

THE CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT GENTRY OF LANCASHIRE DURING THE CIVIL WAR PERIOD

B. G. Blackwood, B.A., B.Litt., D.Phil.

INTRODUCTION

LANCASHIRE was regarded as a county of religious extremes during the seventeenth century. The Reverend Richard Heyricke was warned, before taking up his appointment as warden of the Collegiate Church of Manchester in 1635, that he would be 'crucified as Christ was between two thieves: the Papist [and] the Puritan'.¹ In 1643 a Parliamentary newspaper portrayed Lancashire as a region where a small Puritan population struggled heroically against hordes of 'papists'.² Later Thomas Fuller remarked that in Lancashire, 'The people, generally devout, are, as I am informed, northward and by the west Popishly affected, which in the other parts are zealous Protestants. . .'.³

Contemporaries of course exaggerated the nature and extent of the religious divisions in Lancashire, concentrating on the Roman Catholics and Puritans, and virtually ignoring the Anglicans. However, historians are generally agreed that, apart from Monmouth, Lancashire was the most Catholic shire in seventeenth-century England, and that in response to the challenge from Rome Puritanism gained in strength between 1600 and 1642, especially in Salford hundred.⁴ But no scholar has yet seriously tried to assess the strength of Anglicanism in Lancashire. Nominally, most of the people belonged to the established church. In practice, many Lancastrians who were neither Papists nor Puritans must have been indifferent to religion. Dr R. C. Richardson reminds us that in some parts of Lancashire there was a fair amount of paganism, irreligion and doctrinal ignorance, not to mention witchcraft.⁵ After 1650, when parish church attendance ceased to be compulsory, there are signs of considerable religious apathy in Lancashire. In 1655 Major-General Charles Worsley was informed that 'not one in twenty in many towns go to any place of worship on the Lord's Day, but sit in their houses'.⁶ However, even if the religiously indifferent were numerous in

Lancashire, religion was to play a major part in the Civil War, and therefore deserves our close attention.

This paper will consider the religious affiliations and activities of the 774 Lancashire gentry families alive in 1642,⁷ and conclude by briefly comparing the Catholic and Puritan gentry from a social, economic, cultural and political standpoint.

I THE CATHOLIC GENTRY

During the early-seventeenth century Roman Catholics in England were generally divided into three categories: 'recusants', who refused to compromise with the established church; 'non-communicants', who attended Anglican Church services but did not take communion; and 'schismatics', who took communion while remaining at heart in sympathy with Catholicism. A member of either of the last two groups may be described as a 'Church Papist'. Schismatics are very difficult to discover, but a few are to be found among the Lancashire gentry. On entering the English College of Rome in 1600 Hugh, second son of James Anderton of Clayton, Esquire, said that his two brothers and three sisters were 'all schismatics, like the majority of his kinsfolk'.⁸ Non-communicants are much more conspicuous. During the reign of James I they may even have formed a majority of Lancashire Catholics. In a partial return for Lancashire, dated 1613, we find 2,392 non-communicants as against 2,075 recusants.⁹ But on the eve of the Civil War recusants apparently comprised almost the entire Catholic population of Lancashire. In the 1642 protestation returns Richard Bannister of Altham was the only Lancashire gentleman named as a non-communicant,¹⁰ and there do not seem to have been many other Church Papists among the gentry.

The following table shows the distribution of the Catholic gentry families in Lancashire in 1642, and it will be noted that in every hundred they were outnumbered by the non-Catholic gentry.

It will be observed that the Catholic gentry were most numerous in the lowland hundreds of West Derby, Leyland and Amounderness and least numerous in the highland hundreds of Salford, Blackburn and Lonsdale. The very small number of Catholics in 'industrialised' Salford hundred is particularly striking and may have sociological significance. Catholics were of course unevenly distributed within as well as between hundreds. In 'Blackburnshire' Catholics were to be found mainly in the arable Ribble valley and were rather less conspicuous in the pastoral-clothing districts of Rossendale and Pendle. In Lonsdale

TABLE 1: *The distribution of the Catholic and non-Catholic gentry families of Lancashire during the Civil War period*¹¹

<i>Hundred</i>	<i>Catholic families</i>	<i>Non-Catholic families</i>	<i>Total number of families</i>
Salford	9 (4.6%)	187 (95.4%)	196 (100%)
Blackburn	30 (27.3%)	80 (72.7%)	110 (100%)
West Derby	73 (36.9%)	125 (63.1%)	198 (100%)
Leyland	28 (39.5%)	43 (60.5%)	71 (100%)
Amounderness	51 (47.7%)	56 (52.3%)	107 (100%)
Lonsdale	30 (32.6%)	62 (67.4%)	92 (100%)
Total	221 (28.6%)	553 (71.4%)	774 (100%)

23 of the 30 Catholic families lived in the slightly more arable southern part of the hundred.

However, despite their strength in some areas, the Catholics formed only 28 per cent of the gentry in Lancashire, although in other northern counties the proportion seems to have been less.¹² But although not as numerous as is generally supposed, the Lancashire Catholic gentry played a crucial role in the survival of the old faith. Indeed, the Catholic church in Lancashire depended mainly on the gentry for its priests, nuns, congregations and mass centres. Warden Richard Heyricke thought that the Catholic gentry led their social inferiors to mass.

Great men have followers of their Vices, as of their persons, and when they please to bee Idolatrous, their children, servants, tenants, their poore kinred, and Idolizing Neighbours, will to the Masse with them.¹³

Some of the Catholic gentry in Lancashire seem to have exercised considerable religious influence over the lower orders. William Blundell of Crosby, the well-known Catholic Cavalier, boasted that the township which he dominated had 'not had a Protestant in it' for many years.¹⁴ This remark was made in 1688, but the recusant roll suggests that Little Crosby may also have been entirely Catholic in 1641.¹⁵ Indeed, it can hardly be a coincidence that in 1641 townships with one or more Catholic gentry had large numbers of recusants, while those with no Catholic gentlemen usually, though not always, had few or none. Chorley had three Catholic gentry families, the Chorleys, the Gillibrands and the Rishtons, and 74 recusants. Brindle was socially dominated by James Gerard of Hoghton, a Catholic gentleman, and had 223 recusants. Goosnargh had three Catholic gentlemen, Gabriel Hesketh, Edward Midgall and Henry Towneley, and 256 other Papists. On the other hand, Penwortham, which was under the lordship of John Fleetwood, a strong Protestant, had only seven

Catholics. Bretherton, under the aegis of Henry Bannister of Bank, another Protestant, had just one Catholic. Bispham in Amounderness had no gentry of any kind and also no Papists.¹⁶

As Richard Heyricke noted, Catholic gentlemen kept the old faith alive among their tenants as well as among their deferential neighbours. But it is significant that tenants dwelling some distance from their Catholic landlord were less inclined to follow his religion than those living on his doorstep. In 1632 the 154 tenants of Westby and Lytham resided near their landlord, Sir Cuthbert Clifton of Lytham,¹⁷ and 82 of them were Catholic in 1641.¹⁸ But the 75 tenants of Clifton and Salwick¹⁹ lived at least six miles away from the Cliftons in 1640 and only 18 of them were Catholic in 1641.²⁰

However, it is important not to overstate our case. As Dr Haigh reminds us, Catholicism in Lancashire was not entirely dependent on the gentry.²¹ In certain districts many plebeian Catholics practised their faith without upper class protection or persuasion. The 35 recusants in Whittle-le-Woods, the 39 Catholics in Catterall, and the 68 Papists in Greenhalgh and Thistleton had no Roman Catholic gentry in their midst.²² In a few townships large numbers of humble recusants practised their religion in defiance of a powerful anti-Catholic landowner.²³ Nevertheless, these exceptions do not invalidate our general argument, which is that in Lancashire the Catholic gentry had considerable religious influence on the lower orders.

Not only did the Catholic gentry in Lancashire provide Catholic priests with congregations. They also provided them with mass centres. In 1639 a list of the 82 mass centres in Lancashire was drawn up, with the names of the 50 priests who served them and the laymen who protected them. All but seven of the 82 mission stations were sheltered by the gentry.²⁴

As well as mass centres and congregations, the Lancashire Catholic gentry provided their Church with a large number of priests. A total of nearly 180 Catholic priests, born in Lancashire, were active sometime during the period 1625-1660. Many of these priests, after completing their education abroad, returned to serve in Lancashire or other parts of northern England. The status of several of the Lancashire Catholic clergy is hard to discover, but over half of them were apparently younger sons of the gentry. Only a quarter of the Lancashire Catholic clergy were of plebeian stock, as the following table shows.

Few of those gentry-priests rose to high positions in the Catholic Church. But those priests were not careerists; they were men dedicated to the old faith. In fact most of the Lancashire priests who suffered martyrdom during the seventeenth century

TABLE 2: *Social origins of Lancashire Catholic clergy, 1625-60*²⁵

	<i>Of gentry origins</i>	<i>Of plebeian origins</i>	<i>Of uncertain origins</i>	<i>Total</i>
Secular clergy	33 (44.0%)	29 (38.7%)	13 (17.3%)	75 (100%)
Religious Orders				
Benedictines	26 (70.3%)	4 (10.8%)	7 (18.9%)	37 (100%)
Carmelites	1 (100.0%)	—	—	1 (100%)
Carthusians	—	—	1 (100.0%)	1 (100%)
Franciscans	2 (66.6%)	—	1 (33.4%)	3 (100%)
Jesuits	31 (50.8%)	14 (23.0%)	16 (26.2%)	61 (100%)
Total	93 (52.2%)	47 (26.4%)	38 (21.4%)	178 (100%)

were from gentry families, and included such men as Edward Bamber, Ambrose Barlow, Brian Cansfield, Thomas Holland, John Southworth and John Wall.²⁶

By providing a large number of able priests, the Catholic gentry ensured the very survival of the old faith in Lancashire, for without priests there can be no Roman Catholicism. It is also difficult to visualise Roman Catholicism without nuns, and these the Lancashire gentry supplied in abundance. During the period 1625-1660 a total of 68 Lancashire women were at some time or other in convents abroad, mostly in the Spanish Netherlands.²⁷ Unlike the Lancashire clergy, the nuns seldom returned to their native soil once they had taken the veil. The social origins of 13 (19.1 per cent) of the 68 Lancashire nuns are unknown, but only 14 (20.6 per cent) were apparently of plebeian stock. The other 41 nuns (60.3 per cent) came from gentry families. Several daughters of the Andertons of Birchley, the Blundells of Crosby, the Bradshaws of Haigh, the Cliftons of Lytham and the Tyldesleys of Myerscough entered nunneries. Elizabeth Tyldesley, aunt of Thomas Tyldesley, the famous Cavalier, joined the convent of the Poor Clares at Gravelines in 1610 and was abbess for 39 years before her death in 1654.²⁸

It is of course not surprising that most Lancashire nuns were of gentry stock. The gentry were better able than plebeians to afford the dowries demanded for their daughters by the continental convents. These dowries varied in amount, from the £200 required by the Poor Clares at Gravelines to the £500 and upwards demanded by the Benedictine nunnery in Brussels.²⁹ Obviously only the richer sort could afford to pay such sums. Yet these dowries cost far less than many of the marriage portions provided by the Lancashire gentry. When in 1660 Henry Blundell of Ince Blundell married his daughter, Anne, to James Scarisbrick of Scarisbrick, he gave her husband a portion amounting to

£1,100.³⁰ Clearly it was often cheaper for a Catholic gentleman to send his daughter to a nunnery than to find her a husband. A Protestant gentleman, blessed with one or more daughters, had no such choice.

But if daughters were less costly to Catholic than to Protestant gentlemen, the latter were at least spared the burdens of recusancy fines and composition rents. Legally, the financial penalties for recusancy were savage. Under an act of 1581 convicted recusants could be fined £20 for every month they stayed away from the Anglican Church, a vast sum for all but the richest Catholics. By an act of 1587 Catholics defaulting on payment could have all their goods and two-thirds of their lands seized by the crown.³¹ In practice, these penalties were not rigidly enforced, and only a minority of convicted recusants actually paid the fines. Between 1625 and 1648 only 22 Lancashire Catholic gentry families appear to have paid recusancy fines,³² and just two of these were heavily mulcted. Richard Towneley of Towneley apparently paid £487 17s. 6d. in 1633³³ and George Middleton paid £210 in 1648.³⁴ But it is doubtful if they were severely affected by these fines. The Towneley family's debts of £6,396 in about 1642 must have been caused more by their extensive building operations³⁵ than by their recusancy fine of £487. George Middleton, who was almost certainly hard up during the late 1640s,³⁶ was probably more harmed by his fine of £855 for delinquency³⁷ than by his fine of £210 for recusancy.

The Lancashire Catholic gentry seem to have suffered slightly more from composition rents than from recusancy fines. In 1627 Charles I restored the practice of composition. This was a contract between government and recusant whereby the recusant agreed to compound, that is to pay an annual rent based upon the assessed value of two-thirds of his landed property, often in *lieu* of arrears of recusancy fines. Once a Catholic compounded, he was technically free from further recusancy fines, though in practice this was not always the case. The northern commission for compounding, which sat at York from 1627 to 1642, was responsible for administering the new fining system north of the Trent.³⁸

At least 106 Lancashire Catholic gentry seem to have paid composition rents between 1629 and 1641. These rents varied considerably from one individual to another and sometimes from one year to another. These 106 Catholics made a total of at least 409 payments, amounting to £10,299 15s. 1d.³⁹ This means that the average composition rent was £25. The total income of these Catholic gentlemen was £33,996 and the average £320.⁴⁰ Hence the average composition rent was only about one-twelfth of the

annual income of an estate. This was similar to the situation in Yorkshire where few Catholic gentlemen were required to pay as much as one-fifth of their total income and many paid less than one-tenth.⁴¹ In Lancashire only 19 Catholic gentlemen paid composition rents equivalent to one-fifth or more of their annual income, and only four of them could be said to have been adversely affected. These four gentlemen are listed below, together with their composition rents and annual landed incomes.

TABLE 3: *Composition rents in relation to annual landed income*⁴²

Recusant	Annual composition rent			Annual landed income		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Thomas Middleton of Leighton	243	0	0	900	0	0
Andrew Norris of West Derby	23	6	8	50	0	0
John North of Docker	21	0	0	22	19	3
Thomas Westby of Mowbreck	150	0	0	250	0	0

Andrew Norris and John North both paid their rents in 1632 and the following year their lands were extended for debt.⁴³ Thomas Middleton compounded in 1639.⁴⁴ In 1642 his son was accused by his tenants of imposing heavy entry fines, perhaps a sign that the Middletons had been harmed by recusancy payments.⁴⁵ Thomas Westby of Mowbreck compounded in 1638 and two years later was in debt to the tune of £1,600.⁴⁶ However, this large sum suggests that, unlike Norris, North and possibly Middleton, Westby could not blame composition rents entirely for his plight.⁴⁷ In 1635-6 Westby had bought the estates of the Kirkbys of Rawcliffe,⁴⁸ and although the purchase price is unknown, it may well have contributed to his insolvency.

Thus it would appear that before 1642 most Lancashire Catholic gentry were not financially harmed by the penal laws. Catholics had to endure greater hardships after the Civil War when they became victims of sequestrations, composition fines and forfeitures.⁴⁹

II THE PROTESTANT GENTRY

Let us now turn our attention to the Protestant gentry of Lancashire. The first point to emphasise is that the Protestant gentry were less essential to Protestantism than the Catholic gentry were to Roman Catholicism. Whereas the Catholic priests in Lancashire looked mainly to the gentry for protection,⁵⁰ the

Church of England clergy had many different patrons. Lancashire had 64 parishes in 1642 and, as the following table shows, the local gentry controlled less than a third of them.⁵¹

TABLE 4: *Patrons of the Established Church in Lancashire in 1642*⁵²

<i>Patrons</i>	<i>No. of advowsons</i>
Peerage	6
Gentry	20
Non-Lancashire laymen	8
Bishops	6
Other clergy ⁵³	5
Crown	13
Unknown	6
Total	64

Not only did the established church in Lancashire have few gentry patrons. It also had few gentry-parsons. In 1642 the 64 parishes in the palatinate were served by 58 beneficed clergymen,⁵⁴ of whom 8 (13.8 per cent) were definitely, and 16 (27.5 per cent) were possibly, of Lancashire gentry stock. Among the 46 unbeneficed clergymen in Lancashire in 1642, only 4 (8.7 per cent) were definitely, and 9 (19.5 per cent) were possibly, of local gentry origins.⁵⁵ In short, the great majority of the Protestant clergy in Lancashire were from plebeian families. In this respect they contrasted markedly with the Lancashire Catholic priests, a small majority of whom were gentlemen's sons.⁵⁶

The Protestant gentry may, with great difficulty, be divided into Anglicans and Puritans.

(a) *Anglicans*

Anglicans were 'those generally satisfied with the Church [of England's] doctrine, organization, and ceremonial'.⁵⁷ It is impossible to estimate the numbers of Anglican gentry in Lancashire in 1642 because their religious activities are so sparsely documented. Nominally most of the Lancashire gentry belonged to the Church of England. But whether the majority were sincere members is very doubtful. However, the established church did find some champions among the upper class laity. It is well-known that James Stanley, 7th earl of Derby, leader of the Lancashire royalists in the Civil War, was a very devout Anglican. His *Private Devotions*⁵⁸ are clear evidence of his piety. Among the gentry the most dedicated Anglicans included Edward Chisnall of Chisnall and the elder William Farington of Worden.

The former defended the Church of England against Roman Catholics and the latter against Presbyterians.

In 1652 Edward Chisnall published his *Catholike History* which was a defence of 'the Reformed Church of England' against the Papists. Indeed, he considered that 'the Roman Church is not the Catholique Church, either in respect of the Universality of her Doctrine or any Jurisdiction she can claim from Peter'. Chisnall not only condemned the doctrine of papal supremacy, but also transubstantiation, communion in one kind, 'the Sacrifice upon the Altar', and many other Roman Catholic beliefs and practices.⁵⁹ On the whole *Catholike History* shows Chisnall more adept at attacking Roman Catholicism than at defending Anglicanism.

William Farington of Worden never produced any religious work as vast as *Catholike History*, but in his letter (of 1648?) to the Reverend John Bradley, a Presbyterian minister, he showed himself just as articulate as Chisnall in attacking his religious opponents.⁶⁰ Although Farington showed personal respect towards his correspondent, he did not mince his words, condemning the 'impertinent pragmatical and ignorant [Presbyterian] preachers, who think all religion is a sermon'. But Farington felt bitter towards the Presbyterians, not just because of their religious practices, but because they had destroyed episcopal government and all that it had entailed. Farington believed that:

Under [bishops] we had a Church so united, so orderly, so well governed; a religion so well settled; articles so true, sufficient, and confessed; canons so prudent; devotions so regular and constant . . .

There could hardly be a more enthusiastic defence of the Church of England than this.

(b) *Puritans*

We must now consider those Puritans whom William Farington and others so despised. The following gentry may be classed as Puritans: those appointing or financially assisting Puritan ministers;⁶¹ builders of chapels used for Puritan worship; members of puritanical religious committees; elders of Presbyterian classical assemblies; members of Independent congregations; and, finally, those shown to be Puritans by their wills,⁶² correspondence or the opinions of their contemporaries. On the basis of these criteria it has been calculated that during the Civil War period there were 114 Puritan gentry families in Lancashire. The following table shows their geographical distribution and it will be noted that in every hundred they were heavily outnumbered by the non-Puritan gentry.

TABLE 5: *The distribution of the Puritan and non-Puritan gentry families of Lancashire during the Civil War period*⁶³

<i>Hundred</i>	<i>Puritan families</i>	<i>Non-Puritan families</i>	<i>Total number of families</i>
Salford	47 (24.0%)	149 (76.0%)	196 (100%)
Blackburn	16 (14.5%)	94 (85.5%)	110 (100%)
West Derby	21 (10.6%)	177 (89.4%)	198 (100%)
Leyland	8 (11.2%)	63 (88.8%)	71 (100%)
Amounderness	9 (8.4%)	98 (91.6%)	107 (100%)
Lonsdale	13 (14.1%)	79 (85.9%)	92 (100%)
Total	114 (14.7%)	660 (85.3%)	774 (100%)

In complete contrast to the Catholic gentry, the Puritans were most numerous in the highland hundreds of Salford, Blackburn and Lonsdale and least numerous in the lowland hundreds of West Derby, Leyland and Amounderness. Hardly surprisingly, the Puritan gentry were strongest of all in the most puritanical region of Lancashire, Salford hundred. This was also the most economically advanced part of the county. Dr R. C. Richardson has observed that Puritanism in Lancashire and Cheshire took firmest root in the clothing towns, market centres and in the 'industrialising' pastoral regions.⁶⁴ As regards the Lancashire gentry, 15 (13 per cent) of the 114 Puritan families lived in clothing towns or market centres as compared with only 9 (4 per cent) of the 221 Catholic families. The great majority of the other 99 Puritan gentry families dwelt in pastoral districts. In Blackburn hundred, for example, all but one of the 16 Puritan gentry families lived in the pastoral-clothing eastern region.⁶⁵ In Lonsdale nine of the 13 Puritan gentry families resided in the northern peninsula, which was more pastoral and 'industrial' than the southern part of the hundred.

Nevertheless, despite their strength in some areas, the Puritans comprised barely 15 per cent of the Lancashire gentry. This was a relatively small proportion. Even in Yorkshire the Puritans formed 20 per cent of the gentry population in 1642.⁶⁶ Moreover, the Puritans in Lancashire, or at least in the parish of Manchester, also failed to gain support among the poorer sections of society.⁶⁷ Although statistical proof is lacking, it would appear that Puritanism in Lancashire was essentially the religion of those whom Dr Christopher Hill has called 'the industrious sort'. In the Manchester *classis* the largest single group comprised merchants, while in the Bury *classis* it consisted of yeomen.⁶⁸ Yet although 'the middle sort' may have formed the backbone of Puritanism, Lancashire gentlemen gave considerable help to the

Puritan cause as patrons, as members of various religious committees, as Presbyterian elders and, above all, as magistrates.

As patrons the Puritan gentry appointed ministers, gave financial assistance and built chapels. As Dr Richardson has observed, 'the most direct way in which the gentry could materially influence the growth of puritanism was by their control of advowsons'. However, Richardson found that 'in the diocese of Chester the use of advowsons played a less prominent part in the development of puritanism than it did elsewhere in the country'.⁶⁹ In Caroline Yorkshire, for example, as many as 80 benefices were owned by Puritan lords and gentlemen.⁷⁰ But in Lancashire only nine parish churches were controlled by the Puritan gentry sometime during the Civil War period.⁷¹ However, in addition to those parishes, the Puritan gentry were able to influence appointments of ministers to a few parochial chapels. What mattered most of course was not the numbers but the quality of the clergy they appointed, and with one exception all the ministers nominated by the Puritan gentry were of high calibre.⁷² Two of those divines were well-known Puritans: Isaac Ambrose and John Angier. Ambrose, the author of *Prima, Media et Ultima* (1650) and other works, secured the vicarage of Preston in 1639 through the influence of the Hoghtons of Hoghton. Angier, author of *An Helpe to Better Hearts for Better Times* (1647), owed his appointment to Denton chapel to the Holland family.⁷³ The Puritan gentry appointed several other good, though less able, ministers. Gilbert Ireland of Hutt presented to the rectory of Warrington in 1646 a certain Robert Yates, who was a man of 'good lyffe'. Edward Stockley of Huyton appointed to the rectory of Aughton in 1646 James Worrall, who was 'an orthodox divine of good lyffe and conversacon'.⁷⁴ The Lancashire Puritan gentry undoubtedly used their patronage to good effect.

The Puritan gentry advanced the Puritan cause not only by presenting able ministers but also by financially assisting them. Ralph Assheton of Middleton, as well as appointing the Puritan rectors of Middleton and Radcliffe, contributed 'towards the mainteynce' of Peter Bradshaw, the 'orthodox able Minister' of Cockey chapel. Geoffrey Holcroft of Hurst, esquire, Ellis Hey of Monk's Hall, gentleman, together with Thomas Richardson, a plebeian, paid the 'salury' of William Leigh, the 'very godly Ministe^r' of Culcheth Chapel.⁷⁵ As well as rendering assistance in their lifetime, Puritan gentlemen sometimes left small sums to Puritan ministers in their wills. Thus in April 1662 John Bradshaw of Darcy Lever left £2 to Richard Goodwin, the Presbyterian vicar of Bolton, and £10 to Robert Parke, a Puritan lecturer.⁷⁶ In 1655 John Hartley, a prosperous Manchester

merchant and lord of Strangeways, bequeathed £3 each to two leading Puritan divines, Richard Heyricke and Richard Hollingworth, both of the Manchester Collegiate Church.⁷⁷

A number of Lancashire gentlemen helped to erect Puritan chapels, among these being John Bradshaw of Bradshaw, John Atherton of Atherton and Humphrey Booth of Manchester. In 1640 the Puritan Bradshaw family rebuilt Bradshaw chapel. In 1645 John Atherton of Atherton and his tenants erected the chapel of St John the Baptist at Chowbent, where the Reverend James Livesay, a 'painful godly orthodox minister', was later to officiate. In 1634 Humphrey Booth, a gentleman-clothier of Manchester, contributed nearly £500 towards the cost of building Salford chapel for the support of 'a godly, learned, able, fit, zealous and faithful man for a preaching minister'.⁷⁸

Apart from patronage, some Lancashire gentlemen were able to further the Puritan cause by serving on religious committees. In the Long Parliament, 1640-42, Alexander Rigby of Goosnargh served on committees concerning ecclesiastical canons and the profanation of the sabbath. Ralph Assheton of Middleton was on the committee relating to preaching ministers, while (the elder?) Richard Shuttleworth of Gawthorpe was a member of committees for sabbath observance and the 'suppression of divers Innovations' (i.e. Arminianism). The most active Lancashire member was the Puritan royalist, Roger Kirkby of Kirkby Ireleth, who was on committees concerning preaching ministers, the 'popish hierarchy', ecclesiastical innovations and the sabbath.⁷⁹ In 1650 twenty Lancashire gentlemen, one Cheshire gentleman (George Pigott) and a Lancashire plebeian (William West) were appointed by Parliament to the Lancashire committee for the survey of church livings.⁸⁰ These commissioners seem to have carried out their various tasks thoroughly and conscientiously.⁸¹

Some Lancashire gentlemen helped the Puritan cause as Presbyterian elders. On 19 August 1645 parliament passed an ordinance for the establishment of Presbyterianism throughout England,⁸² and on 2 October 1646 Lancashire was divided into nine administrative divisions called *classes*, each *classis* being responsible for the ordination of ministers and the election of lay elders.⁸³ A total of 64 Lancashire gentlemen were elders after the first Civil War, 26 of them being members of either the Manchester or Bury *classis*.⁸⁴ Unfortunately we have no records to show whether the 38 elders outside Salford hundred ever served. This does not necessarily mean that they were all lukewarm Presbyterians. As Professor J. H. Hexter has argued, those 'who allowed their names to appear on eldership lists must have done so with full knowledge that the national church was to be Presby-

terian in form'.⁸⁵ We can, however, follow the activities of the 26 elders of the Manchester and Bury *classes*, and it would seem that 17 of them were conscientious. John Andrews of Little Lever attended 26 meetings and Richard Meadowcroft of Smethurst 33 meetings of the Bury *classis* between 1647 and 1657. Gentlemen elders of the Manchester *classis* were even more active. Samuel Birch of Ardwick attended 24 meetings between 1650 and 1654, Thomas Strangeways of Strangeways 59 meetings between 1650 and 1660, and Robert Hyde of Denton 68 meetings between 1647 and 1660.⁸⁶ Clearly the moderate success of Presbyterianism in Lancashire owed a fair amount to the gentry.

The Lancashire Puritan gentry perhaps made their greatest contribution to the Puritan cause in their capacity as magistrates. After the Civil War the Puritan justices launched a vigorous attack on vice and immortality. This seems worth stressing, because there has been a tendency among some historians to play down the moral tone of Puritanism.⁸⁷ Now it is true that Puritanism was not just a movement for sober living, and in his study of the pre-war Puritans in the diocese of Chester, Dr Richardson rightly concentrated on their liturgical and pastoral activities.⁸⁸ Nevertheless, some leading Puritans said that their religion was defined in ethical terms. Mrs Lucy Hutchinson said that: '... whoever was zealous for God's glory or worship, could not endure blasphemous oaths, ribald conversation, prophane scoffes, Sabbath breach, derision of the word of God, and the like... were Puritans'. Richard Baxter wrote that his father was 'reviled by the name of Puritan, Precision and Hypocrite' because he had reproved 'Drunkards and Swearers'. Another Puritan said that 'those whom we ordinarily call Puritans are men of strict life'.⁸⁹ Puritans were deeply concerned about moral reform. Dr J. S. Morrill considers that Major-General Charles Worsley's opposition to all manifestations of loose living in Lancashire, Cheshire and Staffordshire was probably as much the result of his moral convictions as of his preoccupation with security.⁹⁰

During the Interregnum the Lancashire Puritan magistrates shared Worsley's zeal for the 'reformation of manners', and their main targets were stage-plays, 'unlawful games', sabbath-breakers, swearers, tipplers, drunkards and disorderly alehouses. On 24 September 1652 Edward Holbrook of Manchester and John Gilliam, a plebeian justice, ordered 'Mr. Samuel Mosley, Mr. Francis Mosley, Mr. Oswald Mosley and William Page' to appear at the Michaelmas quarter sessions and there to give surety not to 'act or use' any more stage plays. In 1656 Jerehiah Aspinwall of Toxteth ordered the constable of North Meols to bring before him 'William Bradshaw, John Bradshaw and John

Blevine and Thomas Brookfield and Richard Abram all of North Meols' because they 'did unlawfullie gather themselves together to playe at unlawfull games . . .'. On 28 February 1657 Edmund Hopwood of Hopwood and Robert Hyde of Denton convicted four clothworkers for 'doeing of worldly labor on the Lord's day.'⁹¹ But the 'sinnes' most vehemently attacked were swearing and drunkenness. The Puritan justices of the 1640s and '50s apparently took these matters far more seriously than did the mainly non-Puritan magistrates of the 1620s and '30s. The quarter sessions recognizances of the post-Civil War period contain long lists of persons punished. Randle Sharples of Blackburn, a plebeian magistrate, convicted at least 18 swearers and 12 drunkards in the first quarter of 1654. John Foxe of Rhodes noted that in November 1656 he punished 21 individuals for swearing a total of 32 oaths. Perhaps the most vigorous of all Puritan magistrates was Edmund Hopwood. In 1656 he convicted 22 alehouse keepers, 33 tipplers, 15 drunkards, 13 swearers and 10 sabbath breakers. In January and May 1657 he dealt with at least 22 tipplers, while between July 1657 and July 1658 he convicted 9 alehouse keepers, 15 tipplers, 13 drunkards, 8 swearers and a sabbath breaker.⁹²

It will be noted that a majority of the offenders listed above were drunkards, tipplers or alehouse keepers. Unlike the nineteenth century temperance reformers, seventeenth century Puritans condemned only excessive drinking and not the demon drink itself. Nevertheless, they denounced drunkenness in the strongest terms and not just through fear of disorder but through hatred of vice. Joseph Rigby of Aspull attacked drunkenness entirely on moral grounds. In words reminiscent of the Elizabethan Puritan, Philip Stubbes, he painted the following picture of a drunkard.

A Drunkard, such an one I take to be,
 As not for thirst, but for the company,
 For pride, for lust, or conscience to stil,
 Or for to drive the time away, doth swill,
 And he to be a creature may be said,
 That God in his Creation never made,
 Halfe man, halfe beast he is, or at the least,
 He's one that's born a man and lives a beast.⁹³

Finally, it remains to consider how far the Lancashire Puritan gentry were united. Clearly they were not all of one mind and their motives for supporting Puritanism obviously varied. Yet it would seem that the Puritan gentry were more united, or at least less disunited, in Lancashire than in many other counties. This is suggested by the very small number of Independents and sectaries among them. There seem to have been only three Congregational

Churches in Lancashire between 1646 and 1660, at Altham, Birch and Walmesley.⁹⁴ However, several Independents were to be found in the divided church at Gorton. No Lancashire gentlemen were numbered among the Gorton or Walmesley Independents. But Thomas Birch of Birch, Oliver Edge of Holt and Charles Worsley of Platt were members of Birch chapel, while Robert Cunliffe of Sparth belonged to the Reverend Thomas Jolly's 'inner society' at Altham.⁹⁵ In addition to those four committed Independent gentlemen, John Bradshaw of Darcy Lever may have been sympathetic to Independency,⁹⁶ while at least two other Lancashire gentlemen—Peter Holt of Bridge Hall and Alexander Rigby of Goosnagh—may perhaps be classed as Presbyterian-Independents. Holt was an active elder of the Bury Presbyterian *classis* between 1647 and 1649, attending 20 meetings.⁹⁷ But in 1650, along with two others, he was accused of trying to persuade two Independents to preach at Bury.⁹⁸ Alexander Rigby of Goosnagh had been named a Presbyterian elder in 1646, but by 1650 he had apparently become 'a great Independent' and 'a most desperate Enemy to the Presbyterian Church Discipline'.⁹⁹ The activities of Holt and Rigby show that religious opinions could change with the times and that it is impossible to draw clear-cut distinctions between Presbyterians and Independents. In any case the Lancashire Independents appear to have been of the non-separating kind. The main religious dividing line in the mid-seventeenth century was not between Presbyterians and Independents, both of whom believed in the unity of Church and State, but between Independents and sectaries.

The sectaries in Lancashire were mainly Quakers, but two Baptist churches were founded after the Civil War: at Warrington and in the College at Manchester.¹⁰⁰ No Lancashire gentlemen seem to have belonged to either of these 'gathered' churches. However, two Lancashire gentlemen may be described as religious radicals, John Sawrey of Plumpton and Thomas Rawlinson of Graythwaite. John Sawrey is a complex character and provides another illustration of the shifting nature of religious allegiances. Sawrey was named as a Presbyterian elder in 1646,¹⁰¹ but later as a member of Barebones Parliament in 1653, he showed himself opposed to a learned ministry and universities.¹⁰² A religious radical like John Sawrey considered that a university education was useless to a minister who lacked the spirit and superfluous to one who had it. The other religious extremist, Thomas Rawlinson of Graythwaite, appears to have been the only gentleman-Quaker in Lancashire during the Civil War period.¹⁰³

III SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

It would seem, then, that serious religious divisions did not exist among the Lancashire Puritan gentry. On the other hand, there are signs of considerable animosity between Protestant and Catholic laymen in Lancashire. Dr Robin Clifton has shown how strong was the fear of Catholics in seventeenth century England, and especially in years of political crises, such as 1640-42.¹⁰⁴ Fear of Catholics was intensified by the Irish rebellion of 1641. Mistrust of local Catholics was particularly acute in western coastal areas and in counties with a fairly substantial Catholic population, such as Lancashire.¹⁰⁵ Indeed, it would seem that anti-Catholic feeling, shown by alarms and panics, was stronger in Lancashire than in most other English counties on the eve of the Civil War.¹⁰⁶

How far the Lancashire Protestant gentry shared the anti-Catholic fears and prejudices of the rest of the non-Catholic population, it is hard to judge. Puritan gentlemen, like Ralph Assheton of Middleton, John Moore of Bank Hall and Alexander Rigby of Goosnargh, certainly did, and so also did the Anglican Earl of Derby.¹⁰⁷ However, it is important to stress that for most of the seventeenth century the Protestant and Catholic gentry of Lancashire lived peacefully together. Indeed, this is partly shown by the lax enforcement of the recusancy laws, except in years of crises.¹⁰⁸ Nevertheless, the very small number of mixed marriages on the eve of the Civil War perhaps indicates a certain amount of ill-feeling or estrangement between Protestant and Catholic gentlemen. In his will, dated 1626, Richard Fleetwood of Penwortham expressly forbade the marriage of his granddaughters, Elizabeth and Marjory, 'to or with anye Popish Recusant whatever'.¹⁰⁹ Most of the Protestant gentry seem to have shared Fleetwood's prejudices. Of the 124 known Protestant marriages, only 7.3 per cent were with Catholic women. Likewise 7.3 per cent of the 151 Catholic gentry marriages were with Protestants. Clearly there was a good deal of religious *apartheid* in Lancashire. Professor Lawrence Stone has observed that this *apartheid* was particularly strong among the Catholic and Puritan landed classes after 1570.¹¹⁰ This is certainly borne out by their marriages. In Lancashire 133 Catholic gentlemen were married on the eve of the Civil War, and only 10 of these had Protestant wives, including James Anderton of Clayton, who married into two prominent Puritan (and subsequently Roundhead) families, the Asshetons of Middleton and the Shuttleworths of Gawthorpe. Of the 78 married Puritan gentry in 1642 only two, Robert Alston of Brockholes and Joseph Rigby of Aspull, had Catholic

wives.¹¹¹ Such religious exclusiveness was hardly conducive to religious amity.

Was any religious ill-feeling exacerbated by social, economic and cultural differences? How far did the Catholic and Puritan gentry differ from each other in terms of status, solvency, size and source of income? Were Catholics and Puritans differently educated?¹¹² Let us first consider socio-economic factors. Writing about the Elizabethan period, Professor W. R. Trimble has suggested that for the most part 'the Catholics were of the minor gentry in wealth, status and influence'.¹¹³ Applied to Lancashire in 1642, this statement needs qualifying. Most upper class Catholic families did indeed belong to the lesser gentry,¹¹⁴ but so also did the Puritans.

TABLE 6: *Social status and religion*¹¹⁵

	<i>Catholic families</i>	<i>Puritan families</i>
Peer	1 (0.5%) ¹¹⁶	—
Baronets	1 (0.5%)	2 (1.7%)
Knights	2 (0.9%)	1 (0.9%)
Esquires	61 (27.4%)	38 (33.4%)
Gentlemen	157 (70.7%)	73 (64.0%)
Total	222 (100.0%)	114 (100.0%)

Professor Trimble has also said that Elizabethan Lancashire 'had few Catholics of any wealth'.¹¹⁷ It would seem that Caroline Lancashire also had few wealthy Catholics, if by 'wealthy' we mean those whose landed incomes were at least £1,000 per annum. However, the following table shows that in 1642 there were not many rich Puritans either.

TABLE 7: *Income and religion*¹¹⁸

<i>Annual income from land in 1642</i>	<i>Catholic families</i>	<i>Puritan families</i>
£		
2,000 and over	3 } 7 (3.2%)	1 } 5 (4.4%)
1,000-1,999	4 }	4 }
750-999	2 }	1 }
500-749	10 } 37 (16.7%)	7 } 22 (19.3%)
250-499	25 }	14 }
100-249	45 }	32 }
Under 100	52 } 97 (43.9%)	15 } 47 (41.2%)
Unknown	80 (36.2%)	40 (35.1%)
	221 (100.0%)	114 (100.0%)

It is clear that in terms of *per capita* income, the differences between the Catholic and Puritan gentry were only slight. However, in terms of known aggregate income, the Catholics were much wealthier than the Puritans. The former were worth £36,148 and the latter only £21,765.

Notwithstanding the amount of wealth which they possessed, very few of the Catholic gentry significantly increased their holdings between 1600 and 1642. But a higher, though small, proportion of Puritan gentlemen apparently added to their estates. On the other hand, about the same (tiny) percentage of Puritan and Catholic gentry seem to have sold a large amount of land between 1600 and 1642.¹¹⁹ Furthermore, the proportion of Puritan families seriously in debt but not selling land was only slightly less than the proportion of Catholic families.¹²⁰ In short, the differences between the Puritan and Catholic gentry in terms of financial stability were negligible, as the following table suggests.

TABLE 8: *Financial state and religion*

	<i>Catholic gentry</i>	<i>Puritan gentry</i>
(a) total number of families	221	114
(b) families buying considerable property, 1600-42	17 (7%)	17 (14%)
(c) families selling considerable property, 1600-42	11 (5%)	7 (6%)
(d) families seriously in debt ¹²¹ sometime between 1600 and 1642, but avoiding heavy sales	16 (7%)	5 (4%)
(e) total number of families in financial difficulties	27 (12%)	12 (10%)

What is particularly striking in the above table is the strong financial position of the overwhelming majority of *both* Puritans and Catholics. The only Puritan gentleman who apparently sold his patrimonial estate before the Civil War was Thomas Strangeways of Strangeways.¹²² Rather more Catholics were hard up and the debts of the Norrises of Speke and the Towneleys of Towneley were enormous.¹²³ Yet, despite our ignorance of the history of many minor 'Anglican' gentry families, it seems safe to say that financial insolvency was no more common among Catholics than among non-Catholics. Financially unstable Catholics, like the Norrises and the Towneleys, could be matched by equally impecunious Protestants, like the Asshetons of Whalley and the Gerards of Halsall.¹²⁴ Why were most Catholics and Puritan gentry in an economically healthy state? There are no simple answers to this question, but a number of tentative suggestions

may be made. The financial stability of the Puritan gentry may perhaps be attributed in part to Puritan teaching, with its emphasis on thrift and austerity. Charles Herle, the Puritan rector of Winwick, strongly condemned extravagance and recommended 'frugality'.¹²⁵ The Puritan Shuttleworths of Gawthorpe certainly kept well within their income. Their total receipts from 21 October 1611 until 6 November 1613 were £3,506 1s. 2½d., while their total disbursements were £3,420 5s. 0½d.¹²⁶ The financial stability of the Catholic gentry may be attributed to a number of factors. Disqualification from local or national office-holding perhaps encouraged some Catholic gentry to devote their entire energies to estate management. Some Catholic gentlemen, like John Hoghton of Park Hall, cultivated their demesnes, others, like the Middletons of Leighton, raised entry fines, while others, like Abraham Langton of Lowe, exploited coalmines.¹²⁷ Some, like John Preston of Furness Abbey, even indulged in money lending.¹²⁸ However, it is unlikely that enterprising or energetic landowners formed a majority of the Catholic gentry. The main reason for the economic health of the Lancashire Catholic gentry must surely have been the leniency of most recusancy impositions.

Thus in terms of status, wealth and solvency, the differences between the Catholic and Puritan gentry were only slight. There was, however, one important economic distinction. Far more Puritan than Catholic families had members engaged in business or professional activities in Charles I's reign.¹²⁹ The following table gives details.

TABLE 9: *Occupation and religion*¹³⁰

	<i>Catholic gentry</i>	<i>Puritan gentry</i>
(a) Total number of families in 1642	221	114
(b) Families with one or more members who were or had been		
(i) Physicians	3 (1.3%)	3 (2.6%)
(ii) Lawyers ¹³¹	5 (2.3%)	12 (10.5%)
(iii) Merchants or traders	6 (2.7%)	16 (14.1%)
Total	14 (6.3%)	31 (27.2%)

The fact that over a quarter of the Puritan families had commercial or professional interests has religious as well as economic significance. Business and professional men had close connections with the Lancashire clothing towns and market centres, and these, says Dr Richardson, were mostly strongholds of Puritanism.¹³² Lancashire gentlemen whose economic activities extended

to London, like Humphrey Chetham, the merchant,¹³³ or Alexander Rigby, the lawyer,¹³⁴ were even more exposed to Puritan influences. Puritan ideas were also imbibed at the universities and the inns of court.¹³⁵ Indeed, over a third of the Puritan gentry families had members who had attended one or other of these institutions before 1642. But partly because of the penal laws, only 13 per cent of the Catholic families had members who had obtained an advanced education in England.¹³⁶ Details are given in the following table.

TABLE 10: *English higher education and religion*¹³⁷

	Catholic gentry	Puritan gentry
(a) Total number of families in 1642	221	114
(b) Families with one or more members who went to		
(i) University only	9 (4%)	20 (18%)
(ii) Inn of Court only	12 (5%)	7 (6%)
(iii) University and Inn of Court	8 (4%)	14 (12%)
(c) Total number of families receiving higher education	29 (13%)	41 (36%)

The facts set out in the above table do not necessarily mean that Catholics were less cultured than Puritans. Sir Cuthbert Clifton of Lytham and Henry Lathom of Mossborough, both recusants,¹³⁸ do not seem to have attended either a university or an inn of court. Yet both were highly civilised gentlemen. Sir Cuthbert Clifton had 'a Chist with Instruments of Musique',¹³⁹ while Henry Lathom had a 'Librerie' with several 'roes of bookes', which included 'one of history, one Virgil'.¹⁴⁰ Moreover, it should not be forgotten that Catholics who found difficulty in obtaining an advanced education in England often received one in continental seminaries.¹⁴¹ At least 38 Lancashire Catholic gentlemen were educated abroad before the Civil War,¹⁴² and during the dangerous 1640s several others sought refuge in the continental seminaries. A majority of Catholics educated at these colleges did in fact become priests, but the point is that their education gave them, and perhaps also their lay relatives, familiarity with current intellectual movements in Europe. It was no accident that some Catholic gentlemen who had studied abroad, such as Richard Towneley of Towneley and Richard Walmesley of Dunkenhalgh, showed an active interest in science.¹⁴³ Other Lancashire Catholic gentlement with an interest in natural philosophy included the Shireburns of Stonyhurst,

the Traffords of Trafford and Christopher Towneley, uncle of Richard, all of whom belonged to the famous Towneley group.¹⁴⁴ Not all members of this group were Catholic, yet, according to Mr C. Webster, they were 'predominantly non-Puritan in sympathy'.¹⁴⁵ Indeed, there is no evidence that the Lancashire Puritan gentry showed any enthusiasm for science during the mid-seventeenth century. We must not, of course, exaggerate the cultural and educational differences between the Catholic and Puritan gentry. Nevertheless, these differences were perhaps greater than any socio-economic distinctions and more likely to aggravate those religious antagonisms which played such an important part in the Great Rebellion in Lancashire.

Finally, how did the Lancashire Catholic and Puritan gentry divide during the Civil Wars (1642-48)? It used to be thought that Catholics were solidly royalist. But Dr K. J. Lindley has convincingly shown that in Lancashire a majority of Catholic commoners and a substantial minority of Catholic gentry were neutral during the Civil Wars.¹⁴⁶ These neutral Catholic gentry consisted of a sizeable 51 and there were 49 whose political allegiance is unknown. The overwhelming majority of these were extremely poor and humble men, 'peasant gentry'. Catholic neutralism in Lancashire was fostered by such grievances as military musters, ship money and distraint of knighthood, to say nothing of recusancy fines.¹⁴⁷ However, neutralism among the Catholic gentry should not be exaggerated for it appears to have been even stronger among the Protestant gentry. If 100 (45 per cent) of the 221 Catholic families 'sate still' during the Civil Wars, 382 (69 per cent) of the 553 Protestant families may have done so. It is nevertheless significant that these Protestant neutrals were overwhelmingly 'Anglican'.¹⁴⁸ The Puritan gentry on the other hand present quite a different picture, for, unlike the Catholic and Anglican gentry, only a quarter of them were neutral during the Civil Wars. Moreover, Table 11 shows that among the committed gentry the Puritans were predominantly parliamentary and the Catholics almost entirely royalist.¹⁴⁹

TABLE 11: *Civil War allegiance and religion*

	<i>Catholic families</i>	<i>Puritan families</i>
Royalists	116 (52.5%)	7 (6.1%)
Parliamentarians	—	67 (58.8%)
Sidechangers or Divided families	5 (2.3%)	11 (9.7%)
Neutrals/Others	100 (45.2%)	29 (25.4%)
Total	221 (100.0%)	114 (100.0%)

CONCLUSION

We are ignorant of the possible religious affiliations of most of the 774 Lancashire gentry families during the Civil War period. We have no idea how many were believing, let alone practising, Anglicans. Only 221 gentry families can be confidently called Catholic, while only 114 were clearly Puritan. Yet despite their small numbers, Catholics and Puritans were the main religious protagonists in Lancashire. The Catholic gentry made an enormous contribution to the Catholic cause. Indeed, the Catholic Church in Lancashire depended largely on the local gentry for its priests, nuns, congregations and mass centres. By contrast, the Established Church depended on gentry patrons and parsons to only a very limited extent.

Puritanism in Lancashire had its main strength in the clothing towns, market centres, 'industrial' rural areas and among 'the middle sort'. Nevertheless, the Puritan gentry gave much help to the Puritan cause as patrons, as members of religious committees, as Presbyterian elders and, above all, as magistrates. Puritanism in Lancashire also benefited by the lack of serious divisions among its gentry supporters.

It is difficult to judge how much religious animosity existed between Catholic and non-Catholic gentry. But the very small number of mixed marriages suggests a fair amount of ill-feeling or alienation. However, any religious hatred owed little to social or economic factors. Since few of the Catholic gentry were heavily mulcted for recusancy, their economic position seems to have been generally sound and not basically different from that of the Puritan gentry. The only major economic difference was that far more Puritan than Catholic gentlemen had business or professional interests. Moreover, far more Puritan than Catholic gentry had received an advanced education in England. On the other hand some Catholic, but apparently no Puritan, gentlemen were associated with the scientific movement. A certain cultural gap seems to have existed between the Catholic and Puritan gentry. Finally, and most obviously, the Catholics and Puritans were sharply divided on political lines. Among the committed gentry the Puritans were overwhelmingly parliamentarian and the Catholics almost entirely royalist during the Civil Wars.

NOTES

- 1 Quoted in R. C. Richardson, *Puritanism in north-west England: A regional study of the diocese of Chester to 1642* (1972), p. 153.

- 2 *Civil War tracts*, ed. G. Ormerod, Chet. Soc. Old. Ser. 2(1844), pp. 101-2.
- 3 *The history of the worthies of England*, ed. P. Austin Nuttall (1840), II, p. 189.
- 4 See Richardson, *op. cit. passim*; C. Haigh, 'Puritan evangelism in the reign of Elizabeth I', *Eng. Hist. Rev.* 92(1977), pp. 30-58; *Idem*, *Reformation and resistance in Tudor Lancashire* (1975); J. Bossy, *The English Catholic Community, 1570-1850* (1975), esp. pp. 91-5, 404-5.
- 5 Richardson, *op. cit.* pp. 3-5, 156, 164.
- 6 *Jolly's note book*, ed. H. Fishwick, Chet. Soc. New. Ser. 33(1894), p. 128.
- 7 The Lancashire gentry were those consistently described as baronet, knight, esquire or gentleman in official documents. For a fuller discussion of the term 'gentry' see my forthcoming Chetham Society publication, *The Lancashire gentry and the Great Rebellion, 1640-1660*.
- 8 *The responsa scholarum of the English College, Rome*, ed. A. Kenny, C[atholic] R[ecord] S[ociety], 54(1962), I, pp. 99, 325, 347.
- 9 B. Magee, *The English recusants* (1938), pp. 87-8.
- 10 Chet[ham] Lib[rary], Bailey Transcripts, Bdle 17.
- 11 This table refers to heads of families. Names of Catholic gentry from P[ublic] R[ecord] O[ffice], E 179/131/317; 131/334; 131/335; 132/336; 132/337; 132/339; 132/340; E 351/426-33; E 377/34A-49; SP 19/21/232; 22/244; 93/122; 114/36; 158/139; SP 23/58A; 61 *et seq.*; SP 28/211; 218; B[ritish] L[ibrary], Harl.ms. 2112 fos. 56-63; Chet. Lib. Bailey Transcripts, Bdle 17; G. Anstruther, 'Lancashire Clergy in 1639', *Recusant History* 4(1957), pp. 40-6.
- 12 See J. T. Cliffe, *The Yorkshire gentry from the Reformation to the Civil War* (1969), p. 186; S. J. Watts, *From border to middle shire: Northumberland 1586-1625* (1975), pp. 82-3; C. B. Phillips, 'The gentry in Cumberland and Westmorland, 1600-1665', Lancaster Univ. Ph.D. thesis 1974, p. 46.
- 13 The epistle dedicatory to *Three sermons preached at the collegiate church in Manchester* (1641).
- 14 M. Blundell, *Cavalier: letters of William Blundell to his friends, 1620-1698* (1933), p. 251.
- 15 W. E. Gregson, 'Recusant Roll for West Derby Hundred, 1641', *THSLC*, 50(1898), p. 236.
- 16 PRO, E 179/131/335; 132/336. The only Protestant gentleman in Goosnargh, Alexander Rigby, was an absentee landlord.
- 17 See *The Clifton papers*, ed. R. C. Shaw (1935), pp. 165-9.
- 18 PRO, E 377/49; E 179/132/336; Chet. Lib., Bailey Colln., Bdle 17.
- 19 For tenants see L[ancashire] R[ecord] O[ffice], DDCI 1454.
- 20 PRO, E 179/132/336.
- 21 Haigh, *Reformation and Resistance*, pp. 283-4.
- 22 PRO, E 179/131/335; 132/336.
- 23 See B. G. Blackwood, 'Social and religious aspects of the history of Lancashire, 1635-55', Oxford Univ. B.Litt. thesis 1956, p. 37.
- 24 See Anstruther, *art. cit.* pp. 40-6.
- 25 Names of clergy from G. Anstruther, *The seminary priests: A dictionary of the secular clergy of England and Wales, 1558-1850*, vol. II (1975); *Records of the English province of the Society of Jesus*, ed. H. Foley, 7 vols. (1875-83); H. N. Birt, *Obit book of the English Benedictines, 1600-1912* (1913); G. Dolan, 'Lancashire and the Benedictines', *THSLC*, 49(1897), pp. 123-30; *Franciscana*, ed. R. Trappes-Lomax, CRS 24(1923); J. Gillow, *Bibliographical dictionary of English Catholics*, 5 vols. (1885-1903).

- 26 See J. A. Myerscough, *A procession of Lancashire martyrs and confessors* (1958), *passim*.
- 27 Birt, *op. cit.* pp. 214, 216, 220, 222; A. Hamilton, *Chronicles of the English Augustinian Canonesses Regular . . . in Louvain, 1548-1644*, 2 vols. (1904-6); F. O. Blundell, *Old Catholic Lancashire*, III (1941), pp. 195-232; and the following vols. of CRS: 9, 13, 14, 24.
- 28 *Miscellanea*, IX, ed. J. Gillow, CRS 14(1914), p. 36.
- 29 See W. M. Brady, *Annals of the Catholic hierarchy in England and Scotland, 1585-1876* (1883), pp. 89-90.
- 30 In return Scarisbrick provided a jointure of only £100 per annum and a title of dower for an additional £20 (LRO, DDSc 28/27).
- 31 *Statutes of the realm*, 23 Eliz. cap. i; 29 Eliz. cap. vi.
- 32 PRO, E 377/34A-49, 55. I have found no evidence of recusancy fines being imposed in Lancashire during the Interregnum.
- 33 PRO, E 377/41. This was the sum owing since the reign of James I.
- 34 PRO, E 377/55. The recusant roll actually names *Thomas* Middleton, but George, a Protestant, was no doubt paying the sum owed by his deceased father.
- 35 B. G. Blackwood, 'The Economic State of the Lancashire Gentry on the Eve of the Civil War', *Northern History* 12(1976), pp. 77, 81.
- 36 *Roy[alist] Composition] Papers*, IV, ed. J. H. Stanning, Lancs. Ches. Rec. Soc. 36(1898), pp. 131-5; LRO, DDT^o H 10 (unfoliated); PRO, C 3/454/4.
- 37 *Calendar of Committee for Compounding*, ed. M. A. E. Green, III (1891), p. 1783.
- 38 See M. J. Havran, *The Catholics in Caroline England* (1962), chapter VI.
- 39 For composition rents see PRO, E 351/426-33.
- 40 Assessments of annual landed income are based mainly on the 1641 lay subsidy rolls (E 179), Duchy of Lancaster pleadings (DL 1), the feodaries' certificates of the courts of wards (Wards 5) and the papers of the committee for compounding (SP 23) in PRO, together with family muniments in LRO. Where there is more than one estimate of income for an individual gentleman, the highest has been chosen. For a detailed discussion of the sources see Blackwood, *art. cit.* pp. 54-7.
- 41 Cliffe, *op. cit.* p. 220.
- 42 The income of John North, derived from the 1653 parliamentary survey of the family estates, is almost certainly an underestimate. See PRO, SP 23/58, fos. 198-9. The estimated incomes of the other three recusants are derived from the 1641 lay subsidy rolls. See PRO, E 179/132/336; 132/337; 132/340.
- 43 PRO, E 351/429; E 379/73 fos. 4-5.
- 44 PRO, E 351/432. The Middletons may also have compounded between 1640 and 1642.
- 45 See J. Rawlinson Ford, 'The customary tenant-right of the manors of Yealand', *Trans. Cumb. & Westmor. Antiq. & Arch. Soc.* New Ser. 9 (1909), pp. 150, 160.
- 46 PRO, E 351/431; DL 1/363.
- 47 Westby had also paid a composition rent of £100 in 1629, 1631 and 1632 (J. Brownbill, 'Lancashire Recusants about 1630', *THSLC*, 60 (1908), p. 173; PRO, E 351/428; 429). But this would bring his total recusancy payments to only £450. We do not know what, if any, composition rents Westby paid in 1630, 1633-37 and 1639-40.
- 48 *Roy. Comp. Papers*, VI pt. i, ed J. Brownbill, Lancs. & Ches. Rec. Soc. 95 (1941), p. 287.

- 49 The economic fate of the Catholic royalists is considered along with that of other royalists in my forthcoming book, *The Lancashire Gentry and the Great Rebellion, 1640-1660*, chapter IV. On the fate of the other Catholic gentry after the Civil War see B. G. Blackwood, 'The Lancashire Gentry, 1625-1660: A Social and Economic Study', Oxford Univ.D.Phil. thesis 1973, App. IX.
- 50 See above p. 4.
- 51 In Cheshire, on the other hand, well over half the parishes were apparently under gentry control during the 1630s (J. S. Morrill, *Cheshire 1630-1660* (1974), p. 274 n.3).
- 52 Information about presentation to benefices from parish clergy lists in *VCH Lancs. III-VIII* (1906-14).
- 53 These include cathedral chapters, Oxford and Cambridge colleges and individual clerics.
- 54 *VCH Lancs. III-VIII*.
- 55 For curates and lecturers see D. Lambert, 'The lower clergy in the Anglican Church in Lancashire, 1558-1642', Liverpool Univ. M.A. thesis 1964, App. II.
- 56 See above p. 5.
- 57 J. F. H. New, *Anglican and Puritan: the basis of their opposition, 1558-1640* (1964), p. 2.
- 58 See *The Stanley papers, Part III*, ed. F. R. Raines, Chet. Soc. Old Ser. 70(1867), vol. III.
- 59 *Catholike history* (1652), pp. 8-78, 420-501, BL, Thomason Tracts E.1273.
- 60 See *Farington papers*, ed. S. M. Farington, Chet. Soc. Old Ser. 39 (1856), pp. 108-11.
- 61 The evidence of presentations generally needs to be corroborated by other information.
- 62 Wills must of course be used cautiously since they sometimes reflect the views of the scribe rather than of the testator.
- 63 This table refers to heads of families. Names of Puritan gentry from *VCH Lancs. III-VIII*; *Commonwealth church survey*, ed. H. Fishwick, Lancs. Ches. Rec. Soc. 1(1879); W. K. Jordan, *The social institutions of Lancashire 1480-1660*, Chet. Soc. 3rd Ser. 11 (1962); *Civil War tracts*, p. 91; *Acts and ordinances of the Interregnum*, ed. C. H. Firth and R. S. Rait, 2 vols. (1911), II, p. 972; *Journals of the house of commons*, II, pp. 52, 54, 105, 437-8; *Journals of the house of lords*, VIII, pp. 507-12; *Minutes of the Manchester Presbyterian classis*, ed. W. A. Shaw, 3 vols. Chet. Soc. New Ser. 20, 22, 24 (1890-1); *Minutes of the Bury Presbyterian classis*, ed. W. A. Shaw, 2 vols. Chet. Soc. New Ser. 36, 41 (1896, 1898); *Jolly's note book*; *The life of Adam Martindale*, ed. R. Parkinson, Chet. Soc. Old Ser. 4(1845); *The diary of Henry Newcome*, ed. T. Heywood, Chet.Soc. Old Ser. 18(1849); *The autobiography of Henry Newcome*, ed. R. Parkinson, Chet. Soc. Old Ser. 26(1852); R. Halley, *Lancashire: its Puritanism and nonconformity*, 2 vols. (1869); B. Nightingale, *Lancashire nonconformity*, 6 vols. (1891-3); Richardson, *op. cit.*; and various wills in print and in manuscript.
- 64 *Puritanism in north-west England*, pp. 11-15, 177.
- 65 The exception was Doughty of Thornley.
- 66 Cliffe, *op. cit.* p. 262.
- 67 R. C. Richardson, 'Puritanism in the diocese of Chester to 1642', Manchester Univ. Ph.D. thesis 1969, pp. 297-9.
- 68 *Minutes of the Manchester Classis*, I-III, *passim*; *Minutes of Bury*

- Classis*, I-II, *passim*. Unfortunately the status of a large number of the Presbyterian elders is unknown.
- 69 *Puritanism in north-west England*, pp. 126-7.
- 70 Cliffe, *op. cit.* p. 268.
- 71 Those parish churches were Altcar, Aughton, Lancaster, Middleton, Poulton-le-Fylde, Preston, Radcliffe, Ulverston and Warrington. Evidence about presentation to benefices mainly from *VCH Lancs.* and *Commonwealth church survey*.
- 72 The exception was William Assheton, rector of Middleton, whose brother, Ralph, was his patron. See *Commonwealth church survey*, pp. 23-4.
- 73 Richardson, *Puritanism in north-west England*, pp. 121 & n.26, 127.
- 74 *Commonwealth church survey*, pp. 51, 94-5; *VCH Lancs.* III, p. 289.
- 75 *Ibid.*, V, pp. 66, 158; *Commonwealth church survey*, pp. 27, 50.
- 76 J. C. Scholes, *History of Bolton* (1892), p. 259.
- 77 *Lancs. & Chesh. wills & inventories, 1572-1696*, ed. J. P. Earwaker, Chet. Soc. New Ser. 28(1893), pp. 107-8.
- 78 Jordan, *op. cit.* p. 87; *VCH Lancs.* III, p. 438; *Commonwealth church survey*, p. 32; Richardson, *op. cit.* pp. 83, 121.
- 79 *Commons Journals*, II, pp. 52, 54, 105, 165, 437-8.
- 80 *Commonwealth church survey*, p. 1.
- 81 *Ibid. passim*.
- 82 *Acts and ordinances*, I, pp. 749-54.
- 83 *Lords Journals*, VIII, pp. 507, 509-12.
- 84 Names from *ibid.* pp. 509-12; *Manchester Classis*, I-III, *passim*; *Bury Classis*, I-II, *passim*.
- 85 *Reappraisals in history* (1961), p. 166.
- 86 *Bury Classis*, I-II, *passim*; *Manchester Classis*, I-III, *passim*.
- 87 See C. Hill, *Society and Puritanism in pre-revolutionary England* (1964), pp. 24-6; H. R. Trevor-Roper, *Religion, the Reformation and social change* (1967), pp. 70-1.
- 88 *Puritanism in north-west England, passim*.
- 89 Lucy Hutchinson, *Memoirs of the life of Colonel Hutchinson*, ed. J. S. Sutherland (1973), p. 44; Richard Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, ed. Matthew Sylvester (1696), p. 3; [Henry Parker?], *A discourse concerning Puritans* (1641), p. 11.
- 90 *Cheshire 1630-1660*, p. 282 & n.4.
- 91 LRO, QSB/1/1652 (unsorted); QSB/1/1656 (unsorted). I am grateful to Dr Keith Wrightson for these references.
- 92 K. Wrightson, 'The reformation of manners, with special reference to the counties of Lancaster and Essex, 1640-1660', Cambridge Univ. Ph.D. thesis 1973, pp. 138-40, 165-7, 171.
- 93 *An ingenious poem called the drunkard's perspective or burning-glasse* (1655), p. 1, BL, Thomason Tracts E.1606(3).
- 94 For a full discussion of this point see Blackwood, D.Phil. thesis, p. 125 n.1.
- 95 Blackwood, B.Litt. thesis, pp. 39, 46-7.
- 96 See Blackwood, D.Phil. thesis, p. 125 n.3.
- 97 *Bury Classis*, I, *passim*.
- 98 *Ibid.* I, p. 111 n.1.
- 99 *Lords Journals*, VIII, p. 511; J. Vicars, *Dagon demolished* (1660), p. 12.
- 100 W. T. Whitley, *Baptists of the north-west of England, 1649-1913* (1913), pp. 41 *seq.*, 46; T. Dowley, 'John Wigan and the first Baptists of Manchester', *The Baptist Quarterly*, XXV (1973), pp. 151-64.

- 101 *Lords Journals*, VIII, p. 512.
- 102 S. R. Gardiner, *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, 1649-1656* (1903), II, pp. 308 n.1, 310.
- 103 E. E. Taylor, *The valiant sixty* (1951), p. 41; A. Cole, 'The social origins of the early Friends', *Jnl. Friends' Hist. Soc.* 48 (1957), p. 103. Richard T. Vann found four gentlemen - Quakers in Buckinghamshire before 1662 ('Quakerism and the social structure in the Interregnum', *Past and Present*, 43 (1969), pp. 77, 79-80).
- 104 Clifton, 'The popular fear of Catholics during the English Revolution', *Past and Present*, 52(1971), pp. 23-55; *Idem*, 'Fear of Popery', *The origins of the English Civil War*, ed. C. Russell (1973), pp. 144-167.
- 105 K. J. Lindley, 'The Impact of the 1641 rebellion upon England and Wales, 1641-5', *Irish Hist. Studies*, 18(1972), pp. 156, 159.
- 106 R. C. Clifton, 'The fear of Catholics in England, 1637 to 1645, principally from central sources', Oxford Univ. D.Phil. thesis 1967, pp. 142, 241, 337 and maps I-III.
- 107 *Ibid.* pp. 108-9, 338; Clifton, *Past and Present*, 52, p. 40; Lindley, *art. cit.* pp. 165-6; *Civil War tracts*, p. 18.
- 108 According to Mr J. D. Cosgrove this was largely due to the reluctance of Protestant gentlemen to proceed against members of their own social class (Cosgrove, 'The position of the Recusant gentry in the social setting of Lancashire, 1570-1642', Manchester Univ. M.A. thesis 1964, chapter III).
- 109 *Lancs. & Chesh. wills & inventories at Chester, 1572 to 1696*, ed. J. P. Earwaker, Chet.Soc. New Ser. 28(1893), p. 196.
- 110 *The crisis of the aristocracy, 1558-1641* (1965), pp. 614-15.
- 111 B. G. Blackwood, 'The marriages of the Lancashire gentry on the eve of the Civil War', *The Genealogists' Magazine*, 16(1970), pp. 326-7.
- 112 I have concentrated on Catholics and Puritans because these were the main religious protagonists in Lancashire and because so little is known about the religious beliefs and economic state of most other gentry families.
- 113 *The Catholic laity of Elizabethan England, 1558-1603* (1964), p. 264.
- 114 *i.e.* were plain gentlemen. Cf. G. E. Aylmer, *The state's servants* (1973), p. 179.
- 115 This table of course refers to heads of families. The main sources used to establish gentility were the freeholder lists of 1600 and 1633, the knighthood composition lists of 1631-2, the muster rolls of 1632, the lay subsidy rolls of 1641 and the Protestant returns of 1641-42. See *Miscellanies: Lancs. & Chesh.*, I, Lancs. Ches. Rec. Soc. 12(1885), pp. 211-23, 229-51; LRO, DDN 64, fos. 78-80, 92-5; PRO, E 179/131/334; 131/335; 132/336; 132/337; 132/339; 132/340; also E 179/131/317 (Blackburn Hundred 1626); Chet. Lib., Bailey Transcripts, Bdle 17.
- 116 The Catholic peer was Henry Parker, 13th baron Morley and Mounteagle.
- 117 *The Catholic laity*, p. 206. For details see pp. 200-1, 205-6, 212-13, 236.
- 118 For comparative purposes income is based on the 1641 lay subsidy rolls (PRO, E 179/131/334; 131/335; 132/336; 132/337; 132/339; 132/340; also E 179/131/317 (Blackburn hundred 1626)). For a discussion of the value of these rolls see Blackwood, *Northern History*, 12, pp. 55-7.
- 119 Apart from *VCH Lancs.* III-VIII, family histories and family muni-ments, the best sources of evidence for property transactions in the

- pre-Civil War period are: LRO, QDD 12-48 (1600-42); Guild[hall] Lib[rary], royal contract estates: sales contracts 1628-77; also draft deeds 52 and 53. Of more limited value are PRO, chancery close rolls, C 54; Palatine of Lancaster feet of fines, PL 17.
- 120 Apart from family muniments, the main sources of evidence concerning serious indebtedness in the pre-Civil War period are: PRO, chancery close rolls (recognizances), C54; chancery crown office, misc. books, C 193/41; Lord Chamberlain's dept., entry books of recognizances, LC 4/196-202. For a critical discussion of the question of indebtedness in the seventeenth century see Blackwood, *North. Hist.*, 12, pp. 76-7.
- 121 Table 8 is confined to private debts only. If debts to the crown or family liabilities were included, the statistics would not be significantly altered.
- 122 LRO, QDD 45/3.
- 123 For details see Blackwood, D.Phil. thesis, pp. 57-8, 174.
- 124 For details see *ibid.*
- 125 Herle, *Wisdom's Tripes* (1655), Pt. ii, 116-21, 173.
- 126 *The house and farm accounts of the Shuttleworths of Gawthorpe*, ed. J. Harland, Chet. Soc. Old Ser. 35(1856), I, p. 211.
- 127 Blackwood, *North. Hist.* 12, pp. 62, 64-5.
- 128 P. R. Long, 'The wealth of the magisterial class in Lancashire, c 1590-1640', Manchester Univ. M.A. thesis 1968, pp. 218, 223.
- 129 The small number of professional men among the Catholic gentry can hardly be explained by the Act of 1606 which forbade Papists to practise law or medicine (3 Jac.I, cap. v), for the Act was frequently evaded. No act excluded Catholics from trade or commerce.
- 130 Information about doctors from miscellaneous sources. Lawyers from R. Somerville, *Office-holders in the Duchy and County Palatine of Lancaster from 1603* (1972); BL, Harl. ms. 1912, fos. 181-3, 200-26, 247-8; and miscellaneous sources. Merchants from family and parish histories; *Preston guild rolls, 1397-1682*, ed. W. A. Abram, Lancs. Ches. Rec. Soc. 9(1884); R. J. A. Shelley, 'Wigan and Liverpool pewterers', *THSLC*, 97(1945), pp. 21-6; PRO, state papers domestic Charles I, SP 16; exchequer port books (Liverpool), E 190/1336/11; Duchy of Lancaster pleadings, DL 1/302-72; Palatine of Lancaster chancery bills, PL 6/8-16; Guild. Lib. mss. 5576/1 (Fishmongers' Company, freemen and apprentices, vol. I, 1614-50); 11593/1 (Grocers' Company register of apprentices, vol. I, 1629-66). I am indebted to Mr. Richard Grassby for information about Lancashire freemen and apprentices of the London Leathersellers' Company, 1629-50.
- 131 These include counsellors at law, recorders, attorneys and those holding crown appointments.
- 132 *Puritanism in north-west England*, pp. 11-15, 177.
- 133 A. P. Wadsworth and J. de L. Mann, *The cotton trade and industrial Lancashire* (1931), p. 33.
- 134 He had chambers in Gray's Inn (*The Lancashire lieutenancy under the Tudors and Stuarts*, ed. J. Harland, Chet. Soc. Old Ser. 50(1859), II, p. 297).
- 135 On the relationship between higher education and religious and political allegiance, see Blackwood, D.Phil. thesis, pp. 186-90.
- 136 On penal laws affecting education see A. C. F. Beales, *Education under penalty* (1963), pp. 29-32, 99-100, 272-3.
- 137 Sources regarding higher education are: Bodleian Library, Oxford Univ. archives, matriculation register PP, 1615-47; *Register of the*

- Univ. of Oxford*, ed. A. Clark, Oxford Hist. Soc. 11 (1887), vol. II; *Alumni Oxoniensis, 1500-1714*, ed. J. Foster, 4 vols. (1891-2); *Brasenose College register, 1509-1909*, Oxford Hist. Soc., 55(1910); *Registrum Orielense*, ed. C. L. Shadwell (1893), vol. I; *Alumni Cantabrigienses to 1751*, ed. J. A. & J. Venn, 4 vols. (1922-7); *A biographical register of Christ's College*, ed. J. Peile (1910), vol. I; *A biographical register of Peterhouse men*, ed. T. A. Walker (1930), vol. II; *Admissions to the College of St. John the Evangelist* (1882), vol. I; *Admissions to Trinity College, Cambridge*, ed. W. W. Rouse Ball & J. A. Venn (1913), vol. II; Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, ms 'Liber Matriculationis', 1560-1678; Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, ms register, vol. I (1598-1706); *Register of admissions to Gray's Inn, 1521-1889*, ed. J. Foster (1889); *Records of Lincoln's Inn*, ed. W. P. Baildon (1896), vol. I; *Register of admissions to the Middle Temple*, ed. H. A. C. Sturgess (1949), vol. I; Inner Temple Library, admissions to the Inner Temple, 1546-1659 (Typescript, 1954).
- 138 *Miscellanea*, XVII, CRS 53(1960), p. 424; *Roy. Comp. Papers*, VI, pt. ii, p. 412.
- 139 See O. Ashmore, 'Household Inventories of the Lancashire Gentry, 1550-1700', *THSLC*, 110(1958), p. 83.
- 140 Henry Lathom's books were valued at £20 in 1643. See PRO, SP 28/217A (unfoliated).
- 141 This despite the legal penalties, for which see Beales, *op. cit.* pp. 272-273.
- 142 *The Douai College diaries*, ed. E. H. Burton & T. L. Williams, CRS 10 (1911), vol. I; *Registers of the English College at Valladolid, 1589-1862*, ed. E. Henson, CRS 30(1930); *The responsa scholarum*, ed. A. Kenny, 2 vols. CRS 54-5(1962-3); W. Croft, *Historical account of Lisbon College* (1902).
- 143 C. Webster, 'Richard Towneley (1629-1707), the Towneley group and seventeenth-century science', *THSLC*, 118 (1966), pp. 51-76; M. Brigg, 'The Walmesleys of Dunkenhalgh', *Trans. Lancs. Ches. Antiq. Soc.* 75-6 (1965-6), pp. 84, 89-91.
- 144 Webster, *art. cit.* pp. 58-61, 73-4. Christopher Towneley was of course more of an antiquarian than an astronomer.
- 145 *Ibid.* p. 76.
- 146 Lindley, 'The part played by the Catholics', *Politics, religion and the English Civil War*, ed. B. Manning (1973), p. 141.
- 147 Lindley, *op. cit.* pp. 166-71; *idem*, 'The lay Catholics in the reign of Charles I', *Jnl. Eccles. Hist.* 22(1971), p. 214. Lindley was concerned with the political rather than the economic consequences of recusancy payments.
- 148 353 (80 per cent) of the 439 'Anglican' gentry families seem to have been neutral.
- 149 For details and documentation see my forthcoming book, *The Lancashire gentry and the Great Rebellion, 1640-1660*.