shoemaker in Goldshaw Booth and two woollen-websters in Blackmoss in Wheatley Booth. The inventories of these tradesmen show that they were all farmers as well. With one exception the valuations of the farms of these men comprised between 40% and 60% of the total value of the inventory. All had between five and ten head of cattle. None had any oxen but owned one or two horses. All except one had varying amounts of hay and corn. They had medium-sized farms with the same pattern of farming as the yeomen and husbandmen.

John Slater of Wheatley Booth, a rough-mason, in 1618 was different because his farm was of minor importance; the value of his farm stock was only 20% of the total value of the inventory, £146. His mason’s tools were valued at £1 6s. 8d.; money and gold in his purse amounted to £52 6s. 8d. He had other business interests besides his masonry because he had a large stock of timber, oak, ash and elder worth £10. There was also wool and yarn worth £11 10s. 0d. All these activities made him financially equal to the prosperous yeomen. His wearing apparel valued at £5 6s. 8d. was twice the average value.

The miller was very different, for his inventory totalled £30, £19 5s. 0d. of which was his farm valuation. His household goods were worth only £7 7s. 6d. and his clothes 30s. 0d. In the

(15) L.R.O., QSB/1/49 (19) (20) (21), QSB/1/165 (3), QSB/1/145 (22) and QSB/1/197 (10) (11) (12).
debts owing to him was noted, “by Mr. Lawrence Townley of the Car Hale £4”. The local mill was at Carr and Mr. Towneley owned the mill.

If John Sharp of Wheatley Lane, in 1639, had not been called a blacksmith it would have been impossible to have distinguished him from the successful yeomen, for there was no mention of a smithy or anvil, just a stock of iron which was not even valued separately. Conversely one husbandman and one yeoman had all the equipment for a blacksmith’s trade, but were known by their social status, not by their occupation. The yeoman was Anthony Wilson of Barrowford Booth who died in 1640. His valuation of £220 was equal to that of John Banester of Park Hill, Barrowford, gentleman, who died in 1652. Wilson had a large farm with dead and live stock worth £123, and all that he required for his blacksmith’s trade was valued at £8 11s. 3d. There were shoes for both horses and oxen. The “furniture” in the smithy was given in detail: there were hammers, tongs, files and compasses; iron and steel nails as well as the shoes; a stiddy or anvil, a screw and a pair of bellows; and stocks, a “slec” [slake] trough and a grind stone “with furniture”. James Varley of Darleley Banke in the Forest of Pendle, blacksmith, who made his will in January 1667, must also have been prosperous. The inventory does not survive, but in the will he made money bequests to the value of £86 and all the rest of his estate he gave to his nephew, Richard Varley.

It is well known that by the seventeenth century the textile trade in Lancashire was well organised with Manchester and Rochdale as the main centres. The putting-out system, by which spinners were supplied with wool and weavers with yarn had been established by that time. Merchants sent the cloth to their agents in London to sell at the fairs or for export. Other districts of Lancashire were also producing cloth. In the thirteenth century enough cloth was being woven in Burnley, Colne and the districts around to make it economically profitable for the de Lacys, lords of the honor of Clitheroe, to have fulling mills in both those townships. In the seventeenth century both linen and woollen cloth were being woven in Burnley, and in Marsden there were clothiers, like the Roberts of Hollin Bank who sold cloth to local buyers, merchants in Rochdale, a draper in London and at the Bartholomew Fair. Burnley, Marsden and Colne are adjoining townships to the Forest of Pendle.

(16) De Lacy Compoti, pp. 119, 122, 125, 126 and 179.
The list of occupations gives the impression that the people of Pendle were not much concerned with the textile industry, but a detailed study of the inventories proves that the opposite was true. Ninety-three of the inventories inspected listed “cards, combs and wheels” used for the preparation and spinning of wool or flax into yarn, and forty-five of them had one or two hand-looms as well. The people who were involved in preparing, spinning and weaving formed a cross-section of the community. Men and women of widely differing wealth, with inventories valued from £16 to £303, were engaged in the domestic textile industry. The pattern was not that of cottage weavers with a small holding. The only example of such a worker is James Hartley of Roughlee who died in 1621. His one cow and hay were valued at £2, his “tolles and pullene” at 4s. 6d., all his household goods at £3 3s. and his stock of malt and meal at 4s. 6d. “One payre of lommes and tow spinning wheles with thinges applying” were worth £1 9s. 4d., and his stock of “clothe, yearene and Wooll” £8 3s. 0d. Neither was it chiefly the men with small farms who had a loom to eke out a meagre living from the land, though James Slater, yeoman, and Edmund Stephenson, husbandman, both of Roughlee, might belong to such a group. The former had a lease of his land and a herd of six cows and a heifer. His beds, furniture and furnishings were valued at £10, and he left to the poor people of New Church parish 20s. 0d. to be divided amongst them. Fifteen people owed him £36 5s. 10d. in amounts from 1s. to £21. The latter, Edmund Stephenson, had rather more in his house, but he had two looms “with things appertaining” worth £1 6s. 8d. The capital investment needed for weaving was very small compared with that needed for cattle, implements and seed corn, so that these men were living quite as comfortably, though their goods were only worth £44 or £46, as some farmers with twice those valuations.

Many of the small and medium farms must have been run solely by family labour. Several sons and daughters could not be fully employed if they had not spinning wheels and looms. The will and inventory of John Briercliffe of Wheathead, who died in 1615, give a clear picture of such a family. His inventory totalling over £84 equalled that of the average yeoman, yet he was described as a husbandman; £50 accounted for his farm, and his household goods were valued at £20, a higher figure than the average. He had cards and wheels. Two looms “with furniture” were worth £3, and there was a stock of wool and yarn worth £5 6s. 8d. There were two sons and two daughters at home, so by farming, spinning and weaving they could all be gainfully employed. Two other sons lived elsewhere. William,
the youngest, was being maintained at “scholes of learning”, and Robert, the eldest, had been to the university.

Yeomen, including the wealthy, prosperous ones living in a style similar to local gentry also had one or two looms. James Mitton of Roughlee, whose total valuation in 1619 was £171, had two looms and wool, yarn and cloth. Ellis Nutter of Reedley, who died in 1667 worth £160, had two looms and two spinning wheels. Anthony Wilson, the rich yeoman who had the well-equipped smithy and a valuation of £220, had “two paire of loomes, warpe weft, cards wheels and combes”. Others who were farmers, craftsmen and weavers at one and the same time included John Slater of Roughlee, a mason, and John Sharp of Wheatley Lane, a blacksmith. Extra income was to be made by spinning and weaving, and people of all degrees of status and wealth engaged in this profitable domestic textile industry.

In three-quarters of the households wool and some flax was carded, combed and spun. That the women did this work is shown in the evidence given by James Robinson at the trial of Anne Whittle at Lancaster in 1612.\(^{(18)}\) He said she was hired by his wife to card wool; she came on the Friday, Saturday and the following Monday. The people who had spinning wheels but no loom had only a small stock of wool, flax or yarn usually worth under 5s. 0d. Wool predominated: only seven instances of flax or linen yarn are recorded. Odd people throughout the Forest and at different times during the century were engaged in spinning flax. These included the household of Ambrose Towneley of Moor Isles in 1641, where there was flax and yarn worth £2, and Ellen Pollard of West Close in Higham, a single woman, who in 1679 had six pounds of bleached linen yarn worth 8s. 0d.

So few farms had flocks of sheep of any size that the amount of wool produced locally must have been negligible. The large stocks that some men held suggest that they were buyers of quantities of wool for distribution or sale to the spinners. A pack of wool worth £12 12s. 0d. was listed in the debts of Henry Hartley of Wheatley Booth, yeoman, in 1617. John Hargreaves of Barley in 1678 had fourteen stone of wool and yarn worth £4 13s. 4d., whilst John Sutcliffe of Pasture in Barrowford in 1616 had wool, yarn and oil worth £16 and William Hargreaves of Barrowford in 1694 had wool and yarn worth £20.

The cloth in hand when the inventories were made was usually described as woollen cloth. Five had grey cloth and four had pieces of kersey. The three who were called clothiers appear to have been in a very small way. John Higgin of Wheatley Booth

\(^{(18)}\) Potts’ Discovery of Witches, Chetham Society, Vol. 6.
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Formerly known as Hargreaves' House. The family of Hargreaves was one of the most wealthy yeoman families in the Forest during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.
in 1685 had a stock of cloth, wool and yarn valued at £10. Robert Mitchell of Reedley in 1669 had ten kersey pieces worth £18, and a merchant in Leeds owed him £2 for two other kersey pieces. It is interesting to see that some cloth was taken into the West Riding of Yorkshire for sale.

In most cases the weaving was done in a room in the house often used for other purposes as well. Richard Hartley of Higham, the weaver whose inventory survives, had his loom in the chamber over the house along with two bedsteads, one meal ark with meal, malt and wheat, one buffet, five corn sacks and one pack-cloth. This was in 1691 and is probably typical of a handloom weaver’s work room. There were eleven references to special workshops or workhouses where the looms were, but all except one who had them were the wealthier yeomen like Ellis Nutter of Reedley, who had in the shop “too pair of Loomes and furniture” and two old spinning wheels. It was usual for them to have two looms but Robert Bulcock of Whitough, whose valuation in 1640 was £303, had “Fower pare of loomes with their furniture” worth £5. To have four looms suggests that there was hired labour for weaving and perhaps the employment of full time weavers. There are groups of cottages close to the Bulcock’s house at Whitough.

Yeomen and husbandmen in all the booths had looms, but half of the people who had looms lived in Roughlee and Barrowford booths. In Barrowford the finishing processes were being done in the seventeenth century. In the inquisition post mortem of Robert Banester of Parkhill in 1616 it was said that he and his father, Henry, were seized of a fulling mill in Parkhill, Barrowford.\(^{(19)}\) James Baldwin of Barrowford in 1665 had three tenters or stretching frames worth £7 10s. 0d. for stretching the cloth after it had been fullled. He also had three pairs of shears and a shear-board with its handles and brakes used for trimming the nap on the surface of the cloth. Men who did this work were known as cloth-dressers and Ruth Shuttleworth of Barrowford in 1679 bequeathed £4 to her son Nicholas, a cloth-dresser. In 1636 Anthony Allen of this booth, a dyer, had to appear at the quarter sessions.

Oil or grease was needed for the preparation of the wool before spinning, and a mixture of oil and butter was often used. Lawrence Smythe, a husbandman in Barrowford in 1609, had “grease for wooll” worth just a few pence for the work in hand, but John Sutcliffe of Pasture in Barrowford had “blended oil and butter” to the value of £3 10s. 0d. Such a large stock might imply that he was supplying it to the people of the neighbour-

\(^{(19)}\) *Inquisitions Post Mortem, Stuart Period, Part 2, p. 29.*
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The factory was pulled down a year or two ago.
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hood. Oil was being produced, for in 1694 William Hargreaves had “One Dutch Mill and Lead with other things belonging to it” worth £2. A Dutch mill was used for extracting rape oil. This man had neither spinning wheels nor a loom in his house, but had wool and yarn worth £20 and was producing oil for its preparation.

This seventeenth-century picture is just a part of the continuous story of spinning, weaving and cloth finishing in the Forest of Pendle. The factory recently demolished in Roughlee was a very early building. Each booth and township has its mill; some are old, some more recent, some very small like Narrowgates between Barley and Whitough, and Spen in Goldshaw. Barrowford developed into a busy cotton-weaving town, and weaving was its main industry until quite recently. Farming and weaving though using very different methods and producing different types of produce and materials, are still the chief occupations within the Forest of Pendle in the twentieth century.
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