

## TWO LIVERPOOL MEDIEVAL AFFRAYS.

By R. Stewart-Brown, M.A., F.S.A., F.S.Gen.

Read 8 November, 1933.

## I. THE GREAT RIOT AT LIVERPOOL IN 1345.

**M**EDIEVAL references to Liverpool affairs are rare and therefore some account of the great riot which took place there in 1345 may be acceptable.<sup>1</sup>

An entry, probably contemporary, made in the annals of Whalley Abbey, has the following reference to this riot: <sup>2</sup>

*Lyrpoole Magnus conflictus in campo de Lyverpoole inter illos  
1344 de Ratcliffe ex una parte et illos de Trafford ex altera.  
Unde Robertus Ratcliffe vicecomes occisus est et xiiii  
altera parte.*

It seems certain that Robert [de] Ratcliffe was the bastard owner of Ordsall and Flixton, whose sudden death is recorded as occurring on 14 Feb. 1344/5 (1344 O.S.), the very day of, but without reference to, this Liverpool riot.<sup>3</sup> He was not in fact sheriff at the time, but had so acted in several previous years. His name does not occur among those whose murders were made the subject of indictments, but this may have been

<sup>1</sup> The events are very briefly mentioned in Gore's *Annals* and some of the local histories, and a little further detail is given in the *V.C.H. Lancs.*, II, 204; IV, 6, 331 n.), but by reference to the official records entered on various rolls in the Record Office a fuller account is available.

The record material here used is taken from the following: Pat. Roll, 6 Mch. 1344/5 (No. 213, m. 26d.), *id.* 8 Mch. (No. 213, m. 24d.), Close Roll, 12 Feb. 1345/6 (No. 179, m. 20d.), *id.* 20 May 1346 (No. 179, m. 4d.), *Coram Rege* Roll 1346 (No. 344, m. 8), *id.* (No. 345, m. 2), *id.* 1347 (No. 347, m. 3d.), *id.* (No. 348, m. 22), *id.* 1362/3 (No. 409, m. 15).

<sup>2</sup> See Miss Taylor's account of these annals and her extracts from the Cotton MS. *Vespasian A 5*, collated with Dodsworth MS. 122, in *Jour. Chester Arch. Soc.*, XIX, 186, etc.

<sup>3</sup> *V.C.H. Lancs.*, IV, 210, and *Lancs. Inq.* (*Cheth. Soc.*, 95, 149).

because he was one, if not the leader, of the party responsible for the deaths.

That the Liverpool riot was between a band of Radcliffes and their adherents and another of the Traffords and their friends, is made clear by the evidence. On Thursday 10 Feb. 1344/5, bodies of evildoers and disturbers of the peace went armed to Liverpool, and feloniously and seditiously, with banners displayed and in warlike manner, in the presence of the royal justices sitting there, wickedly killed many men, mutilated and wounded others in their limbs and robbed many, besides contemptuously hindering the justices in their work.<sup>1</sup>

There does not appear to be any extant record of this Liverpool sitting of the justices in Feb. 1345. Pleas of the Crown were at this date usually held at Lancaster and Preston, but the royal judges had sat at Liverpool on 9 June 1343, and the justices of the Duke of Lancaster were apparently there on 1 July 1351.<sup>2</sup> The turbulent conditions then prevalent in Lancashire had presumably made sittings necessary in the little borough of Liverpool, possibly within the Castle. Nor is the cause of the quarrel known, though long-standing feuds often persisted between the local magnates.

When the justices (Richard de Willoughby, Thomas de Ferrers and John de Ireland) next sat at Liverpool, on Wednesday 6 April 1345, about two months later, the riot was formally reported to them by a body of 12 jurors: Robert Cowdray, Alan de Eccleston, John de Ireland, John del Clough, Richard Travers, John de Coverdale, John de Croft of Walton, William Blundell, Robert de Hurleton, William Banastre of Bretherton, Thomas de Southworth and John de Ditchfield. They stated that John son of Richard de Radcliffe, Richard son

<sup>1</sup> So recited in the records.

<sup>2</sup> *Lancs. Assize Rolls (Rec. Soc.)*, Pt. II, pp. 322, 336-7 (Assize Rolls 430 and 445).

of William de Radcliffe, Henry son of Sir Henry de Bury, William son of Robert de Radcliffe, Sir William de Hesketh, Gilbert de Southworth, Gilbert de Ince brother of Henry de Ince, Thomas de Singleton son of Gilbert de Singleton, Thomas son of John de Singleton and Reginald of Little Bolton, came armed to Liverpool on Thursday 10 Feb. 1344/5 and remained there until 14 Feb. (Valentine's Day), on which day they, with others, killed Adam de Lever, Geoffrey son of Henry de Trafford Kt., Robert son of John de Ashton, Richard de Trafford son of John de Trafford the elder, John and Robert Trafford his brother, Gilbert son of Gilbert de Haydock, Adam de Bradshaw of Pennington and Henry his brother, William son of William de Urmston, Richard brother of Henry de Trafford, Robert de Shoresworth, Geoffrey son of Thomas de Barlow and William his brother, William "le Thrower," Henry son of Henry Botering, Henry son of Roger de Westeleye, Adam Sprynk (or Spink), John de Hulme, Adam Dynemogh (outlawed for felony), Roger de Ather-ton, John son of John de Redyford, Richard de Milnegate, Robert "le Wedeuson" (or Wydouson), Henry Jame-son of Irlam and Roger de Ashley ; 27 in all. (Robert de Radcliffe (the bastard) is not named among the killed.) Other presentments included the names of John de Radcliffe parson of Bury, Robert de Worsley, Hugh le Norreys and Robert his brother, Robert Lyththemosse, Hugh son of Adam de Culcheth, Richard son of Thomas Perpount, John son of John de Balshagh, John son of Robert de Farrington and Adam de Croft, among the large number charged with these murders.

The law had moved in this case very swiftly at first, as on 6 March 1344/5, orders had been issued already to inquire into these felonies, a commission being directed to Thomas de Hastang, Richard de Willoughby, Edmund Trussel, William Basset, Robert de Hungerford, Richard de la Pole and Simon Pakeman, appointing them justices

for the purpose, and a few days later Simon Drayton, Thomas de Ferrers, Richard de Islep, John de Freeland [? Ireland] and Robert de Morley were also commissioned to assist. The sheriff was ordered to arrest all the offenders. Many surrendered and were committed to the Marshall for safe custody, but the King apparently decided to deal with them all in his own way. The following year, on 12 Feb. 1345/6, a letter was issued ordering the release of all indicted except a lengthy list of 180 persons (see Appendix) who had been pardoned but were to be kept in custody until the royal pleasure was known.

At Easter 1346, the following ten of the pardoned appeared *coram rege*: John son of Richard de Radcliffe, Richard son of William de Radcliffe, Henry son of Henry de Bury, William son of Robert de Radcliffe, Sir William de Hesketh, Gilbert de Southworth, Gilbert de Ince, Thomas [son of Gilbert] de Singleton, Thomas son of John de Singleton and Roger of Little Bolton. When asked how they wished to acquit themselves of the felonies, they each offered a charter of pardon from the King. The charters, which are all fully set out in the records, were very alike, and that of John de Radcliffe, dated 5 July 1345, may be given as an example of them all.

Edward by the grace of God, King of England and France, and Lord of Ireland, to all his bailiffs and faithful men to whom the present letters shall come, greeting. Know ye that of our especial grace and at the request of our beloved and faithful cousin Henry of Lancaster, earl of Derby, we have pardoned John son of Richard de Radeclyf the suit of our peace which pertains to us for the felonies and trespasses whatsoever perpetrated by the said John within our Realm of England against our peace before the sixteenth day of June last past, whereof he is indicted accused or appealed, and also outlawries if any have been promulgated against him on these occasions, and we grant him our firm peace therefor; so nevertheless that he set out

in our retinue to the parts of Vascony or elsewhere where we have assigned him when he shall be forewarned by us to stay there in the same service for one year at his own proper charges. And that he stand to right in our court if any wish to speak against him concerning the felonies and trespasses above said. In witness whereof we have caused these our Letters Patent to be made. Witness our dearest son Lionel, keeper of England, at Reading the fifth day of July in the nineteenth year of our reign of England, and our sixth of France. [1345]<sup>1</sup>

The pardon to Richard son of William de Radcliffe was dated 5 May 1345, and those to Henry de Bury, William son of Robert de Radcliffe, William de Hesketh, Gilbert de Southworth, Gilbert de Ince, Thomas son of Gilbert de Singleton, Thomas son of John de Singleton and Roger of Little Bolton, 5 July 1345.

To be forced to serve in Gascony or elsewhere for a year at one's own expense as a term of pardon was not at all an unusual thing. It enabled the King to obtain cheap soldiers and to keep rebellious or troublesome persons under control and away from local influences.

It further appeared that Queen Isabella, the King's mother, intervened on behalf of John de Radcliffe, who was her Steward of Blackburnshire and could not, she said, absent himself from his bailiwick without loss to the Queen, and so the King excused him from proceeding in his retinue to Gascony. Similar exemptions were given to Richard de Radcliffe, Roger of Little Bolton and William Radcliffe, all Queen's foresters of Blackburnshire. Thomas son of John de Singleton, Gilbert de Ince, Thomas son of Gilbert de Singleton, Sir William Hesketh, Henry le Bury and Gilbert de Southworth had satisfied the King that they really intended to set out with him. However, none of their charters of pardon was then allowed and they were all remanded on bail given by the following :

<sup>1</sup> *Coram Rege* Roll No. 344, m. 8. The other charters of pardon are also on this roll.

Robert de Dalton chivaler, Adam de Ashurst chivaler, Henry de Haydock, Robert de Singleton, Henry de Bold, Robert de Hornby, Geoffrey 'Hacconeshore', Thomas de Dalton son of Robert de Dalton, John de Laufield, Robert de Bryche, Thomas de la More, clerk and Geoffrey de Holt.

Similar pardons and proceedings occurred in 1346 as to John de Radcliffe the parson of Bury (who paid ten marks to Richard de Thoresby, keeper of the Hanaper of the Chancery, to be excused going abroad), Hugh son of Robert le Norreys of Burtonhead, and Robert his brother, and Robert de Workeslegh (who had no means to support himself in the King's retinue for so long and paid 20s. to be let off). Their bails were: — de Radcliffe the elder, Adam de Eccleston, Robert de Hornby and Roger Crall.

Robert Lyghtothemosse was pardoned only on 13 Jan. 1346/7 for good service done in Gascony with Henry, Earl of Lancaster and he was bailed by Thomas de la More, John de Dees, Thomas de Fallynges, William Horwich, John le Reve and Roger de Farrington. Hugh son of Adam de Culcheth was pardoned on 10 Jan. 1346/7, Richard son of Thomas Perpount on 11 April 1347, John son of John de Balshaw on 5 July 1345 and John son of Robert de Farrington on 20 Nov. 1346. The bails for them in 1347 were Robert del Bruche, Geoffrey del Holt, John le Perpount, John son of Robert de Radcliffe, Nicholas le Norreys and Jordon de Hulme. Other charters of pardon have not been noted, but doubtless in time all were discharged.

In one case, however, there was a repercussion in 1363. The original indictment against Adam son of John de Croft, besides including him among the murderers (for which he was pardoned), had charged him with stealing from Adam de Lever, and others of the dead men, their armour, to wit, plates, basinets and 'akatouns,'<sup>1</sup> to the

<sup>1</sup> *Haqueton*, a stuffed jerkin worn under the mail.

value of £10. Adam de Croft was outlawed after being five times demanded at the County Courts without appearance (for very good reason, as we shall see), and the usual inquiry by the sheriff was ordered concerning his lands and chattels. Some years later John his son appeared by Thomas de Thorp his guardian, and asserted that his father had died at Rufford before outlawry was pronounced, and he asked that it should be cancelled. The matter dragged on until John the heir of Adam himself died, whereupon Joan, John's daughter and heiress, renewed the application to annul the outlawry of Adam and an inquiry was eventually held on 22 Jan. 35 Ed. III [1362].

Joan, who appeared by her guardian John de Sadyngton, was opposed by one Richard de Frisby who said Adam died after, not before, the outlawry. Eventually at York next year, William de Skipwith and William Rise, justices of assize, tried the matter with the following jurors :

Henry de Standish, Henry de Chernok, John son of Adam de Clayton, John de Clayton the elder, John de Bereworth, Roger Banaster of Wrightington, Richard de Longtre, Henry de Asshawe, Richard son of Edward de Rigby, John de Notshagh, Nicholas de Brokholes and John de Stanford.

They swore that Adam had died before being outlawed. Judgment ordering restitution of her lands was however not obtained by Joan until the chief and other lords of Adam's lands had been notified. They were John, Duke of Lancaster, mediate lord, and Ralph de Dacre, Ralph de Betham chivaler, John de Coupland, Peter prior of the Church of St. Mary at Lancaster, Edmond son of Thomas de Dacre and John de Croft of Wilton, immediate lords. They did not appear or object, and the girl Joan recovered her inheritance at last.

## APPENDIX.

## NAMES OF THOSE PARDONED BY THE KING, 1346-7.

*(Close Roll, 20 Edward III, Pt. I, (No. 179), m. 20d.)*

|   |   |
|---|---|
| John son of Richard de Rade-<br>clyf                          | John le Walshe, "person-<br>sone" of Standish                 |
| Richard son of William de<br>Radeclif                         | William son of Robert de<br>Moston and Robert his<br>brother  |
| John de Radclyf, parson of<br>the church of Bury              | Henry son of Adam de Tildes-<br>leghe and Hugh his<br>brother |
| Thurstan de Holand of Sal-<br>fordshire                       | Hugh son of Henry de Tildes-<br>leghe                         |
| Henry son of Henry de Bury,<br>knight                         | Richard de Lauton of Maker-<br>field                          |
| William son of Robert de<br>Radeclif                          | Robert de Hornclif  |
| Robert son of John de Legh<br>of County Chester               | John son of Henry de Eccle-<br>ston                           |
| William de Heskeyth, knight                                   | Gilbert de Ins brother of<br>Henry de Ins                     |
| John del Holt of Salford-<br>shire                            | Henry son of Henry de Ather-<br>ton of Hyndeleghe             |
| Geoffrey his brother  | Hugh son of Adam Culchith                                     |
| Roger of Little Boulton                                       | Robert son of Hugh del Holt                                   |
| John de Heton   | Henry son of Henry de<br>Shakersleghe                         |
| Hugh de Walkeden  | Richard son of Richard de<br>Asteleghe, clerk                 |
| Richard called Hudde of<br>Walkeden and Jordan<br>his brother | Thomas Latewys  |
| William de Walkedon   | Roger son of William de<br>Shotelesworth                      |
| Thomas de Strangways  | Richard his brother   |
| Robert de Workesleghe   | Henry son of Robert de<br>Pynnyngton                          |
| Gilbert de Suthworth  |   |
| Matthew de Suttheworth<br>called Maykyn the elder             |   |
| William de Worthynton   |   |

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Roger brother of Hugh de Tettelowe                        | Richard son of Henry de Shotlesworth and Henry his brother |
| Robert son of Roger son of Richard of Radeclyf            | Adam "le Procuratoureson"                                  |
| Roger de Harewode of Salfordshire                         | John del Holt of Reued                                     |
| Roger de Sale   | Roger son of John de Knoll                                 |
| Adam de Sale of Leght                                     | John de Wynkidelegh  |
| Adam son of John de Croft, Ralph and William his brothers | William de Shipwalbothum son of Henry del Stok             |
| John de Chernok   | John son of Robert de Yolstones                            |
| Thomas de Notehowe  | Adam son of William de Yolstones                           |
| John son of John de Bukeden of Totyngton [ton             | John son of Nicholas Langeto <sup>1</sup> of Bouland       |
| John son of Robert de Faryng-                             | Laurence son of Richard de Knol                            |
| Robert son of John de Clayton of Faryngton                | John son of Simon de Blakay                                |
| Nicholas Deuyas of Samlesbury                             | Henry de Aghton and Richard his brother                    |
| Edmund de Fulshawe  | Adam son of Adam de Rous-thorn                             |
| Thomas de Syngelton son of Gilbert de Syngelton           | Roger brother of Thomas de Notehogh                        |
| Thomas son of John de Syngelton                           | John de Notehogh   |
| John Banastre of Ryblechestre and Thomas his brother      | John son of Robert de Hornclyf                             |
| Richard son of Robert de Walton                           | Roger son of John de Buke-don                              |
| John Nicol de Broghton                                    | William de Tonde, parker, of Mussebury                     |
| Robert de Cattelowe, forester of Rosyndale                | Jordan de Stretford  |
| Hugh de Perburn of Cophull                                | Henry brother of John del Grenehalg                        |
| Hugh le Norreys   | Geoffrey son of Roger de Chaderton                         |
| Ralph de Hyde   | Robert son of Jordan de Walkeden                           |
| Richard son of Richard de Haydok of Hephay                |  |

<sup>1</sup> Langeto(n).

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Nicholas son of Adam le<br>Taillour of Cophull                 | Thomas de Irlaund of Rugh-<br>ford                          |
| Richard son of John de Bal-<br>shagh and John his bro-<br>ther | Adam Tayt<br>John de Kekewyk<br>Gilbert Gredle              |
| John son of William de<br>Syngelton of Couplond                | Owen de Aghton  |
| Alan son of Adam le Grayne<br>[ <i>or</i> Graue]               | Thomas de Chaydok [? Hay-<br>dock]                          |
| William son of Robert de<br>Yolstones                          | Richard son of William le<br>Litster                        |
| John de Walshawe   | John son of John le Feure of<br>Raveneslache                |
| Robert son of Adam de White-<br>leydale                        | Richard de Lynales  |
| Geoffrey de Bucleye  | Nicholas del Newehous of<br>Gradale                         |
| Peter de Crosselegh  | Nicholas son of Adam de<br>Langtaa <sup>1</sup> of Boweland |
| Thurstan de Tildesleye son<br>of Richard de Tildes-<br>leye    | John de Heton of Salford-<br>shire                          |
| Henry son of William son of<br>Nicholas de Preston             | Richard de Wyndhell, ser-<br>vant                           |
| Robert brother of Hugh le<br>Norreys                           | John de Radeclyf  |
| Robert son of Geoffrey de<br>Urmeston                          | Thomas son of John de Halgh-<br>ton                         |
| Adam son of Adam son of<br>Ithell de Ins                       | Richard de Cudworth, late<br>"sumnor" of Salford-<br>shire  |
| Adam Oulebille   | Richard son of Henry de<br>Tilgeslehurst                    |
| Adam son of Adam del<br>Belefeld                               | William son of Robert de<br>Workeslegh                      |
| William son of Nicholas del<br>Slak                            | William de Stanley of county<br>Chester                     |
| Robert son of Robert de<br>Hornclyf                            | Richard le Fisshere, servant                                |
| Thomas de Crosselegh   | Matthew de Sotheworth                                       |
| Hugh son of William de<br>Worthynton                           | Gilbert son of Hugh de<br>Bury                              |
| Rickard de Ingolheued  | Robert Denesson   |

<sup>1</sup> Langton.

|                              |                              |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Richard Carpenter son of     | Roger de Etheleston          |
| Robert son of Stephen        | John Grilly                  |
| de le Hegh                   | Adam le Hunte, forester of   |
| Roger son of Richard de      | Penhull                      |
| Tildeslegh                   | Henry del Bothe              |
| Henry son of Henry de        | John brother of William de   |
| Birches of Legh              | Yolstones                    |
| Richard de Haston, servant   | Elias de Quiteleydale        |
| of Richard de Radclyf        | Richard son of Adam de       |
| Richard son of Adam Ent-     | Gradale                      |
| wisel                        | Nicholas Travers, " Bokiler- |
| Robert son of Robert de      | plaiere "                    |
| Hyndelegh                    | Robert de Stokbruggeleye     |
| Richard brother of Alan de   | Elias de Boulton             |
| Par                          | Robert del Bruches           |
| Thomas son of Richard son    | Richard de Wylkeshalgh       |
| of Hugh de Burton Wod        | Richard son of Thomas le     |
| William son of Richard de    | Perpount                     |
| Legh                         | John son of Adam son of      |
| Robert son of Robert de      | Andrew                       |
| Radclyf, late parson of      | Richard le Tayllouressone of |
| the church of Middleton      | Blakebourne                  |
| Hugh de Tettelowe            | John son of Henry de Legh    |
| Robert son of Jordan de      | and William his brother      |
| Tettelowe                    | John son of Matthew de       |
| Thomas son of Gilbert de     | Sotheworth                   |
| Ins                          | Thomas son of Gilbert de     |
| Robert Lyghtthemosse         | Sotheworth                   |
| John son of Henry de Tildes- | Henry son of Henry de        |
| lehurst                      | Workesleye                   |
| Hugh and Adam brothers of    | Robert son of Adam de Prest- |
| the same John                | wych                         |
| Christopher de Ellershawe    | Robert son of Roger de Parva |
| Robert de Yolstones          | Boulton                      |
| John de Grenehalgh           | William son of Emma Peuker   |
| John son of Henry Banastre   | Thomas son of Laurence       |
| of Walton                    | Travers [180]                |

## II. THE MOLYNEUX AND STANLEY FEUD OF 1425.

The feud which, for unknown reasons, possibly local rivalry, arose in 1425 between the Stanley and Molyneux families and culminated in the serious affair related below, has received some slight notice in local history, but the version given, derived mainly from Gregson's *Fragments of Lancashire*, is incomplete and very erroneous, all writers except one placing the matter in the wrong year, 1424.<sup>1</sup>

The antagonists were, on the one side, Thomas Stanley the younger, created the first Baron Stanley in 1456 (son and heir of Sir John Stanley, Kt., of Knowsley, who died in 1437), and grandson of Sir John Stanley (d. 1414), who embattled the Tower of Liverpool in 1406<sup>2</sup>; and, on the other, Sir Richard Molyneux, Kt., of Sefton, whose eldest son Richard, married, shortly after these events, Elizabeth, Stanley's daughter, and so the strained relations between them were doubtless in some way relieved.

There will be found in the appendix to this note a correct version of such documentary evidence as now appears to survive. The main document, being in English of the first quarter of the fifteenth century, deserves to be printed in full on that ground alone.

It seems that on Monday 25 June 1425, Sir Richard Radcliffe, the sheriff of Lancashire, produced, at Manchester, to Ralph Radcliffe and James Holt, two justices of the peace, a writ from King Henry VI stating that there were great rumours of an affray about to take place

<sup>1</sup> See the mutilated version of the documents in Gregson, *op. cit.* (1869 ed.), p. 163, and the accounts in *V.C.H. Lancs.*, III, 69, 159, IV, 12, Baines, *Lancs.* (Croston ed.), V, 119, Muir, *Hist. Municipal Government of Liverpool*, 59, and *Hist. of Liverpool*, 61, etc., etc.; also *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, sub Molyneux and Stanley. Prof. Tait alone gives the correct date of 1425 (*V.C.H. Lancs.*, II, 214 n.). His reference, however, is to Towneley's abbreviated note of the documents (see below).

<sup>2</sup> See my paper in *Trans. Hist. Soc.*, 61, p. 41.

between Molyneux of Sefton and Stanley the younger of Liverpool; and charging the sheriff to use his utmost power to prevent it occurring. The sheriff ordered the two justices, with other "gentyls," to go with him to Liverpool where the trouble was expected to be. The party arrived there on Wednesday 27 June and found Stanley in his father's house (The Tower), with more than two thousand men in the town. Being asked to explain this assemblage, Stanley told them he was informed that Molyneux, with a great body of his adherents, was coming to beat and slay Stanley and his party, and that he intended to resist if he could. (No actual fighting seems to have occurred.) But Stanley was ready to leave the matters in dispute to any reasonable persons and to find sureties to keep the peace if Molyneux would do the same. He would also allow himself to be arrested and agreed to go into custody wherever he was ordered. The arrest took place on the Friday and Stanley seems to have been taken to Clitheroe Castle.

Then the sheriff called upon everyone else to aid him against Molyneux, and most of those present agreed to do so. The official party thereupon went out to West Derby and there, on the moor, they met Molyneux, with over a thousand men, arrayed as for battle and moving in fast towards Liverpool. The sheriff can scarcely have had a superior force, but at any rate he arrested Molyneux and put him in safe custody in Lancaster Castle. Most of these facts were set out in a certificate dated 16 July which the two justices gave to William Troutbeck<sup>1</sup> (of Dunham-on-the-Hill, Cheshire), the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, for the Council. They had requested the sheriff to join in the certificate

<sup>1</sup> For him, see Earwaker, *St. Mary-on-the-Hill, Chester*, p. 183, Ormerod, *Hist. of Cheshire* (Helsby ed.), II, 37, etc., and Brownbill, *Jour. Chester Arch. Soc.*, N.S., xxvii, pt. ii, 149.

as he was present, but he refused, and he also declined to record it when asked by the Chancellor to do so, apparently because he did not agree with everything the justices had put in.

Some previous report of the matter had evidently rapidly reached the King because, on 10 July, he issued an order to the Chancellor to seal a writ to the sheriff commanding him to move Stanley at once from Clitheroe Castle and deliver him to the constable of Kenilworth Castle, while Molyneux was similarly to be taken from Lancaster to Windsor Castle.<sup>1</sup>

Both were evidently released before long and a general pardon to Molyneux was recorded in 1437.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The usual version is erroneous on this point.

<sup>2</sup> *V.C.H. Lancs.*, III, 69.

APPENDIX.

I.

To the Honble. Maister William Troutbeke Chancellor to our Lord King of his Duché of Lancaster and to the Kinge's Counsell.

Raufe of Radcliffe [and] James of the Holte Justices of the Pees within the County of Lancaster sends gretynges in God Almighty. Certifiant yaw that on Monday next after Midsummer day, the yere of the reigne of Kyng Henry the sixt after the conquest thirde [25 June 1425] at Manchester Sr Richard of Radcliffe Shiriffe of Lancascire shewes us a wrytte directe to him fro our lord Kyng, makant mention that ther was great rumor, and congregation of rowtes betwene Sr Rychard Molyneux sometyme dwellant at Sefton in the Counte of Lancaster Knyght on the on parte, and Thomas of Stanley the yonger of Lyuerpull of the counte of Lancaster Esq. on the tother parte, charging the sayd Shiref to take the power of the said counte, and lette and wythstand the sayd riot and congregations. Querfore the sayd Shiref charget us, and mony other Gentyls, on the Kyng's behalve, And as we that were Kepers of the King's Pees, that we should go with him to Lyuerpull, ther as the sd congregations and ryot was ordenet to be. And the sayd Shiref and we yede to Lyuerpull on the Wedenesday next after [27 June :] and ther we found the sayd Thomas of Stanley in hys Fader[']s hows, and myche multitude of peple in the town to the nnumber of two thowsaund men and moe, and we asket him the cause of that assemble of the Kyng's peple, and he was enformnet that the sayd Sir Richard Molyneux wold come theder with grete congregacions riotes and grete multitude of peple to sle and bete the sayd Thomas, hys men and hys servantz, the queche he wold w<sup>t</sup>stond if he might. And the sayd Thomas sayd that he wolde pit him ordenance of any resonable men of all the aduersite that stode betwene the sayd

Sr Rychard and hym. And also the sayd Thomas sayd that he wold fynde sufficient surete of the pees for him and all hese, to the said Sr Rychard and all hese, so that the sayd Sr Rychard wold fynde seurete in the same fourme. And over that the sayd Thomas agreeet hym to be Arestet be the same Shiref, and be comaundement of the Justice of Pees, and to go to quat ward that ever thai wold assigne him. And theron the Fryday next after [29 June] the sayd Shiref arestet the same Thomas, and comyttet him to ward. And the sayd Shiref made crye, that the peple that ther was should go with hym to help hym to exicute hys office, and the moste parte of all the peple ther being and theder comyng, by hys comaundement, agreeet hom to go with him, att his comaundement, if he wolde have hom. And the sayd Shiref, by comaundement of the Justice of Pees, and of yaw the Chaunceller that ther was, yodden up to West Derbe toun, and ther on a more within the same toun, we saghe the sayd Sir Rychard with gret congregations, rowte, and multitude of peple to the noubre of a thousand men and mo, arayet on maner as to go to battall and comand fast toward the toun of Lyuerpull. And ther the sayd Shiref arestet the same Sir Rychard and comyttet hym to ward. And for as myche as we have requiset the Shiref beforesayd for to certyfy with us of the same riot, for as myche as he was ther present, to the queche certificacion he wold not agree, therefore we the sayd Raufe and James certify yaw in the forme beforesayd. Wrytten the xvi day of July in the yere abouesayd [1425].

*(In a Cedul sowed to this certificate as followeth :)*

Be it had in mynde that I the sayd William Troutbeck Chancellor of Lancaster have showet this certificate to Sr Richard Radclife shiref of Lancaster and desiret hym to record hit. And he sayd that he wolde not record hit in all things as hit is aboute written.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dodsworth MS. (Bodley's Lib., Oxford), No. 87, ff. 42-3, taken by him *ex bundello inquisitionum de tempore H. 6 apud Lancastriam indorsato* φ. There is also an abbreviated version in Towneley MS. 7 D1. 4 (C.C. 8. 70), p. 220 (Transcripts of Records of the County of Lancaster), Chetham's Library, Manchester.

II.

Henricus Dei [gratia] Rex Anglie Francie et Dominus Hibernie Cancellario suo in Comitatu Palatino salutem. Mandamus vobis firmiter injungentes quod statim, visis presentibus, fieri faciatis et sigillari quoddam breve nostrum vicecomiti comitatus predicti, dantes ei ex parte nostra firmiter in mandatis quod Thomam filium Johannis Stanley militis in castro nostro de Cliderow existentem usque castrum nostrum de Kenylworth salvo et secure adducat et eum Constabulario nostro ibidem vel ejus locum tenenti liberet indilate, et Ricardum Molyneux militem in castro nostro Lancastrie existentem usque castrum nostrum de Wyndsore similiter salvo et secure adducat et eum Constabulario nostro ibidem vel ejus locum tenenti, ibidem salvo custodiendum, sine dilacione quacunque similiter liberet. Et quod dictus vicecomes sub periculo incumbenti premissa facere nullatenus amittat. Teste meipso apud Westmonasterium 10 Julii anno regni nostri 3<sup>o</sup> [1425].<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dodsworth MS. 87, fo. 41. I have not found this order on the Close Roll. There seems to be no corresponding Palatine roll extant for this date.

The first part of the paper is devoted to a general survey of the literature on the subject. It is found that the majority of the writers have been concerned with the question of the relative importance of the various factors which enter into the determination of the rate of interest. The most important of these factors are the supply and demand for money, the state of the economy, and the policy of the central bank. The author then proceeds to a detailed analysis of the theory of interest, and shows how it can be derived from the theory of the firm. He then discusses the various theories of interest, and shows how they can be reconciled with each other. Finally, he discusses the policy implications of the theory of interest, and shows how it can be used to guide the actions of the central bank.

The second part of the paper is devoted to a detailed analysis of the theory of interest. It is found that the theory of interest can be derived from the theory of the firm. The firm's objective is to maximize its profit, and this is done by choosing the level of output and the level of input. The level of output is determined by the demand for the firm's product, and the level of input is determined by the cost of the inputs. The firm's profit is the difference between its revenue and its cost, and this is maximized when the firm's marginal revenue is equal to its marginal cost. The theory of interest is derived from the firm's theory of output and input, and shows how the rate of interest is determined by the firm's marginal revenue and marginal cost.