A REALLY critical edition of the Liber de Wintoniâ (as Domesday Book is technically called)—one which would bring the full resources of modern scholarship to bear upon all the points suggested by it,—is still a desideratum, and, as Professor Freeman says, it is an object which ought to be taken up as a national work. A considerable amount of Domesday literature has appeared since the royal order in 1767 for the publication of this amongst other records; but much remains to be done, for a great deal of that which has been given to the world on the subject is deficient in breadth of treatment and in accuracy of criticism. We in this part of the country are greatly indebted to Mr. Beamont for his Introduction and Notes to the photozincographic facsimile of the Domesday Record of the two north-western counties palatine. Mr. Beamont has been a member of this society almost ever since its foundation 40 years ago, and is one of whom the society is justly proud. It seems, indeed, rash for me to venture upon the subject which I have chosen, lest I should be supposed to be putting myself in competition with him, or setting myself up as a critic upon his Introduction; but
I thought that perhaps we might be led over some new ground to-night, if we turned to the Domesday account of the land *Inter Ripam et Mersham*, and considered, firstly, the history of that territory, and then its hundreds, the townships mentioned, the landlords, and the churches. Into general points affecting the whole country (as, for example, the differences between radmen and drenghes, or the dimensions of the carucate and hide of land), we need not enter this evening; but perhaps we may find time, at the end of the paper, for a momentary glance into the bye-laws (so to call them) and customs which were then in force in this particular neighbourhood.

I. As to the history of the territory. Whilst our heathen English forefathers were gradually first devastating, and then themselves settling down in, the eastern and southern parts of the country, to which they gave their name, the British principalities in the north-west drew together into the kingdom of Strathclyde—a kingdom which stretched from the Clyde to the Mersey, and from the sea to the hills that form the watershed. The capital of this kingdom was Alclwyd, or Dumbarton, which was strongly fortified to protect the British from the incursions of the Scots and Picts of the north; the hills guarded them on the east from the Northumbrian English and the Britons of Elmet (which, roughly speaking, answered to the West Riding); south of the Mersey was another British kingdom, Gwynedd, of which the capital was Chester. It was not until the seventh century that the southern portion of the kingdom of Strathclyde, that part which now forms the county of Lancaster, became English territory; it was gradually dismembered by the Northumbrian English. In the year 613, Æthelfrith, the King of Northumberland, whose grandfather Ida had founded the Bernician kingdom, advanced over the moors at the head of Ribblesdale into our south Lancashire, and, crossing the Mersey, marched on to Chester, where his rival, Eadwine, had taken refuge. The battle of Chester need not detain us; it has been fully described by Mr. Green in his *Making of England*. It was a decisive
victory, and marked an important step in the English conquest of Britain, for it thrust a wedge of English territory between the Britons of what we now call Wales and their kinsmen of Strathclyde; and amongst other results of the battle was the transference of the land between Ribble and Mersey from the kingdom of Strathclyde to that of Northumberland. Elmet, thus cut off from other British principalities, yielded to Eadwine thirteen years later; and Leeds (which was then called Loidis or Lothene, and which it is consequently difficult to distinguish sometimes from the Lothian which stretched from the Forth to the Tweed)—Leeds had become Northumbrian before 655; and about twelve years later, lands on the Ribble and in Amounderness were granted to St. Wilfrith, so that part (at any rate) of Lancashire north of the Ribble must have become English by that time. It would be interesting to enquire into the further dismemberment of Strathclyde, and speak of the long-continued independence or semi-independence of Galloway and Cumberland; but to do so would lead us too far from the subject in hand.

Lancashire south of the Ribble became Northumbrian, then, in 613, and seems to have continued to belong to Northumberland until the arrangement made in 877 between the Danish host and Ceolwulf, the under-king of that part of the Marchland, which the English still retained: in the previous year Yorkshire had been parted amongst Danish landholders, and then, in 877, the eastern half of the Marchland was in the same way parcelled out amongst the Danes; but a long strip of territory, embracing the valleys of the Mersey and the Severn, was handed over to Ceolwulf ("an unwise Thegn," as the Chronicle calls him), and the name of Marchland was afterwards confined to this territory, stretching from the Ribble to the Bristol Avon, and shut in east and west by the Danes and the British. This was the first connection between South Lancashire and the Mercian kingdom—a connection, that we may regard as having become an incorporation, when the great King Eadward, who was almost the peer of his father Ælfred, set about, in 923, the building of a fort at Thelwall (a township near Warrington, partly in Lancashire and
partly in Cheshire, for the Mersey runs through the township), and despatched thence a Mercian force to garrison the old Roman town of Manchester, which had probably lain desolate since the days of Aethelfrith. These fortresses of Manchester and Thelwall, together with two built a few years before by King Eadward's sister at Chester and Runcorn, were intended no doubt to render any effective alliance between the Danes and the Britons impossible.

South Lancashire from that time was part and parcel of the Mercian Ealdormanry, or earldom, as it was afterwards called; and, although not absolutely incorporated with Cheshire, it was regarded as an appendage to that county, which at the time of Domesday Book embraced also a considerable portion of Flintshire and Denbighshire, the Hundreds of Atiscross and Exestan being afterwards handed over to Wales: it will be an interesting question for those who advocate Home Rule or Disestablishment for Wales to decide what the boundary of Wales is; will they go by Domesday Book, or will they prefer Henry VIII.'s *ipse dixit* in 1536 as to what is Wales, and what is England? It is of course commonly said that South Lancashire appears in Domesday Book under the head of Cheshire, but this is not strictly true; the account of it is given on two pages, after the account of Cheshire, and just as each page of the portion about Cheshire is headed by the word *Cestresire* in red ink, so these two pages relating to South Lancashire have their own separate heading, also in red ink, *Inter Ripam et Mershams*. This anomalous district was granted to Roger of Poitou, of whom we shall speak later on; and, after his second forfeiture, the greater portion of it was given by Henry I. to Ranulf, the third palatine Earl of Chester, though it never became part of the palatinate. On the extinction of the male line of these Earls of Chester in 1232, the land between Ribble and Mersey was inherited by the great house of Ferrers; and either in that year, or in 1266, at the downfall of that restless family (which had shared in every intrigue and conspiracy since the reign of Stephen), it must have been incorporated with the newly-formed county of Lancaster. That county
had previously consisted of the Honor of Lancaster and the Hundred of Amounderness, and it was shortly to be augmented by the Liberty of Furness, taken from Westmoreland in 1295, and again seemingly in 1312 by that portion of South Lancashire which had not been granted to the Earls of Chester, viz., the Honor of Clitheroe, which Thomas Earl of Lancaster inherited in right of his wife.

Such is a sketch of the vicissitudes which the land between Ribble and Mersey went through before it finally became part of the county of Lancaster.

II. And now we will turn to its Hundreds. This of course is not the place to enquire into the history of the division of the country into hundreds; the Bishop of Chester in the first volume of his Constitutional History has said (I suppose) all that can be said on the subject. But one can not forbear quoting the delightfully naive remark of Baines, which is (I am sorry to see) repeated in the edition now being issued in monthly parts: "There are evidently no sufficient data to determine into how "many hundreds South Lancashire was divided in the Roman "period, and still less in the time of the aborigines," which is very much the same sort of thing as if one were to wonder into how many bishoprics Asia Minor was divided at the time of the Trojan War. Between the Ribble and Mersey there are now four Hundreds—West Derby, Leyland, Blackburn, and Salford; the last three of these are the same now as they were in the days of Edward the Confessor; but, where we have now the one Hundred of West Derby, Domesday gives us three—Derby, Newton, and Warrington: when were these three condensed into one? It would appear that various changes in local boundaries were made either slightly before, or very early in, the reign of Henry III.: the Lancaster, that appears in the Pipe Rolls from 1165 onwards, is not the County but the Honor, and we can not be sure of the existence of the county of Lancaster before 1221. A year or two after that date the Hundreds of Newton and Warrington had certainly been condensed into the
The Domesday Record of the Hundred of West Derby; it may be that whatever year saw the amalgamation of Amounderness and the Lancaster Honor into the county of Lancaster (the germ of the present county), saw also the amalgamation of these three Hundreds into one.

It would be interesting if some one with local knowledge could point out why it is that the boundary between Newton and Derby Hundreds runs through the middle of the parish of Wigan; the townships of Holland, Dalton, Winstanley, and Orrell being in the latter Hundred. The boundary of the Hundred of Newton is here very nearly, but not exactly, the same as that of the later Fee of Makerfield, which included the greater part of Wigan parish. At the present time there is one township in that parish—Aspull by name—which is in Salford Hundred, all the other townships being in West Derby. This fact had escaped the notice of the lawyers who drafted the Act by which the Liverpool Bishopric was founded; and the Bill had made some progress, before I caused it to be pointed out to Lord Beauchamp (who had charge of it in the Upper House) that the Bill, if its wording remained unaltered, would leave the one township of Aspull in the middle of Lancashire, as an island (so to call it), under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Chester.

We may notice in passing that there have been many changes in the Hundreds of Cheshire also. Wirrall appears in Domesday as Wilaveston, Macclesfield as Hamestan, and other names are changed, and not only that, but the present Hundreds of Buckland and Edisbury each contain two of the Hundreds of Domesday Book.

III. As to the Townships mentioned in South Lancashire. It is well known that Domesday is here much more meagre than in most parts of England. Newton and Warrington are the only places spoken of by name in their respective Hundreds. In Blackburn Hundred we have the names of Blackburn, Whalley, Huncoat near Accrington, Walton-le-Dale, and Pendleton near Clitheroe; in Salford Hundred those of Salford, Ratcliff, Manchester, and Rochdale; whilst Leyland and Penwortham are the
only names given in Leyland Hundred. On the other hand, in
Derby Hundred we have the names of more than 40 townships
or hamlets; but this is all out of the 188 manors which Domes­
day itself says existed between Ribble and Mersey.

Every one knows that amongst these manors Liverpool is not
mentioned, or at least only appears under the name of Esmedune
or Smithdown, a place mentioned in documents of the 13th
century in connection sometimes with Toxteth and sometimes
with the forest of West Derby. Four hundred years later, we
find receivers appointed for the crown-rents of Toxteth, Smith­
down Moss, and Liverpool; and the name is still perpetuated in
Smithdown Road, that runs towards Liverpool along the boundary
of the townships of Toxteth and West Derby. Smithdown then
probably lay west of Derby and north of Toxteth, and contiguous
to both, and therefore occupied the site of, at any rate, a con­
siderable portion of Liverpool, which latter name was perhaps
confined at the time of Domesday to the well-known pool or
inlet of the Mersey, now built over, answering to Wallasey Pool
on the opposite side of the river. If this be so, the transference
of the name from the inlet to the group of houses on its banks
is exactly paralleled by the instance of the modern village in
Cheshire, which is now called Hoylake, a name formerly applied
to the tidal channel washing the coast at that spot. This theory
would of course account for the name Liverpool not appearing in
Domesday Book. Our learned Secretary, however, believes in
an ingenious and probable derivation of the word from a British
source, which would make it the name of a place, and not of a
pool, from the very first.

Judging from the scantiness of the information, it would cer­
tainly seem as if the Domesday Commissioners had contented
themselves with crossing over from Chester to the king's manor
of Derby, and there had gathered sworn information about that
Hundred, and gleaned further pieces of knowledge about the five
other Hundreds (especially about the king's land in them), with­
out troubling themselves to penetrate into a part of the country
so wild and desolate, and inhabited by people full of a sturdy
independence.
IV. When we pass on to the Landlords, we naturally take first those with whom our sympathies lie—the Englishmen, who are spoken of in the past tense, some of whom were dead and gone before the Domesday survey, but many of whom must have been living on, dispossessed of their lands for no other crime than love for England. The first and foremost of these is, of course, King Eadward, who (besides being, as it seems, Lord of the Hundreds of Warrington, Blackburn, Salford, and Leyland) owned West Derby and six unnamed berewicks or hamlets dependent on that manor, Warrington and three hamlets in that neighbourhood, Blackburn Huncoat and Pendleton in the north-east, Salford and Ratcliffe in the east, Walton-le-dale Leyland and Penwortham in the north. These 19 townships belonged to the Confessor, and passed at his death to his nobler successor King Harold, whom the compilers of Domesday Book mention as seldom as possible; indeed, when they have to speak of the nine months of his reign, they generally use some periphrasis, such as, "after the death of "King Eadward, before that King William had come into "England." We, who have been born between Ribble and Mersey, may be proud to think that our native district must thus have contributed largely to the assistance of the one king of the English who has died fighting in defence of his country,—helped him (we will hope) by both men and means in his struggle against the Norwegian King and the Norman Duke.

The dispossessed Englishmen of lower degree are not named, excepting those in the Hundred of West Derby, and one, Gamel of Rochdale, in the Hundred of Salford. There were many different landholders in the Derby Hundred. One of them was a lady, Godgilu by name, frenchified into Godiva, but no doubt a different person from Earl Leofric's famous wife; whether the name of Teos, the owner of Barton, is feminine or not, I am not scholar enough to say; it is no doubt the French clerk's ignorant way of pronouncing some good old English name. Of one of these landholders we would gladly know more—Uhtred, a great man in the district, for he held more than 15 townships in the Hundred, viz., Kirkby, Roby, Knowsley, Crosby, Maghull,
Aughton, Kirkdale, Little Woolton, Speke, Litherland, Dalton, Skelmersdale, Lathom, Lydiate, and Altcar, together with part of Scarisbrick and Marton. We would gladly identify him, if we could, with one of the Uhtreds of the great House of Eadwulf, which held the northern counties against all the inroads of the Danes, and for generations ruled Northumberland so independently that up to the eve of the Norman Conquest the writs of the king at Winchester did not run north of the Humber—a House which was so famous, that Scotch kings and Galwegian princes and Cumbrian lords were proud of their descent from it, and which still exists in the direct male line, the head of it bearing the surname of Nevill, which an ancestor of his took from his Norman mother in the twelfth century. Such identification, however, would be mere guess-work. Gamel of Rochdale may have been a kinsman of Uhtred, for his name, too, was not unknown amongst the descendants of Eadwulf of Bamborough, and he and Uhtred appear to have had rights and liberties not possessed by all the landlords of the district. We may notice, before we pass on, that the Uhtred of whom we have been speaking owned Wallasey, and Wallasey only, on the south bank of the Mersey; this connection between Wallasey and the land between Ribble and Mersey may allow us to conjecture that the time was not then far distant when Wallasey had been an island, and when the more important of the two mouths of the Mersey had been where Leasowe Castle now stands, thus leaving Wallasey a part of the Hundred of West Derby rather than of the peninsula of Wirral.

It is with a certain malicious satisfaction that an Englishman finds that "held," and not "holds," is used of Roger of Poitou himself, to whom the Conqueror had granted the whole land between Ribble and Mersey, together with 210 other manors—398 in all. Roger "of Poitou" was so called from his residence (one would suppose) at his wife's castle in Poitou rather than at his own at Lancaster, or at the one, which he had himself built at Penwortham,—the only castle then existing between Ribble and Mersey,—and doubtless the abode of such oppression and
cruelty as he and his knew well how to exercise. Roger had married Almodis, Countess, in her own right, of La Marche, in Poitou. He was the third son of Roger of Montgomery, who was the head of a house connected by "the spindle side" with the dukes of Normandy, and who, at the great battle of 1066, had been in command of the right wing, which consisted of Frenchmen and other "soldiers," i.e. (for the word was then used in its strict sense) mercenaries,—the same Roger of Montgomery, who, when Earl of Shrewsbury, became the one Norman robber that left his surname to be borne in future ages by a county in this island. Roger of Poitou's mother was Mabel Talvas, the heiress of the chiefest of all Norman families in power and in wickedness, "small in stature, talkative, clever, and witty" (as the old chronicler calls her), guilty of fearful crimes and doomed to a fearful end; she passed on her evil nature to her eldest son, the famous or infamous Robert of Belesme, Earl of Shrewsbury and Arundel in England, Count of Ponthieu and Alencon in France, a horrible tyrant of the worst feudal type, who drew down upon himself the hatred of our English forefathers in a more abundant measure than did any other Norman oppressor. But, if the wickedness of the family culminated in Robert of Belesme, we cannot say much to the credit of his younger brother, Roger of Poitou. In 1077, forgetful of what he owed to the Conqueror, he espoused the cause of King William's rebellious son Robert, and was deprived of his English possessions, the revenues of which William, with characteristic grim pleasantry, employed in hiring mercenaries to fight against their former owner.

Thus, when Domesday Book was compiled, the King himself held the land between Ribble and Mersey; and the names of the few tenants mentioned as having received lands from Roger of Poitou (Ralph, Tetbald, Osmund, Adelard, and others,) are too insignificant to detain us, with the exception of two, who apparently held between them the Hundred of Blackburn, and whose descendants still own estates between Ribble and Mersey. The first of these is Roger de Busli or Bussel, afterwards Baron
of Penwortham, whose descendant, Avice Bussel, just before the year 1279, brought to her husband, William Farington, as her marriage-portion half the manor of Leyland, which is still held by her descendants in the male line; and the second is Albert Greslet or Gresley, the founder of a family which held Manchester from the days of the Conqueror to those of Edward II., when Joan, its heiress, carried that barony into the house of De la Warr; it was from these Gresleys that the great Lancashire family of Assheton received that carucate of land in Ashton-under-Lyne, which gave them their surname, when Emma Gresley became the bride of the Englishman,Orm, the son of Eadward.

To return, however, to Roger of Poitou. He was afterwards reinstated in his lordships by William the Red, but, joining in the insurrection of his elder brother against Henry I., he once more lost all his English fiefs in 1103, and England finally got rid of the house of Montgomery, though both Robert and Roger left children to inherit in France the lands, the power, and the evil name, of their forefathers.

V. I have already tried your patience too much, and can only allow myself a word about the churches. The only two churches alluded to in the Derby Hundred are Childwall, under which name we read "there was a priest, having half a carucate "of land," and Walton-on-the-Hill with twice that amount of glebe. Newton Hundred was much smaller than Derby, but we hear of two churches there also, Wigan and Winwick; "the "church of the same manor had one carucate of land, and "S. Oswald of the same vill had two carucates;" it is well known that the rectors of those two churches are still considerable owners of glebe-land. In Warrington Hundred, Warrington church is the only one mentioned, and was called then, as now, S. Elphin. Blackburn and Whalley were the churches of the north-eastern Hundred; Leyland Church stood alone in its Hundred; whilst in Salford Hundred we find "the church of "S. Mary and the church of S. Michael;" the former of these is the "old church" at Manchester; as to the latter, Mr. Beamont
hesitantly identifies it with the ancient church of S. Michael, Ashton-under-Lyne, which was within the original parish of Manchester. There can, I should think, be little doubt about the truth of this conjecture; it is certainly preferable to Mr. Whitaker's idea of a S. Michael's Church at Aldport, in Manchester,—a church, the very existence of which remains to be proved. Mr. Whitaker adduces the two Manchester fairs to demonstrate the existence of two Manchester churches, and, because neither of these fairs coincides with the Feast of S. Michael, he attempts to shew that Michaelmas day was at one time held in April; the great thing, that he does prove, is the length, to which a man will go to support a favourite theory.

It is pleasant to think that at any rate there were ten times as many churches as there were castles in this district, and indeed it is possible that, besides these ten, other churches may have existed; but still the parishes between Ribble and Mersey in the eleventh century must have been very much like what South African parishes are now, and, where we have in these days the busy hum of huge towns and overgrown villages without number, in those days there seems to have been nothing but the silence of a vast solitude. Indeed we know that great tracts were uninhabited, for we read of a forest in the Manor of Derby, (the predecessor probably of the extra-parochial district of Croxteth,) two more in connection with some of Uhtred's manors, (one of which is now perhaps represented by Simonswood, which is also extra-parochial,) a fourth at Lathom, two more at Melling and Lydiate, and another at Woolton,—seven in the Derby Hundred alone. In the little Hundred of Newton there was a forest 15 miles long and 9 broad, and another almost as large in Salford Hundred, whilst two are mentioned in each of the Hundreds of Leyland and Blackburn.

The country had indeed been more civilized a short time before than it was at the time of the Domesday survey. "In King Eadward's time" the six Hundreds were "worth £145 2s. 2d.; when Roger of Poitou received it from the king, it was worth
“£120”; in the same way the fifteen drenghes of Newton Hundred had been diminished to six; though all this, of course, is as nothing compared with the terrible devastation that had fallen upon Yorkshire, which then included Lancashire north of the Ribble. The accounts that we have of William’s harrying of the country in 1069 are graphic enough, but they are outdone by the passionless witness of Domesday, where the significant word “waste” is attached to Yorkshire manors through page after page. To take the Lancashire Hundred of Amounderness as an instance, for it, as I have just said, in those days belonged to Yorkshire; the Survey reckons up 62 manors in that Hundred, which had belonged to Earl Tostig, King Harold’s brother, and had afterwards been granted by the Conqueror to Roger of Poitou, and then it quietly adds:—“Sixteen of these have a few people living “in them, but we do not know how many; the rest are waste”! Perhaps the missing drenghes of Newton Hundred, and many another valiant man from the land between Ribble and Mersey, were amongst the large body of Englishmen who made their way to Constantinople, and there, in the service of the eastern Emperors of the House of Komnēnos, they not uncommonly had the satisfaction of meeting in open battle the kinsmen of their conquerors, for the Norman invader in the eleventh century found the shores of Epeiros guarded by the axes of Englishmen no less than the hills of Sussex; and the strangely abiding tie, which the Waring (or Varangian) Guard thus formed between England and the New Rome, lasted until the death-throes of the Byzantine empire, when Harold, the son of Godwine at length found a worthy compeer in Constantine Palaiologos.

Under such a ruler as Roger of Poitou the value of the district would rapidly decline still further, and civilisation would go backward, and even Christianity relax a little of its former hold upon the people. So indeed we may gather from the startling fact that the fine for violence against the weaker sex was, between the Ribble and Mersey, only one quarter of what it was in Cheshire, no more, in fact, than the fine imposed on one who wilfully absented himself from the shire-moot; thus, too, in Cheshire
certain offenders paid a double fine if the offence was committed on a Sunday or during a holy season; but all days were esteemed alike in the wilder district north of the Mersey.

With this rather dreary view of the churchmanship and of the prosperity of our predecessors here in the eleventh century, I must conclude. I have kept you long enough, and must abstain from touching upon further points of interest. But may I ask whether any Liverpool man can prove himself the heir of a certain Æthelmund, of whom Domesday speaks? for, if so, he might lay claim to a property which has considerably increased in value during the last 800 years. "Æthelmund," we are told, "held "Smithdown," i.e., as we have already seen, Liverpool; "it was "worth 32d."!